

State of Utah

Federal Receipts Reporting

and

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 %

Federal Receipts Reductions

For State Fiscal Year 2015



To: The Executive Appropriations Committee

November 30, 2015

Prepared by: Department of Administrative Services, Division of Finance



Table of Contents

Introduction	v
Explanation of Information	v
Federal Receipts Report:	
Designated State Agencies	1
Institutions of Higher Education	4
Local Education Agencies	7
State Agency Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions:	
Agriculture and Food	
Meat and Poultry Inspection	11
Board of Regents and Student Assistance Programs	
Federal College Access Challenge Grant (CACG)	13
Student Loan Guarantee Program	15
Student Loan Purchase Program	17
Environmental Quality	
Drinking Water Federal State Revolving Funds (FSRF)	19
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST)	23
National and State Clean Diesel	25
Nonpoint Source Project Grants	27
Performance Partnership Grant	29
Superfund Sites	31
Water Quality State Revolving Fund Loans	33
Health	
Affordable Care Act – Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program	35
AIDS Prevention	37
Children’s Health Insurance Program – CHIP/CHIPACAID	39
Colorectal Screening	41
Community and Family Health Services Grant - CHIPRA	43
Core Capacity Tobacco – Collaborative Chronic Disease	47
EPICC Diabetes, Nutrition, Physical Activity, Obesity, School Health..	49
Epidemiology and Lab Capacity for Infectious Disease	51
Grant to States to Support Health Insurance Rate Reviews.....	53
Hospital Preparedness Program	55
Immunization and Vaccines for Children	59
Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities	61
Maternal and Child Health Block Grant	63
Medicaid – Federal Survey and Certification Title 18	65
Medicaid – Federal Survey and Certification Title 19	67

Continues

Health (continued)

- Medicaid – Medical Assistance Program 69
- National Cancer Prevention and Control 71
- Preventive Block 73
- Public Health Emergency Preparedness 75
- Ryan White Part B (Ryan White Care Act Title II, Ryan White Part B Supplemental and ADAP Shortfall Relief) 77
- Utah WISEWOMAN Program 79
- Vaccine Distributions 81
- Women, Infant and Children (WIC) Program 83
- Women, Infant and Children (WIC) Technology 85

Heritage and Arts

- AmeriCorps (Corporation for National and Community Service) 87
- Division of Arts and Museums 89
- Division of State History 91
- Utah State Library General Operations 93

Human Services

- Access to Recovery 95
- Adoption Assistance Title IV-E 97
- Block Grants for Community Mental Health Services 99
- Child Welfare Title IV-B Subpart 1 101
- Family Violence Prevention and Services 103
- Foster Care Title IV-E 105
- IV-B Subpart 2, Promoting Safe and Stable Families 107
- IV-D Child Support Collections/Incentives 109
- MH&SA Projects of Regional and National Significance 111
- Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse 113
- Social Services Block Grant, Discretionary and TANF Transfers 115
- Title III Grants for State & Community Programs on Aging and Nutritional Services Incentive Program (NSIP) 117

Labor Commission

- UOSH (Utah OSHA) Compliance 119

National Guard

- Law Enforcement Assistance 121
- Military Construction Cooperative Agreement 123
- Military Operations and Maintenance 125

Natural Resources

- Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program 129
- Boating Safety Coast Guard 131
- Coal Program 133
- Cooperative Agreements 135

Continues

Natural Resources (continued)	
Endangered Species	137
Fish, Wildlife, and Plant Conservation Resource Management	139
Forestry, Fire, and State Lands	141
Recreational Trails Program	143
Sportfish Restoration	145
Wildlife Restoration	147
Public Education	
ASPIRE	149
Assessment and Accountability	151
Career and Technology Education	153
Child Nutrition Programs	155
Elementary Secondary Education Act	159
Office of Rehabilitation, Disability Determination Services	161
Office of Rehabilitation, Vocational Rehabilitation	163
Special Education IDEA	165
Teaching and Learning	167
Public Safety	
Emergency Management Federal Funds	169
Highway Safety Program	171
Transportation	
Highway Planning and Construction Program	173
Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program	175
Public Transit Program	177
Veterans' Affairs	
Veterans Nursing Homes	179
Workforce Services	
Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)	181
Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF)	183
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)	185
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)	187
Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program	189
Employment Service Cluster	191
Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)	193
Refugee and Entrant Assistance	195
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)	197
Temporary Assistance For Needy Families (TANF)	199
Trade Adjustment Assistance	201
Unemployment Insurance (UI)	203
Weatherization Assistance Program	205
Workforce Innovation Fund ("GenLEX")	207
Workforce Investment Act (WIA)	209

This page intentionally left blank.

Introduction

Section 63J-1-219 of the *Utah Code* requires the annual reporting of federal receipts received by certain state agencies, herein referred to as designated state agencies, and requires the report to contain a plan to operate the designated state agency in the event federal receipts are reduced by certain amounts. This report is submitted to the Executive Appropriations Committee.

The report is divided into two sections. The first section is a summary of federal receipts and related budget information for designated state agencies and a summary of federal receipts for state colleges and universities (USHE) and for local education districts and charter schools (LEAs). The second section is the planning information for designated state agencies if there were a reduction of 5 percent and 25 percent in their federal receipts.

Explanation of Information

Federal receipts can vary significantly from year to year for certain federal programs while receipts for other federal programs are fairly constant. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) provided one-time federal money mostly in state fiscal years 2010 and 2011. There was a small amount of ARRA money spent in fiscal year 2015 which is presented separately and is not included in the agency plans of potential 5 percent and 25 percent reductions.

Federal Receipts

The basis for reporting federal receipts is from the State's fiscal year 2015 Single Audit Report for state agencies and state colleges and universities (USHE). The Single Audit Report is published by the Office of the Utah State Auditor at the conclusion of their audit of federal programs. The financial information included in the Single Audit Report and this Report is prepared by the Division of Finance from the State's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) using information from the State's central accounting system and from information submitted by state agencies.

Utah State Higher Education (USHE) includes very different kinds of federal receipts besides what is considered normal federal grants related to the core instruction component and operation of the institution. The majority of the federal receipts are part of the USHE total budget, but not the core operating budget. Further, one of the components of the USHE \$5.4 billion budget is the University of Utah's hospital and clinics which has approximately \$1.8 billion in annual revenue. Only a small portion of the total federal receipts for USHE is appropriated by the Legislature. The vast majority of federal funds come from research and development (R&D) grants for specific research projects. R&D grants are often related to the institution's mission and at the University of Utah also include research grants of the University hospital and clinics. In addition to these funding types, the institutions also receive federal student financial aid. For the purpose of this report, student financial aid is listed as a separate category of federal receipts.

Local education districts and charter schools (LEAs) are not included in the State's Single Audit Report or CAFR. The information presented is from the LEA's Annual Financial Report; this is unaudited information that was submitted to the Utah State Office of Education. Audited financial statements are due by November 30, 2015, and will be reconciled to their annual financial reports. Also, the LEA federal revenues are titled as *Federal Revenues from All Sources* to note that they include both ARRA and non-ARRA grants that come from state agencies as well as direct federal assistance to the LEAs.

Budget

For this report, the statute requires a "total budget" to be presented. For USHE and LEAs "total budget" was not available. In these instances "budgeted expenditures" were used as the denominator to calculate the percentage of total budget that constitutes federal receipts. More detail is provided below.

The *Final Agency Total Budget* for state agencies is from the fiscal year 2015 State of Utah CAFR, Detail Budgetary Comparison Schedules.

The *Budgeted Expenditures* for USHE are the expenditures as reported in the fiscal year 2015 State of Utah CAFR in the Statement of Activities for Component Units.

The *Budgeted Expenditures* for LEAs are from the LEA's unaudited annual financial report submitted to the Utah State Office of Education.

Comparisons

The Federal Receipts Report for State Agencies computes a difference between the *Federal* funds appropriated and the *Federal* funds receipts. There are cases where the receipts received are more than the appropriated amount. The appropriation process starts approximately 18 months before the end of operations for the fiscal year. Two legislative sessions are held during this time where appropriations and supplemental appropriations are made. The statutory and procedural requirements for identifying, approving, and appropriating federal funds have changed in recent years. Some of the situations in fiscal year 2015 for receipts exceeding appropriations may include:

- Several federal programs are exempted from the approval process by statute (UCA 63J-5-103). Also exempt are pass-through federal funds.
- Some appropriations of federal funds, often related to entitlement programs, are appropriated to one agency but a different agency receives the federal funds.
- The federal award/grant was appropriated in one fiscal year but federal receipts were received in subsequent fiscal years.
- Intent language in appropriation bills provides latitude in operating federal programs.

5% and 25% Plan of Potential Reductions

The statute requires designated state agencies to develop plans to operate their agency in the event federal receipts are reduced by 5 percent and 25 percent. State agencies were requested to report only non-ARRA federal programs. The ARRA federal receipts are not included in the plan of potential reductions since it was one-time funding and was mostly spent by fiscal year 2013. To focus attention on significant programs, state agencies were asked at a minimum to report on programs where receipts are \$1 million and greater. In addition, state agencies were allowed to report on groups of programs where the programs or the plans were similar in nature. Reporting federal programs where receipts were less than \$1 million was optional. A federal program is identified by a Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number, such as CFDA number 20.205, Highway Planning and Construction from the Federal Highway Administration.

(Remainder of page is blank.)

(This page intentionally left blank.)

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Designated State Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015

Designated State Agency	Federal Funds Receipts <i>(1)</i>	Federal Funds Appropriated <i>(2)</i>	Appropriated Over/(Under) Receipts <i>(2) - (1)</i>	Final Agency Total Budget <i>(3)</i>	Federal Receipts % of Total Budget <i>(1) / (3)</i>	5% of Non ARRA Fed. Receipts <i>(1) x 5%</i>	25% of Non ARRA Fed. Receipts <i>(1) x 25%</i>
Administrative Services							
Federal grants	\$ 31,716	\$ 38,900	\$ 7,184	\$ 63,451,000	0.0%	\$ 1,586	\$ 7,929
Agriculture and Food							
Federal grants	\$ 5,531,549	\$ 5,699,900	\$ 168,351	\$ 33,116,000	16.7%	\$ 276,577	\$ 1,382,887
Board of Regents							
Federal grants	\$ 1,665,686	\$ 303,100	\$ (1,362,586)	\$ 34,418,000	4.8%	\$ 83,284	\$ 416,422
Commerce							
Federal grants	\$ 283,937	\$ 403,100	\$ 119,163	\$ 35,304,000	0.8%	\$ 14,197	\$ 70,984
Corrections							
Federal grants	\$ 338,170	\$ 394,300	\$ 56,130	\$ 279,162,000	0.1%	\$ 16,909	\$ 84,543
Environmental Quality							
Federal grants	\$ 17,943,898	\$ 18,663,300	\$ 719,402	\$ 56,872,000	31.6%	\$ 897,195	\$ 4,485,975
Governor's Office of Economic Development							
Federal grants	\$ 1,479,288	\$ 1,411,100	\$ (68,188)	\$ 82,119,000	1.8%	\$ 73,964	\$ 369,822
Health							
Federal grants	\$ 1,784,324,115	\$ 1,789,954,400	\$ 5,630,285			\$ 89,216,206	\$ 446,081,029
ARRA funding	20,258,248	36,198,000	15,939,752				
	<u>\$ 1,804,582,363</u>	<u>\$ 1,826,152,400</u>	<u>\$ 21,570,037</u>	\$ 2,794,945,000	64.6%		
Heritage and Arts							
Federal grants	\$ 6,929,161	\$ 7,855,500	\$ 926,339	\$ 27,251,000	25.4%	\$ 346,458	\$ 1,732,290
Human Services							
Federal grants	\$ 119,133,788	\$ 130,215,500	\$ 11,081,712	\$ 734,115,000	16.2%	\$ 5,956,689	\$ 29,783,447
Insurance							
Federal grants	\$ 1,010,866	\$ 3,452,100	\$ 2,441,234	\$ 15,333,000	6.6%	\$ 50,543	\$ 252,717
Labor Commission							
Federal grants	\$ 3,218,704	\$ 3,234,200	\$ 15,496	\$ 14,166,000	22.7%	\$ 160,935	\$ 804,676

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Designated State Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015

Continued

Designated State Agency	Federal Funds Receipts (1)	Federal Funds Appropriated (2)	Appropriated Over/(Under) Receipts (2) - (1)	Final Agency Total Budget (3)	Federal Receipts % of Total Budget (1) / (3)	5% of Non ARRA Fed. Receipts (1) x 5%	25% of Non ARRA Fed. Receipts (1) x 25%
National Guard							
Federal grants	\$ 68,374,140	\$ 63,222,600	\$ (5,151,540)	\$ 74,430,000	91.9%	\$ 3,418,707	\$ 17,093,535
Natural Resources							
Federal grants	\$ 37,997,279	\$ 53,333,300	\$ 15,336,021			\$ 1,899,864	\$ 9,499,320
ARRA funding	3,400,435	80,000	(3,320,435)				
	<u>\$ 41,397,714</u>	<u>\$ 53,413,300</u>	<u>\$ 12,015,586</u>	\$ 219,894,000	18.8%		
Public Education *							
Federal grants	\$ 464,759,976	\$ 548,699,800	\$ 83,939,824			\$ 23,237,999	\$ 116,189,994
ARRA funding	521,838	—	(521,838)				
	<u>\$ 465,281,814</u>	<u>\$ 548,699,800</u>	<u>\$ 83,417,986</u>	\$ 3,428,388,000	13.6%		
Public Safety							
Federal grants	\$ 17,783,122	\$ 37,646,200	\$ 19,863,078	\$ 188,526,000	9.4%	\$ 889,156	\$ 4,445,781
Public Service Commission							
Federal grants	\$ —	\$ 116,900	\$ 116,900			\$ —	\$ —
ARRA funding	889,433	1,375,000	485,567				
	<u>\$ 889,433</u>	<u>\$ 1,491,900</u>	<u>\$ 602,467</u>	\$ 8,404,000	10.6%		
Tax Commission							
Federal grants	\$ 563,537	\$ 537,100	\$ (26,437)	\$ 93,969,000	0.6%	\$ 28,177	\$ 140,884
Technology Services							
Federal grants	\$ 40,000	\$ 1,066,700	\$ 1,026,700	\$ 3,444,000	1.2%	\$ 2,000	\$ 10,000
Transportation							
Federal grants	\$ 315,370,780	\$ 202,726,300	\$(112,644,480)	\$ 1,254,865,000	25.1%	\$ 15,768,539	\$ 78,842,695
Veterans' Affairs **							
Federal grants	\$ 20,969,538	\$ 471,000	\$ (20,498,538)	\$ 3,343,000	627.3%	\$ 1,048,477	\$ 5,242,385
Workforce Services							
Federal grants	<u>\$ 546,465,204</u>	<u>\$ 713,201,600</u>	<u>\$ 166,736,396</u>	<u>\$ 749,126,000</u>	72.9%	<u>\$ 27,323,260</u>	<u>\$ 136,616,301</u>
TOTALS							
Federal grants	\$ 3,414,214,454	\$ 3,582,646,900	\$ 168,432,446			<u>170,710,722</u>	<u>\$ 853,553,616</u>
ARRA funding	25,069,954	37,653,000	12,583,046				
	<u>\$ 3,439,284,408</u>	<u>\$ 3,620,299,900</u>	<u>\$ 181,015,492</u>	<u>\$10,194,641,000</u>	33.7%		

* Public Education includes the Utah State Office of Education, Utah State Office of Rehabilitation, Utah Schools for the Deaf and Blind, and Minimum School Program.

** Veterans' Affairs received \$20.466 million in Federal funds that are not subject to appropriation.

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Designated State Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015

Continued

Designated State Agencies with no Federal Receipts:

Alcoholic Beverage Control
Financial Institutions
Human Resource Management

Enterprise Funds

Enterprise funds are used for loan and certain other programs that are accounted for as business-type activities separate from the normal budgeted operations of a state agency. The employers' unemployment premiums spent are required to be reported in the Single Audit. In addition, some enterprise funds noted below received federal funds used for administration. These costs are reported in the above state agency amounts.

	Employers' Premiums	Federal Funds Receipts	5% of Non ARRA Fed. Receipts	25% of Non ARRA Fed. Receipts
Unemployment Compensation Fund				
– Workforce Services	\$ 177,770,445	\$ 4,748,734	\$ 237,437	\$ 1,187,184
Unemployment Compensation Fund ARRA				
– Workforce Services ***		\$ (801,660)	\$ (40,083)	\$ (200,415)
Water Loan Programs – Environmental Quality		\$ 14,173,226	\$ 708,661	\$ 3,543,307
Water Loan Programs Water Resources Investigation				
– Natural Resources		\$ 482,312	\$ 24,116	\$ 120,578
Federal Health Insurance Pool – Insurance		\$ 53,620	\$ 2,681	\$ 13,405
UCI Utah Wild Horse and Burro Program – Corrections		\$ 295,205	\$ 14,760	\$ 73,801
Housing Loan Programs – Workforce Services		\$ 5,202,440	\$ 260,122	\$ 1,300,610
Student Assistance Programs – Board of Regents ****		\$ (7,417,689)	\$ (370,884)	\$ (1,854,422)

*** Unemployment Compensation Fund negative net federal revenues reflect benefit recoveries from prior years.

**** The Student Assistance Programs had FY 2015 federal revenues of \$33.1 million less student loan interest receipts and special allowance payments of \$40.5 million resulting in a negative balance of \$7.4 million. The student loan interest and special allowance rates, set by federal statute, have traditionally been intended to adjust student loan yields upward to market, resulting in additional positive income. However in the current low interest rate environment, the federally mandated formula has placed the student loan yield above market, requiring the difference to be refunded to the federal government.

Sources:

Federal Funds Receipts — Fiscal Year 2015 Single Audit expenditures with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) listed separately.
Federal Funds Appropriated — Appropriated federal funds from line items in appropriation acts.
Final Agency Total Budget — Fiscal Year 2015 State of Utah Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), Budgetary Comparison Schedules.

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Institutions of Higher Education
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015

<u>Colleges and Universities</u>	<u>Federal Funds Receipts *</u>	<u>Budgeted Expenditures</u>	<u>Federal Receipts % of Total Budget</u>	<u>State Appropriated Federal Funds</u>
University of Utah **				
Institution	\$ 21,226,781			—
Student Financial Aid	31,661,069			—
Research and Development	254,125,775			—
ARRA	100,551			—
	<u>\$ 307,114,176</u>	\$ 3,738,638,000	8.2%	<u>\$ —</u>
Utah State University				
Institution	\$ 17,683,433			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	40,094,122			—
Research and Development	118,989,221			3,902,300
ARRA	104,827			—
	<u>\$ 176,871,603</u>	\$ 617,783,000	28.6%	<u>\$ 3,902,300</u>
Dixie State University				
Institution	\$ 1,062,505			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	16,339,218			—
Research and Development	103,050			—
	<u>\$ 17,504,773</u>	\$ 90,814,000	19.3%	<u>\$ —</u>
Salt Lake Community College				
Institution	\$ 3,082,899			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	35,545,275			—
Research and Development	365,124			—
	<u>\$ 38,993,298</u>	\$ 205,421,000	19.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
Snow College				
Institution	\$ 1,006,710			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	6,236,312			—
	<u>\$ 7,243,022</u>	\$ 43,056,000	16.8%	<u>\$ —</u>
Southern Utah University				
Institution	\$ 6,446,183			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	12,720,681			—
Research and Development	130,921			—
	<u>\$ 19,297,785</u>	\$ 141,584,000	13.6%	<u>\$ —</u>
Utah Valley University				
Institution	\$ 6,871,264			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	48,523,664			—
Research and Development	69,459			—
	<u>\$ 55,464,387</u>	\$ 293,527,000	18.9%	<u>\$ —</u>
Weber State University				
Institution	\$ 2,666,148			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	30,036,221			—
Research and Development	152,045			—
	<u>\$ 32,854,414</u>	<u>\$ 220,497,000</u>	14.9%	<u>\$ —</u>
Total — Colleges and Universities	<u>\$ 655,343,458</u>	<u>\$ 5,351,320,000</u>	12.2%	<u>\$ 3,902,300</u>

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Institutions of Higher Education
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015

Continued

<u>Utah College of Applied Technology</u>	<u>Federal Funds Receipts *</u>	<u>Budgeted Expenditures</u>	<u>Federal Receipts % of Total Budget</u>	<u>State Appropriated Federal Funds</u>
Bridgerland				
Student Financial Aid	\$ 988,380			—
	<u>\$ 988,380</u>	\$ 15,792,000	6.3%	<u>\$ —</u>
Davis				
Student Financial Aid	\$ 1,076,627			—
	<u>\$ 1,076,627</u>	\$ 19,547,000	5.5%	<u>\$ —</u>
Dixie				
Institution	\$ 33,756			
Student Financial Aid	480,334			—
	<u>\$ 514,090</u>	\$ 4,021,000	12.8%	<u>\$ —</u>
Mountainland				
Institution	\$ 31,300			
Student Financial Aid	625,185			—
	<u>\$ 656,485</u>	\$ 11,300,000	5.8%	<u>\$ —</u>
Ogden-Weber				
Institution	\$ 329,209			—
Student Financial Aid	1,600,893			—
	<u>\$ 1,930,102</u>	\$ 20,320,000	9.5%	<u>\$ —</u>
Southwest				
Institution	\$ 5,360			—
Student Financial Aid	249,551			—
	<u>\$ 254,911</u>	\$ 3,983,000	6.4%	<u>\$ —</u>
Tooele				
	<u>\$ —</u>	\$ 3,303,000	0.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
Uintah Basin				
Institution	\$ 33,959			—
Student Financial Aid	152,228			—
	<u>\$ 186,187</u>	\$ 9,407,000	2.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
UCAT Administration				
	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>\$ 2,069,000</u>	0.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
Total — Utah College of Applied Technology				
	<u>\$ 5,606,782</u>	<u>\$ 89,742,000</u>	6.2%	<u>\$ —</u>

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Institutions of Higher Education
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015

Continued

<u>ALL Institutions of Higher Education</u>	<u>Federal Funds Receipts *</u>	<u>Budgeted Expenditures</u>	<u>Federal Receipts % of Total Budget</u>	<u>State Appropriated Federal Funds</u>
TOTALS				
Institution	\$ 60,479,507			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	226,329,760			—
Research and Development	373,935,595			3,902,300
ARRA	<u>205,378</u>			<u>—</u>
Total — All Institutions of Higher Education	<u>\$ 660,950,240</u>	<u>\$ 5,441,062,000</u>	12.1%	<u>\$ 3,902,300</u>

* Federal receipts acquired directly by the institutions.

** Includes University of Utah's hospital and clinics.

Sources:

Federal Funds Receipts — FY 2015 Single Audit expenditures categorized by type of federal assistance: Institution, Student Financial Aid, Research and Development, and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Institution is primarily the core instruction component and operation of the institution of higher education.

Budgeted Expenditures — FY 2015 State of Utah Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) college and university expenditures in the Statement of Activities for Component Units.

State Appropriated Federal Funds — College and university appropriations of \$3,902,300 for USU agriculture experiment station and cooperative extension service.

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Local Education Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015

<u>School Districts</u>	<u>Federal Revenues from All Sources *</u>	<u>Budgeted Expenditures</u>	<u>Percent of Budgeted Expenditures From Federal Revenues</u>
Alpine District.....	\$ 36,223,617	\$ 621,972,913	5.8%
Beaver District.....	1,753,770	18,949,575	9.3%
Box Elder District.....	6,582,981	95,744,884	6.9%
Cache District.....	9,535,605	235,991,724	4.0%
Canyons District.....	21,664,475	369,984,939	5.9%
Carbon District.....	2,899,876	34,144,804	8.5%
Daggett District.....	213,619	4,170,592	5.1%
Davis District.....	41,684,876	613,037,600	6.8%
Duchesne District.....	3,135,526	79,579,000	3.9%
Emery District.....	1,817,148	27,677,599	6.6%
Garfield District.....	1,186,128	12,171,848	9.7%
Grand District.....	1,652,873	19,161,934	8.6%
Granite District.....	64,143,004	553,476,473	11.6%
Iron District.....	6,939,227	73,235,928	9.5%
Jordan District.....	27,945,140	427,886,719	6.5%
Juab District.....	1,537,335	20,369,450	7.5%
Kane District.....	953,378	17,719,782	5.4%
Logan City District.....	6,124,546	28,859,994	21.2%
Millard District.....	3,194,290	34,801,211	9.2%
Morgan District.....	1,007,699	24,713,895	4.1%
Murray District.....	3,392,393	78,238,917	4.3%
Nebo District.....	18,428,221	278,317,271	6.6%
North Sanpete District.....	2,339,365	25,347,654	9.2%
North Summit District.....	614,114	11,945,225	5.1%
Ogden City District.....	20,375,746	133,688,796	15.2%
Park City District.....	1,859,263	71,466,225	2.6%
Piute District.....	927,110	5,622,500	16.5%
Provo District.....	14,668,529	135,094,824	10.9%
Rich District.....	341,903	8,067,247	4.2%
Salt Lake District.....	29,674,668	263,042,598	11.3%
San Juan District.....	13,503,666	45,223,271	29.9%
Sevier District.....	5,017,487	67,792,800	7.4%
South Sanpete District.....	3,352,951	37,652,052	8.9%
South Summit District.....	754,052	19,368,807	3.9%
Tintic District.....	166,594	5,976,521	2.8%
Tooele District.....	18,326,797	133,464,065	13.7%
Uintah District.....	5,659,340	88,709,813	6.4%
Wasatch District.....	3,610,852	63,344,430	5.7%
Washington District.....	20,373,434	255,300,610	8.0%
Wayne District.....	645,242	7,047,995	9.2%
Weber District.....	18,960,240	297,700,706	6.4%
Total School Districts.....	\$ 423,187,080	\$ 5,346,063,191	7.9%

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Local Education Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015

Continued

<u>Charter Schools</u>	<u>Federal Revenues from All Sources *</u>	<u>Budgeted Expenditures</u>	<u>Percent of Budgeted Expenditures From Federal Revenues</u>
Academy for Math Engineering & Science (AMES).....	\$ 161,083	\$ 3,598,002	4.5%
Alianza Academy.....	315,806	3,099,888	10.2%
American International School of Utah.....	218,078	33,498,221	0.7%
American Leadership Academy.....	765,462	12,253,810	6.2%
American Preparatory Academy – Salem.....	207,591	3,019,107	6.9%
American Preparatory Academy – Lea.....	2,277,249	23,008,808	9.9%
Aristotle Academy.....	183,108	1,209,163	15.1%
Ascent Academies.....	261,046	7,612,708	3.4%
Athenian eAcademy **.....	—	—	—
Bear River Charter School.....	52,578	1,223,138	4.3%
Beehive Science & Technology Academy (BSTA).....	123,450	2,063,772	6.0%
Canyon Grove Academy.....	288,760	2,847,106	10.1%
Canyon Rim Academy.....	124,509	6,880,920	1.8%
Channing Hall.....	183,298	4,340,278	4.2%
City Academy.....	147,926	2,226,763	6.6%
CS Lewis Academy.....	210,002	2,120,585	9.9%
Davinci Academy.....	489,514	7,313,839	6.7%
Dixie Montessori Academy.....	120,178	2,489,144	4.8%
Dual Immersion Academy.....	465,017	3,240,336	14.4%
Early Light at Daybreak.....	213,000	4,650,265	4.6%
East Hollywood High.....	114,461	2,466,257	4.6%
Edith Bowen Laboratory School.....	190,744	3,686,046	5.2%
Endeavor Hall.....	134,320	3,453,256	3.9%
Entheos Academy.....	634,698	6,868,456	9.2%
Esperanza School.....	201,777	9,230,717	2.2%
Excelsior Academy.....	455,964	4,386,238	10.4%
Fast Forward High.....	181,496	1,875,171	9.7%
Freedom Preparatory Academy.....	628,637	7,207,631	8.7%
Gateway Preparatory Academy.....	337,590	4,003,648	8.4%
George Washington Academy.....	18,153	5,217,944	0.3%
Good Foundations Academy.....	108,552	7,238,830	1.5%
Greenwood Charter School ***.....	—	—	—
Guadalupe School.....	532,970	2,372,428	22.5%
Hawthorn Academy.....	314,371	5,112,675	6.1%
Highmark Charter School.....	130,921	3,959,997	3.3%
Intech Collegiate High School.....	87,577	1,700,205	5.2%
Itineris Early College High.....	79,179	5,013,528	1.6%
Jefferson Academy.....	173,189	2,780,984	6.2%
John Hancock Charter School.....	33,871	1,181,453	2.9%
Kairos Academy.....	15,973	821,048	1.9%
Karl G Maeser Preparatory Academy.....	78,614	4,272,115	1.8%
Lakeview Academy.....	275,953	5,721,478	4.8%
Leadership Learning Academy.....	204,968	3,021,821	6.8%
Legacy Preparatory Academy.....	205,134	23,313,604	0.9%
Lincoln Academy.....	293,386	6,432,244	4.6%
Lumen Scholar Institute **.....	—	—	—

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Local Education Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015

Continued

Charter Schools	Federal Revenues from All Sources *	Budgeted Expenditures	Percent of Budgeted Expenditures From Federal Revenues
Mana Academy Charter School.....	289,647	2,242,159	12.9%
Maria Montessori Academy.....	119,270	3,552,294	3.4%
Merit College Preparatory Academy.....	261,893	3,026,378	8.7%
Moab Charter School.....	79,028	917,903	8.6%
Monticello Academy.....	252,493	4,835,497	5.2%
Mountain Heights Academy.....	48,209	2,780,984	1.7%
Mountain West Montessori Academy.....	128,504	3,038,801	4.2%
Mountainville Academy.....	117,138	4,523,217	2.6%
Navigator Pointe Academy.....	95,666	3,082,394	3.1%
No. UT Academy For Math Engineering & Science (NUAMES)...	99,926	4,451,578	2.2%
Noah Webster Academy.....	246,755	3,225,558	7.6%
North Davis Preparatory Academy.....	384,178	6,245,108	6.2%
North Star Academy.....	149,521	3,263,007	4.6%
Odyssey Charter School.....	102,718	3,043,145	3.4%
Ogden Preparatory Academy.....	842,924	7,356,962	11.5%
Open Classroom.....	159,520	2,665,450	6.0%
Pacific Heritage Academy.....	253,751	2,294,815	11.1%
Paradigm High School.....	156,981	4,131,611	3.8%
Pinnacle Canyon Academy.....	492,040	5,229,551	9.4%
Pioneer High School for the Performing Arts.....	—	2,381,914	—
Promontory School of Expeditionary Learning.....	238,790	2,750,398	8.7%
Providence Hall.....	579,411	15,507,911	3.7%
Quest Academy.....	274,233	5,325,807	5.1%
Ranches Academy.....	56,103	2,046,723	2.7%
Renaissance Academy.....	123,841	4,038,618	3.1%
Rockwell Charter High School.....	263,931	3,742,404	7.1%
Ronald W Reagan Academy.....	368,585	4,387,984	8.4%
Roots Charter High School **.....	—	—	—
Salt Lake Arts Academy.....	76,247	2,777,654	2.7%
Salt Lake Center for Science Education.....	177,652	2,974,766	6.0%
Salt Lake School for the Performing Arts.....	41,156	2,014,364	2.0%
Scholar Academy.....	205,483	3,027,334	6.8%
Soldier Hollow Charter School.....	67,392	1,700,635	4.0%
Spectrum Academy.....	267,836	9,359,980	2.9%
Success Academy.....	116,656	2,682,176	4.3%
Summit Academy.....	405,905	10,443,583	3.9%
Summit Academy High School.....	142,080	4,517,573	3.1%
Syracuse Arts Academy.....	407,992	6,609,567	6.2%
Terra Academy ***.....	—	—	—
Thomas Edison Charter School.....	165,085	7,299,976	2.3%
Timpanogos Academy.....	54,434	2,676,349	2.0%
Tuacahn High School for the Performing Arts.....	140,365	2,836,016	4.9%
Uintah River High School.....	455,266	1,024,079	44.5%
Utah Career Path High School.....	49,753	1,230,798	4.0%
Utah Connections Academy.....	273,217	5,400,434	5.1%
Utah County Academy of Science (UCAS).....	81,887	2,781,600	2.9%
Utah International Charter School.....	223,945	1,341,684	16.7%
Utah Military Academy.....	72,976	2,355,896	3.1%
Utah Virtual Academy.....	862,023	13,630,664	6.3%

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Local Education Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2015

Continued

<u>Charter Schools</u>	<u>Federal Revenues from All Sources *</u>	<u>Budgeted Expenditures</u>	<u>Percent of Budgeted Expenditures From Federal Revenues</u>
Valley Academy.....	238,758	2,748,386	8.7%
Vanguard Academy ***.....	—	—	—
Venture Academy.....	324,746	4,932,971	6.6%
Vista at Entrada School of Performing Arts and Technology.....	259,506	5,503,726	4.7%
Voyage Academy.....	232,064	10,458,813	2.2%
Walden School of Liberal Arts.....	240,570	3,260,371	7.4%
Wasatch Institute of Technology.....	40,882	546,415	7.5%
Wasatch Peak Academy.....	131,028	2,493,935	5.3%
Weber State University Charter Academy.....	—	223,028	—
Weilenmann School of Discovery.....	166,856	4,388,842	3.8%
Winter Sports School.....	—	538,774	—
Total Charter Schools.....	<u>\$ 24,346,969</u>	<u>\$ 479,902,187</u>	5.1%
Total All Local Education Agencies.....	<u>\$ 447,534,049</u>	<u>\$ 5,825,965,378</u>	7.7%

* Federal Revenues from All Sources includes direct federal assistance to Local Education Agencies and pass through federal revenues received from State agencies.

** New charter school opened.

*** Information not available at time of report.

Source:

Unaudited information from the Local Education Agencies' Annual Financial Report.

Department of Agriculture and Food
Meat and Poultry Inspection

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.475
Agency contact name and phone number	Cody James (801) 538-7166

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,646,112
Number of FTEs	24
Recipients/Clients Served	30 Processing and Harvesting plants 42 Custom Exempt Plants 34 Farm Custom Slaughter plants
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Meat and poultry processing, harvesting, Custom Exempt and Farm Custom Slaughter establishments

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$82,306)	(\$411,528)
State:		
General Fund	(72,131)	(360,657)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$154,437)	(\$772,185)

FTEs	-2	-5
-------------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	In order for the state of Utah to have a Meat and Poultry Inspection program, we need to maintain Utah Code Title 4-32-2.1. Adoption of federal provisions at least equal to, with United States of America Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS) regulations and the Federal meat and Poultry products inspection Acts, Humane Slaughter Act, and title 9 Code of Federal Regulation Part 300 through Part 500.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	UDAF Meat and Poultry Inspection program provide daily coverage to office establishments, so they can market their products for retail and/or wholesale accounts.
25 %	UDAF Meat and Poultry Inspection program provide daily coverage to office establishments, so they can market their products for retail and/or wholesale accounts. Because of the cuts, it would not be feasible for UDAF to continue the inspections. There would not be enough inspectors to inspect all of the plants. The federal government would have to take over the program.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	If we are forced to take a 5% cut in our budget, this means that we'll have to reduce our workforce by approximately two inspection personnel, this will result in turning over to the federal government two slaughter establishments and/or six processing establishments.
25 %	If we are forced to take a 25% cut in our budget, this means that we'll have to reduce our workforce by approximately 9 inspection personnel, this will result in turning over to the federal government 9 slaughter establishments and/or 18 processing establishments.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No, because the federal government would have to take over the state inspection program, which will result in Utah businesses making a decision to come under federal inspection or closing their business.
25 %	No, because the federal government would have to take over the state inspection program, which will result in Utah businesses making a decision to come under federal inspection or closing their business.

Utah State Board of Regents
Department of Outreach and Access/USHE
Federal College Access Challenge Grant (CACG)
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.378
Agency contact name and phone number	Julie Hartley, 801-366-8492

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:	\$ 1,097,663
Federal Receipts	
Number of FTEs	1.02
Recipients/Clients Served	66,121
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Low-income and historically underrepresented students: 64,355 ; Secondary school counselors, financial aid administrators, and college admissions counselors: 1766

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:
(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$54,883)	(\$274,416)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$54,883)	(\$274,416)

FTEs	0	0
-------------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	<p>(1) Provide for public institutions of higher education an amount which is equal to or greater than the average amount provided for non-capital and non-direct research and development expenses or costs by the State to such institutions during the five most recent preceding academic years, and</p> <p>(2) Provide for private institutions of higher education an amount which is equal to or greater than the average amount provided for student financial aid for paying costs associated with postsecondary education by the State to such institutions during the five most recent preceding academic years.</p>
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Eliminate the Utah Scholars Coaches. These programs operate on available funding and do not fund core operations of the State Board of Regents.
25 %	Eliminate the Utah Scholars Coaches and any StepUp Outreach events. Additionally, decrease the statewide StepUp to Higher Education marketing campaign. The CACG activities operate on available funding, and do not fund core operations of the State Board of Regents.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Elimination of the Utah Scholars coaches would affect approximately 100 10 th grade students receiving college preparation mentoring.
25 %	Elimination of the Utah Scholars coaches would affect approximately 100 10 th grade students receiving college preparation mentoring. Additionally, decreasing the marketing campaign would reduce publications, outreach materials, and decrease grassroots initiatives and PR efforts servicing approximately 30,000 middle/Jr. high to high school students and their families.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	None.
25 %	None.

Utah Higher Education Assistance Authority
Student Loan Guarantee Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.032
Agency contact name and phone number	David Schwanke, (801) 321-7286

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 23,550,169
Number of FTEs	36
Recipients/Clients Served	93,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Program provides guarantee services related to a student loan portfolio of approximately \$1.09 billion pertaining to 93,000 borrowers (as of September 30, 2015).

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,177,508)	(\$5,887,542)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$1,177,508)	(\$5,887,542)

FTEs	-1.8	-9
-------------	------	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	N/A
--	-----

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	A 5% reduction in Federal receipts would cause a corresponding decrease in the number of FTE's from 36 to 34.
25 %	A 25% reduction in Federal receipts would cause a corresponding decrease in the number of FTE's from 36 to 27.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	The level of service being provided to student loan borrowers would be diminished but not severely impacted.
25 %	The level of service being provided to student loan borrowers would be diminished and moderately impacted.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Yes, the mandated services would continue to be met with less employees.
25 %	Yes, the mandated services would continue to be met with less employees.

Utah State Board of Regents
Student Loan Purchase Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.032
Agency contact name and phone number	David Schwanke, (801) 321-7286

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	(\$ 30,967,858)
Number of FTEs	195
Recipients/Clients Served	222,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Program manages the servicing activity for a student loan portfolio of approximately \$2.68 billion pertaining to 222,000 borrowers (as of September 30, 2015).

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	NA	NA
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	\$0	\$0

FTEs	0	0
-------------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	N/A
--	-----

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	The Federal interest receipts and special allowance payments related to the Program totaling (\$30,967,858) are interest payments related to a portfolio of individual student loans. The interest rates are set by statute and would require a change of law to reduce the receipts. As such, these receipts are not subject to administrative budget review and are not applicable for this reporting purpose.
25 %	Same as above.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	N/A
25 %	N/A

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	N/A
25 %	N/A

Department of Environmental Quality
Drinking Water Federal State Revolving Funds (FSRF)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
 Based on Fiscal Year 2015
 —Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.468
Agency contact name and phone number	Craig Silotti, (801) 536-4460

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 11,080,508
Number of FTEs	25
Recipients/Clients Served	1025
Description	The purpose of the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Capitalization Grant is to provide grants and low interest loans to Utah communities to replace aging, failing, and inadequate facilities. These projects help water systems achieve or maintain compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act. The conditions of the Grant allow a portion of the grant (up to 31%) to be set aside (simply called set-asides) for specific activities. The Division of Drinking Water uses such set-asides to administer the loan program and to supplement the division's program management. The set-asides are also used for direct technical assistance to the communities. The recipients may therefore be any water system in the State of Utah (total active systems 1,025) and the clients served consists of the entire population in the State of Utah as determined in the 2010 census.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(554,025)	(2,770,127)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Drinking Water Development Security Fund (5210)	0	0
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: Credit _____	0	0
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(554,025)	(2,770,127)

FTEs	-1	-5
------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The state is not required to offer a loan/grant program, but loss of the set-asides would be devastating to the Division of Drinking Water. The grant requires an overall 20% state match deposited directly into the SRF Fund which is provided from sales tax UCA 73-10c-5 (Fund 5235). References are R309-700 & R309-705, and 40 CFR Parts 9 and 35 Federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA), Title XIV Section 1413 "...A State has primary enforcement responsibility for public water systems...for which the Administrator determines... that such State: (1) has adopted drinking water regulations that are no less stringent than the national primary drinking water regulations..." If it is determined
--	---

that Utah is not meeting this requirement, which could include dropping programs that would ordinarily be required under the SDWA, the Federal government can take over implementation of Primacy in Utah.

10% of the total grant can be used for the following state programs: Program augmentation, Capacity Development, Source Water and Operator Certification. A 1:1 match is required for this part of the set-aside.

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	A 5% reduction in federal loan amounts would directly reduce the amount of money available for loans and grants to water systems by an estimated \$433,580. This will mean less ability to provide assistance to water systems facing water system infrastructure problems. No rules would be changed. When ARRA monies were made available by Congress, a survey was conducted to determine the funding needs of public water systems. The results showed a need of \$400 million (not including the Lake Powell Pipeline project and the Bear River project). A 5 % reduction in set-asides would also reduce the Division's operating budget and by association would reduce the amount of direct technical assistance we can offer to water systems by \$120,176. This change would not require any rule or statute changes. This could eliminate 1 FTE.
25 %	A 25% reduction in federal loan amounts would directly reduce the amount of money available for loans and grants to water systems by an estimated \$2,167,902, based on utilization in 2015. This will mean a lesser ability to provide assistance to water systems facing water system infrastructure problems. No rules would be changed. When ARRA monies were made available by Congress, a survey was conducted to determine the funding needs of public water systems. The results showed a need of \$400 million (not including the Lake Powell Pipeline project and the Bear River project). A 25 % reduction would also eliminate the backflow prevention program. This program requires systems to have a program in place to prevent backflow into culinary water systems, which can introduce accidental contamination into distribution systems and homes. Additionally, the state provides certification for testers of backflow prevention devices; water systems rely on this certification, which would also be lost if these reductions occur. The 25% reduction would also mean eliminating review of distribution systems, since (compared with other water system infrastructure) distribution systems represent a lower risk of introducing contaminants and causing adverse health effects. Although reducing review of new distribution systems could pose a risk to water system customers, the Division believes the risk would be greater if cuts were made in other areas. The rest of the plan review process would remain intact. The Division would also eliminate the technical assistance provided to water systems with surface water treatment plants. This involves a single FTE. Up to five FTEs could be eliminated in these scenarios, based on an associated reduction of \$433,580 in the Federal set-asides. Rules affected: R309-500, R309-105-12, R309-305

Continued on next page.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	<p>Overall, less money will be available for water systems and municipalities facing infrastructure, treatment, capacity, and other problems. These monies can be allocated to water systems with more favorable terms when systems are deemed to be disadvantaged, using criteria in R309-705. A reduction in funding for the SRF loan program means that less money will be available to meet these needs among all water systems, including those that have fewer financial resources to correct problems, i.e., disadvantaged communities.</p> <p>It must be noted that many systems have no alternative funding for project construction. Commercial loans would be financially prohibitive or simply unavailable.</p> <p>Water systems benefit from direct technical support that is freely provided to water systems outside of the regulatory process. A reduction in this service means that water systems will have to turn to the private sector for this help, at additional expense to the system, or the system may make costly mistakes and compromise public health.</p>
25 %	<p>The impacts of a 25 % reduction are similar to those for 5% reduction, but of course the scope of the impact is much larger, and even fewer systems would receive meaningful assistance.</p> <p>It must be noted that many systems have no alternative funding for construction projects. Commercial loans would be prohibitively expensive or simply unavailable.</p> <p>Elimination of the backflow prevention program means more risk of otherwise preventable cross-connection/backflow incidents. Such incidents can introduce non-potable water into homes and distribution systems, which endangers the public through exposure to contaminants, including bacteria and potentially hazardous chemicals.</p> <p>Reduction of plan review for distribution systems means that faulty designs may be missed or overlooked, which also carries the risk of introducing untreated water, bacteria, and other contaminants into distribution pipes, homes and businesses, or construction of facilities that are not adequate to meet customer needs.</p> <p>Elimination of the technical assistance to surface water treatment facilities could significantly impact the small water systems with treatment facilities. This may result in treatment objective breakdowns and possible waterborne disease.</p> <p>The Division would consider a reduction of this size to be unsustainable, especially if combined with reductions associated with other Federal grants. The risk of loss of primacy would be very high. The Federal State Revolving Fund (FSRF) program set-asides provided 46.2% of the Division's operating budget (\$2,403,521) in FY 2015.</p>

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	<p>All public water systems in Utah must meet all applicable drinking water standards, which are established under: the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act, the State Safe Drinking Water Act or both. Those water systems that do not or cannot meet standards sometimes use loan/grant funding to remedy areas where infrastructure is needed to comply. The only other fund available to help systems make those improvements is the Drinking Water Security Development Fund provided in UCA 73-10c-5 which is used to meet the 20% state match requirement for the SRF Program. It awards loans to systems using somewhat similar criteria as its federal counterpart and is currently being used in conjunction with the federal program to assist water systems.</p>
25 %	<p>All public water systems in Utah must meet all applicable drinking water standards, which are established under: the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act, the State Safe Drinking Water Act or both. Those water systems that do not or cannot meet standards sometimes use loan/grant funding to remedy areas where infrastructure is needed to comply. The only other fund available to help systems make those improvements is the Drinking Water Security Development Fund provided in UCA 73-10c-5 which is used to meet the 20% state match requirement for the SRF Program. It awards loans to systems using somewhat similar criteria as its federal counterpart and is currently being used in conjunction with the federal program to assist water systems.</p> <p>Since plan review would remain intact for all water system construction, mandated services will be maintained, although reduced. Other resources are not available.</p>

Department of Environmental Quality
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.805
Agency contact name and phone number	Roy Baran, (801) 536-4109

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 969,334
Number of FTEs	10
Recipients/Clients Served	212 Facilities
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Recipient: the leaking underground storage tank program. Client: owners of leaking underground storage tanks who are unable to perform cleanups.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$48,467)	(\$242,333)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: PST Trust Fund	0	0
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$48,467)	(\$242,333)

FTEs	0	-2
-------------	---	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	10% state match.
--	------------------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Investigate and cleanup contaminated sites where owner is unwilling or unable to perform work. No change in statute or rule would be required.
25 %	Investigate and cleanup contaminated sites where owner is unwilling or unable to perform work, also oversight of owners who perform investigation and cleanup of their sites. No change in statute or rule would be required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	Reduces division ability to investigate and cleanup petroleum contaminated LUST sites and slow the cleanups in process.
25 %	Significantly reduces the division's ability to investigate and cleanup contaminated LUST sites, also reduces ability to oversee other sites. Result/impact may be delays in pending property transactions relying on cleanups.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	There are federally mandated services that need to be completed. No other funding sources are available.
25 %	There are federally mandated services that need to be completed. No other funding sources are available.

Department of Environmental Quality
National and State Clean Diesel

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.039 and 66.040
Agency contact name and phone number	Craig Silotti, 801 536-4460

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,173,301
Number of FTEs	.16
Recipients/Clients Served	25
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Construction-1, agriculture-10, school district-1, trucking- 12, state agency-1, small business(off road)-1

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$58,665)	(\$293,325)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other: In-Kind Match from land owners	0	0
TOTAL	(\$58,665)	(\$293,325)

FTEs	0	0
-------------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There is no required match, however if we match the base amount of the grant we awarded an additional 50% federal funds.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Less equipment upgrades/retrofits to reduce diesel emissions. This program awards grants to participants for reducing diesel emissions from fleets. This would not require a change in statute or rules.
25 %	Less equipment upgrades/retrofits to reduce diesel emissions This program awards grants to participants for reducing diesel emissions from fleets. This would not require a change in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Reduction in incentives to reduce diesel emissions from their fleet. The participants would do less equipment upgrades or retrofits.
25 %	Reduction in incentives to reduce diesel emissions from their fleet. The participants would do even less equipment upgrades or retrofits.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	no
25 %	no

Department of Environmental Quality
Nonpoint Source Project Grants

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.460
Agency contact name and phone number	Walter Baker, 801-536-4312

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 874,428
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	17
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Local land owners

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$43,721)	(\$218,607)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other: <u>In-Kind Match from land owners</u>	0	0
TOTAL	(\$43,721)	(\$218,607)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Match for this grant is 40% of federal award amount. This is provided by contracts with in-kind match.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	A 5% reduction in federal funds for this program would result in a dollar for dollar reduction in 319 Nonpoint Source projects funded. There would not be any change needed in statute or rules.
25 %	A 25% reduction in federal funds for this program would result in a dollar for dollar reduction in 319 Nonpoint Source projects funded. It is likely that EPA would require some of the budget cut to be taken in the staffing & support administrative side of this program. This could result in a reduction of funds currently supporting DWQ staffing for this program. There would not be any change needed in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	There would be 5% fewer on the ground projects implemented to address nonpoint source pollution sources.
-----	--

25 %	There would be 25% fewer on the ground projects implemented to address nonpoint source pollution sources. This reduced ability to address nonpoint sources of pollution would eventually result in continued degradation of state water quality.
------	--

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	Utah is only obligated to operate this program at the levels provided by federal funding. Thus, reductions in federal funds would not require the state to provide additional resources.
25 %	Utah is only obligated to operate this program at the levels provided by federal funding. Thus, reductions in federal funds would not require the state to provide additional resources.

Department of Environmental Quality
Performance Partnership Grant

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.605
Agency contact name and phone number	Craig Silotti, (801) 536-4460

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 8,214,417
Number of FTEs	55
Recipients/Clients Served	2,763,885
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	All Utah citizens (2010 census) and the state's environment are benefited and affected. This grant provides funding to monitor and regulate federal programs over Utah's air, land, and water. We regulate various industries that release pollutants in the land, air, and water to benefit all Utah citizens.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$410,721)	(\$2,053,604)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Environmental Quality Restricted Account	0	0
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$410,721)	(\$2,053,604)

FTEs	-3	-13
------	----	-----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	This grant combines 10 different federal programs in one. Each has a different match requirement from zero to 50%. Two grants have a maintenance of base amount totaling \$1,668,400 which does not change with reductions to the federal award amount.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	This grant provides funding to operate programs to ensure state compliance with federal regulations to limit pollutants to acceptable limits to ensure the health of the citizens and environment of the state. The programs include small business assistance, Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Drinking Water Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. The reduction would not result in changes to rules or statutes but would result in a loss of some personnel reducing the department's capacity to comply with all federal regulations.
25 %	This grant provides funding to operate programs to ensure state compliance with federal regulations to limit pollutants to acceptable limit to ensure the health of the citizens and environment of the state. The programs include small business assistance, Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Drinking Water Act and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. The reduction would not result in changes to rules or statutes, but would result in a significant loss of personnel reducing the department's capacity to comply with all federal regulations. Inspections and other compliance activities would be significantly reduced. Reductions of this amount would reduce staff training which would impact their ability to properly perform their duties.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	This would reduce our ability to conduct outreach activities to help small business and keep citizens informed. The effect on industry and general public would not be significant but it would have some impact on our ability to timely issue permits and there would be some reduced monitoring of the environment and industry compliance.
25 %	This would result in a loss of most all public outreach efforts and help to small business. There would be significant delays in issuing permits, reduced oversight and compliance activities, delays in replacing equipment, reduced training of staff. This would increase the risk to the public of exposure to unhealthy air quality, drinking water, water in lakes and streams, and land exposures.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Programs are mandated by federal and state laws.
25 %	Programs are mandated by federal and state laws. Primacy for the federal programs would be threatened if other funding sources were not identified. Fees could be increased.

Department of Environmental Quality

Superfund Sites

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions

Based on Fiscal Year 2015

—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.802
Agency contact name and phone number	Roy Baran, (801) 536-4109

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,442,647
Number of FTEs	13
Recipients/Clients Served	75 Sites
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Recipient: State Superfund program. Client: All citizens of the State affected by contamination of land and water caused by mining and manufacturing activities.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$72,133)	(\$360,662)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

Other:		

TOTAL	(\$72,133)	(\$360,662)

FTEs	0	-3
-------------	---	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	10% state match on Superfund CORE funding.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	State Superfund program. Moderate reductions to site discovery and assessment, involvement in investigation, cleanup, and maintenance of remedies at Superfund sites, coordination with EPA and other stakeholders. No change of statute or rule would be required.
25 %	Significant reductions to the State Superfund program would be required. Discovery and assessment would be cut. A large portion of site assessment work would likely be returned to EPA to complete. State participation in addressing sites and decision-making on cleanups would be curtailed. Delays in cleanups and program development would likely occur. No change of statute or rule would be required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	Moderate reductions in the pace of discovery, investigation and cleanup would affect residents, businesses, and State and local agencies. Also reduction in coordination with stakeholders in addressing Superfund sites.
------------	---

25 %	Significant reduction in the pace of Superfund site cleanup activities would result; also a reduction in the number of sites discovered and evaluated. Significant reduction in State participation in addressing existing sites in Utah, including reduced coordination with stakeholders on site cleanup and other site-specific concerns and issues.
-------------	---

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	The Superfund program is established by the federal Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). While Superfund is not delegated to the states, EPA is required to provide states with meaningful and substantial involvement. This is done through cooperative agreements. If federal funding is cut, state involvement would be reduced. There are no mandated services requiring state maintenance.
25 %	Cuts would significantly reduce state participation in the Superfund program. No federal mandates for services and no other funding sources available.

Department of Environmental Quality
Water Quality State Revolving Fund Loans

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.458
Agency contact name and phone number	Walter Baker, 801-536-4312

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,788,662
Number of FTEs	5
Recipients/Clients Served	65
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Outstanding Loans issued. Recipients include cities, towns, and districts throughout the State of Utah.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$289,433)	(\$1,447,165)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Wastewater Loan Program		
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other: <u>In-Kind</u>		
TOTAL	(\$289,433)	(\$1,447,165)

FTEs	0	-1
-------------	---	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The match is 20%.
--	-------------------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	A 5% reduction in federal funds for this program would result in a dollar for dollar reduction in funding for community wastewater infrastructure projects. It would also result in a reduction in the set-aside allowance used to fund Division FTE administering these wastewater infrastructure projects. There would not be any change needed in statute or rules.
25 %	A 25% reduction in federal funds for this program would result in a dollar for dollar reduction in funding for community wastewater infrastructure projects. It would also result in a reduction in the set-aside allowance used to fund Division FTE administering these wastewater infrastructure projects. There would not be any change needed in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	A 5% reduction in federal funds for this program would result in a dollar for dollar reduction in funding for community wastewater infrastructure projects. Generally communities seeking this funding are the least able to secure private funding and critical infrastructure needs may go unmet. The 5% reduction in federal funds would also result in a reduction in the set-aside allowance used to fund Division FTE administering these wastewater infrastructure projects. At this funding level reduction, project management performance would be impacted.
25 %	A 25% reduction in federal funds for this program would result in a dollar for dollar reduction in funding for community wastewater infrastructure projects. Generally, communities seeking this funding are the least able to secure private funding and critical infrastructure needs may go unmet. The 25% reduction in federal funds would also result in a reduction in the set-aside allowance used to fund Division FTE administering these wastewater infrastructure projects. At this funding level reduction, one FTE would be lost and project management performance would be impacted.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	Utah is only obligated to operate this program at the levels provided by federal funding. Thus, reductions in federal funds would not require the state to provide additional resources.
25 %	Utah is only obligated to operate this program at the levels provided by federal funding. Thus, reductions in federal funds would not require the state to provide additional resources.

Department of Health
Affordable Care Act
Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.505
Agency contact name and phone number	Teresa Whiting, 801-273-2893

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,335,800
Number of FTEs	5
Recipients/Clients Served	Approx. 1,200 families
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Low-income, pregnant women, mothers, and young children in Box Elder, Cache, Rich, Davis, Salt Lake, Weber, Washington, Utah, and Morgan counties.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$116,790)	(\$583,950)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$116,790)	(\$583,950)

FTEs	-0.25	-1.25
-------------	-------	-------

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	None
---	------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	We would eliminate one FTE, and reduce contracts with local service provider to serve approximately 45 fewer families.
25 %	We would eliminate one FTE, and reduce contracts with local service provider to serve approximately 297 fewer families.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	Fewer families will receive home visiting services.
-----	---

25 %	Fewer families will receive home visiting services.
------	---

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	No.
25 %	No.

Department of Health
AIDS Prevention

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.940, 93.944
Agency contact name and phone number	Amelia Self, (801) 538-6221

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,229,228
Number of FTEs	6
Recipients/Clients Served	12,032
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	12,000 clients were tested for HIV in 2014 and through 6/30/2015. In addition, 32 clients were served with partner services for the period of 1/1/15-6/30/15

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:
(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$61,461)	(\$307,307)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$61,461)	(\$307,307)

FTEs	-0.75	-3
------	-------	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	None
--	------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	HIV Prevention program activities including counseling and testing, prevention education and behavioral interventions would need to be reduced. Free testing of at-risk individuals would be reduced and less HIV positive individuals would be identified and referred to care. No change in statute or rules.
25 %	HIV Prevention program activities listed above would be severely reduced and funding to local health departments and community based organizations would be cut. Personnel at the state level would be cut by 3 FTEs. No change in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Free HIV testing would be reduced and limited only to those at highest risk due to limited test kit purchases. Fewer individuals would receive education programs and behavioral interventions. Fees may be charged for counseling and testing, trainings and technical assistance.
25 %	Local Health Departments and funded contracted agencies would receive significant decreases in HIV Prevention funding. Individuals will be limited in their access to HIV testing and prevention education. Positions will be cut at the Utah Department of Health and contracted local health departments and community based organizations.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	There are no mandated federal services in HIV Prevention.
25 %	There are no mandated federal services in HIV Prevention.

Department of Health
Children's Health Insurance Program – CHIP/CHIPACAID

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.767
Agency contact name and phone number	Shari Watkins, (801) 538-6601

Fiscal Year 2015 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 99,693,709
Number of FTEs	7.1
Recipients/Clients Served	15,775 / month
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	CHIP eligible children with family incomes less than or equal to 200% of the federal poverty level (FPL) (after the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act [ACA] implementation in January enrollment changed to less than or equal to 138% FPL). Recipients/Clients Served listed above is the average number of enrollees post ACA implementation as the other children are now covered by Medicaid.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$4,984,685)	(\$24,923,427)
State:		
General Fund	(32,561)	(162,805)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Tobacco Settlement Restricted Account #1320	(551,016)	(2,755,078)
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits	(88,903)	(444,516)
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$5,657,165)	(\$28,285,826)

FTEs	0	0
-------------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Under the MOE provisions, to receive federal Medicaid funds, states cannot impose eligibility and enrollment policies that are more restrictive than those in place at the time the ACA was enacted (March 23, 2010) until 2014 for adults and until 2019 for children in Medicaid and CHIP. This restriction would have to be lifted if either 5% or 25% cuts are required.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 2,351 recipients. Currently the State is required by law to be open to any qualifying child. This law would have to be rescinded and CHIP enrollment would need to be capped at 13,424. An alternative option would be to reduce the amount of CHIPicaid expenditures funded by the CHIP grant. CHIPicaid expenditures are Medicaid expenditures for children that were previously eligible for CHIP prior to ACA or would have been eligible for CHIP had the eligibility rules implemented by ACA not occurred. This option would not necessarily cause any children to lose insurance coverage but would increase other costs for the state because the same expenditures would be reimbursed at the lower, Medicaid reimbursement rate, rather than the CHIP enhanced reimbursement rate. This option would have an increased state cost in the Medicaid budget of approximately \$447,358.
-----	---

25 %	The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 11,755 recipients. Currently the State is required by law to be open to any qualifying child. This law would have to be rescinded and CHIP enrollment would need to be capped at 4,020. An alternative option would be to reduce the amount of CHIPicaid expenditures funded by the CHIP grant. CHIPicaid expenditures are Medicaid expenditures for children that were previously eligible for CHIP prior to ACA or would have been eligible for CHIP had the eligibility rules implemented by ACA not occurred. This option would not necessarily cause any children to lose insurance coverage but would increase other costs for the state because the same expenditures would be reimbursed at the lower, Medicaid reimbursement rate, rather than the CHIP enhanced reimbursement rate. This option would have an increased state cost in the Medicaid budget of approximately \$2,236,791.
------	---

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 2,351 recipients. Currently the State is required by law to be open to any qualifying child. This law would have to be rescinded and CHIP enrollment would need to be capped at 13,424. Current law does not allow for reduction in services. CHIP premiums are paid at a capitated rate. Reduction to this rate would likely cause all service providers to sever their contracts. The alternative option of reducing CHIPicaid expenditures funded by the CHIP grant would minimize the impact on recipients but would increase the State's cost in another budget. This is a viable option only if the hypothetical reductions in federal funding are not imposed on all federally-funded programs.
25 %	The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 11,755 recipients. Currently the State is required by law to be open to any qualifying child. This law would have to be rescinded and CHIP enrollment would need to be capped at 4,020. Current law does not allow for reduction in services. CHIP premiums are paid at a capitated rate. Reduction to this rate would likely cause all service providers to sever their contracts. The alternative option of reducing CHIPicaid expenditures funded by the CHIP grant would minimize the impact on recipients but would increase the State's cost in another budget. This is a viable option only if the hypothetical reductions in federal funding are not imposed on all federally-funded programs.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	The option to cut CHIP eligibility would not cause the burden for coverage to shift to the State. Under ACA, the children's families would be required to find other insurance coverage or face tax penalties. The services provided through this budget are required for the program to exist and changes to state and federal law would have to occur in order for the restrictions on eligibility to be applied.
25 %	The option to cut CHIP eligibility would not cause the burden for coverage to shift to the State. Under ACA, the children's families would be required to find other insurance coverage or face tax penalties. The services provided through this budget are required for the program to exist and changes to state and federal law would have to occur in order for the restrictions on eligibility to be applied.

Department of Health
Colorectal Screening

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Lynette Phillips (801) 538-7049

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 885,594
Number of FTEs	15
Recipients/Clients Served	300
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Low income uninsured individuals in need of a screening colonoscopy.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$42,780)	(\$213,899)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$42,780)	(\$213,899)

FTEs	0	0
-------------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	None.
--	-------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Fifteen low income uninsured individuals in need of a screening colonoscopy would not be able to receive colonoscopy. This would not require a change in statute or rule.
25 %	Seventy five (out of 300) low income uninsured individuals in need of a screening colonoscopy would not be able to receive colonoscopy. This would not require a change in statute or rule.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Fifteen low income uninsured individuals in need of a screening colonoscopy would not be able to receive a colonoscopy (out of 300). Population based education efforts would be reduced somewhat but continue (as per grant requirements)
25 %	Seventy five (out of 300) low income uninsured individuals in need of a screening colonoscopy would not be able to receive a colonoscopy. A 25% reduction would necessitate a decrease of 1.0 FTE Population based education efforts would be scaled back and reduced.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No and no.
25 %	No and no.

Department of Health
Community and Family Health Services Grant – CHIPRA

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015

—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.767
Agency contact name and phone number	Shari Watkins, (801) 538-6601

Fiscal Year 2015 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,015,845
Number of FTEs	1.53
Recipients/Clients served	101,863
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Children in Medicaid and CHIP in both Utah and Idaho

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$100,792)	(\$503,961)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$100,792)	(\$503,961)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) specify that existing coverage for children under the Medicaid or CHIP program will remain in place until 2019. It is assumed that this restriction will be lifted if either 5% or 25% cuts are required. NOTE: This form has been prepared using FY2015 data, as instructed, but it is important to note that the CHIPRA grant ends February 21, 2016.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	The Community and Family Health Services Grant (CHIPRA) is a national quality system for children's health care provided by Medicaid and CHIP. Utah and Idaho are collaborating together to demonstrate a meaningful implementation of the medical home model across primary, specialty, and complex care practices caring for children with chronic and complex conditions using shared statewide electronic health records (EHR) and Health Information Technology systems, evaluating quality improvement efforts and measures that impact the Medicaid and CHIP populations in both states. Utah Department of Health, Division of Medicaid Health Financing has contracted with the University of Utah (U of U) to provide direction for all clinical components of this demonstration project and advisory responsibilities. In addition, U of U provides medical home coordinators in care practices in Utah and Idaho, established a Medical Home Portal with information and resources to enhance care and access to services, developed a pediatric patient summary tool which provides up-to-date patient information, established a partnership with the State of Idaho to improve common clinical problems, immunization delivery, screening, and cooperates with CMS in order to gather information about the effectiveness of CHIPRA.
-----	--

	A federal reduction of 5% would decrease the current contractual payments to the Idaho Department of Health and University of Utah in the amount of \$100,792. This would affect the exchange of important electronic health information records and evaluation and measurement in the quality of care for children in both the Medicaid and CHIP populations. In addition, this would also affect the U of U's ability to adequately inform, direct, and advise the clinics involved with the demonstration project.
25 %	The Community and Family Health Services Grant (CHIPRA) is a national quality system for children's health care provided by Medicaid and CHIP. Utah and Idaho are collaborating together to demonstrate a meaningful implementation of the medical home model across primary, specialty, and complex care practices caring for children with chronic and complex conditions using shared statewide electronic health records (EHR) and Health Information Technology systems, evaluating quality improvement efforts and measures that impact the Medicaid and CHIP populations in both states. Utah Department of Health, Division of Medicaid Health Financing has contracted with the University of Utah (U of U) to provide direction for all clinical components of this demonstration project and advisory responsibilities. In addition, U of U provides medical home coordinators in care practices in Utah and Idaho, established a Medical Home Portal with information and resources to enhance care and access to services, developed a pediatric patient summary tool which provides up-to-date patient information, established a partnership with the State of Idaho to improve common clinical problems, immunization delivery, screening, and cooperates with CMS in order to gather information about the effectiveness of CHIPRA. A federal reduction of 25% would decrease the current contractual payments to the Idaho Department of Health and University of Utah in the amount of \$503,961. This would affect the exchange of important electronic health information records and evaluation and measurement in the quality of care for children in both the Medicaid and CHIP populations. In addition, this would also affect the U of U's ability to adequately inform, direct, and advise the clinics involved with the demonstration project.

	What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?
5 %	The number of Medicaid and CHIP children served under the CHIPRA program with chronic and complex conditions would be reduced from 101,863 to 96,769 for both the states of Utah and Idaho. This is an estimated reduction of 5,094 children being served, 2,538 from Idaho and 2,556 from Utah. If this federal reduction is implemented a decrease in the exchange of important electronic health records for Medicaid and CHIP children in Utah and Idaho will result. In addition U of U will not be able to provide as much support from its medical home coordinators, management of patient information, immunization delivery, and screening to the Utah and Idaho care practices.
25 %	The number of Medicaid and CHIP children served under the CHIPRA program with chronic and complex conditions would be reduced from 101,863 to 76,397 for both the states of Utah and Idaho. This is an estimated reduction of 25,466 children being served, 12,688 from Idaho and 12,778 from Utah. If this federal reduction is implemented a decrease in the exchange of important electronic health records for Medicaid and CHIP children in Utah and Idaho will result. In addition U of U will not be able to provide as much support from its medical home coordinators, management of patient information, immunization delivery, and screening to the Utah and Idaho care practices.

<p>Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?</p>	
5 %	<p>This cut would make 5,094 children in Medicaid and CHIP in the states of Utah and Idaho lose CHIPRA services. There are no mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain if this federal funding is cut. However, there are no current grants or federal programs in place to substitute for these services.</p>
25 %	<p>This cut would make 25,466 children in Medicaid and CHIP in the states of Utah and Idaho lose CHIPRA services. There are no mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain if this federal funding is cut. However, there are no current grants or federal programs in place to substitute for these services.</p>

(This page intentionally left blank.)

Department of Health
Core Capacity Tobacco – Collaborative Chronic Disease

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Janae Duncan, (801) 538-9273

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,229,764
Number of FTEs	7.3
Recipients/Clients Served	Around 200,000 Utah youth and adults
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Utah tobacco users

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$61,488)	(\$307,441)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$61,488)	(\$307,441)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	1:3 required State: Federal
--	-----------------------------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Reductions to Utah Tobacco Quit Line cessation interventions (resulting in 150-200 callers not served) and reductions in local health department community interventions. No change in statute required.
25 %	Reductions to Utah Tobacco Quit Line cessation interventions (resulting in 150-200 callers not served) and reductions in local health department community interventions (with a loss of approximately 2–2.5 FTEs in the local health districts). All UDOH positions are a requirement of the federal funding. No change in statute required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	Decreased access to tobacco quit services and community programs and policies that reduce the burden of tobacco; Increased smoking with resulting health and economic costs to Utah.
-----	--

25 %	Decreased access to tobacco quit services and community programs and policies that reduce the burden of tobacco; Increased smoking with resulting health and economic costs to Utah.
------	--

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	N/A
25 %	N/A

Department of Health
EPICC Diabetes, Nutrition, Physical Activity, Obesity, School Health

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015

—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.945, 93.757
Agency contact name and phone number	Nicole Bissonette, (801) 538-6228

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,979,178
Number of FTEs	25
Recipients/Clients Served	State of Utah residents
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Utah residents with diabetes, uncontrolled hypertension and those at risk for those conditions and well as Utah residents who are overweight or obese.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$148,959)	(\$744,795)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$148,959)	(\$744,795)

FTEs	-2	-6
------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	1:4 required State: Federal match Legislature would need to appropriate additional funds. Current match comes from an allocation of general funds.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Reductions to the school's nutrition and physical activity interventions would result in 30,000 less students being served, reductions to quality improvement efforts around high blood pressure and diabetes resulting in 300+ less people being served. Reductions to local health district efforts and partner efforts. No change in rule or statute.
25 %	Reductions to the schools nutrition and physical activity interventions would result in 150,000 less students being served. Reductions to quality improvement efforts around high blood pressure and diabetes would result in 700+ less people being served. Significant reductions to local health district efforts and partner efforts. No change in rule or statute.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Decreased effort on improving schools nutrition and physical activity policies, decreased effort on blood pressure and diabetes control. Reduced funding to local health districts and partner agencies. Increased incidence of diabetes, high blood pressure, obesity, heart disease and stroke. Reduction in funding to key partners including local health districts.
25 %	Decreased effort on improving schools nutrition and physical activity policies, decreased effort on blood pressure and diabetes control. Reduced funding to local health districts and partner agencies. Increased incidence of diabetes, high blood pressure, obesity, heart disease and stroke. Significant reduction in funding to key partners including local health districts

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	N/A
25 %	N/A

Department of Health
Epidemiology and Lab Capacity for Infectious Disease

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.323
Agency contact name and phone number	Melissa Stevens Dimond, (801) 538-6810

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,351,744
Number of FTEs	17
Recipients/Clients Served	Statewide
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Funds support epidemiologic and laboratory capacity related to: enteric diseases and foodborne disease outbreak detection and response; influenza; health information systems; healthcare associated infections and a multi-drug resistant organism (MDRO) prevention project; West Nile virus; and the National Electronic Disease Surveillance System (NEDSS) implementation in Utah (TriSano). Funds support personnel that attend to surveillance, investigation, and response to diseases and outbreaks in collaboration with local health partners. Funds also support critical laboratory infrastructure and supplies. Contractual funds support courier service for statewide transportation of samples to the Utah Public Health Laboratory (UPHL), implementation of electronic laboratory reporting and refinement of TriSano, and participation by key partners in the MDRO prevention project.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$67,587)	(\$337,936)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$67,587)	(\$337,936)

FTEs	-1	-5.5
------	----	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	N/A
---	-----

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	At the 5% level, reductions would occur in laboratory supplies available for West Nile virus and enteric pathogen testing, and in contracts supporting electronic laboratory reporting implementation and refinement of TriSano. At this level, no staff would be eliminated, and programs would only be reduced, not eliminated. This would not require a change in statute or rules.
25 %	At the 25% level, all contracts, including those supporting courier service for sample transport to UPHL, local health department investigation support, and implementation of electronic laboratory reporting, would be discontinued. In addition, two full-time equivalents (FTEs) would have to be eliminated from these programs. This would not require a change in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	At the 5% level, testing capacity to support identification of West Nile virus and enteric pathogens would be reduced, which would impact public health's ability to detect and promote prevention for these conditions. Capacity to continue implementation of electronic laboratory reporting would be reduced, resulting in delays in bringing additional laboratories onto the system. This would lead to frustration from partner laboratories waiting to participate, and could lead to outbreak identification being missed, or delayed, due to reporting inefficiencies.
25 %	At the 25% level, testing capacity would be severely limited for West Nile virus and enteric pathogens; courier capacity for sample transport would be eliminated; and electronic laboratory reporting progress would be essentially halted. Local health department contracts would be eliminated, and two FTEs would be lost. This level of reduction would be devastating to laboratory and epidemiology public health programs given the resulting, sudden reduction in capacity, and this would have a negative impact on external partnerships, including with local health departments, medical providers and facilities, and laboratories. Electronic laboratory reporting would be stagnant, which would be deleterious long-term given its potential for improving efficiencies and data quality, and given the frustration it would cause with partner laboratories waiting to be brought on to the system.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No.
25 %	No – mandated services would be from the State level; investigation of cases and outbreaks is required in State statute and rule. Internal personnel would be assigned to cover investigations and other critical work previously assigned to reduced or eliminated positions.

Department of Health
Grant to States to Support Health Insurance Rate Reviews

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.511
Agency contact name and phone number	Joel Hoffman, (801) 538-6279

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,596,546
Number of FTEs	2.5
Recipients/Clients Served	Public
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Grant funds are used to promote healthcare transparency. Clients include policy makers, public health employees, academic researchers, and healthcare consumers.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$79,827)	(\$399,136)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$79,827)	(\$399,136)

FTEs	-1	-1.5
-------------	----	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There is no state matching or maintenance of efforts associated with the Grant to States to Support Health Insurance Rate Reviews, Cycle III.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Existing contracts would be reviewed and cancelled or amended to make up the difference. There is \$ 690,277 in outstanding contract budgets. This is more than enough to make reductions of 5% or 25% if necessary.
25 %	Existing contracts would be reviewed and cancelled or amended to make up the difference.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Depending on which contracts change, the data collection, review, or analysis of the All Payer Claims Database will be impacted. This will have an effect on the Office of Healthcare Statistic's ability to support healthcare price transparency efforts in the community. Vendors affected by the reduction may need to limit the scope of their work or make staff reductions.
25 %	Multiple contracts will need to be cancelled or amended to make up the difference.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No, there are not mandated federal services that would be affected by funding cuts.
25 %	No, there are not mandated federal services that would be affected by funding cuts.

Department of Health
Hospital Preparedness Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.889
Agency contact name and phone number	Kevin McCulley 801-273-6669

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,070,081
Number of FTEs	4
Recipients/Clients Served	Utah Hospitals, long term care facilities, LHDs, healthcare association, EMS, others/Statewide
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The HPP provides services to the entire state through funding and developing preparedness and response capacity and capability within healthcare systems, from hospitals, to local public health, to EMS, to long-term care, to outpatient clinics. Sub grantees include all (12) local health departments, of 51 hospitals in the state, 96 long-term care facilities, all Community Health Center organizations in the state, and internally to the Bureau of EMSP.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$103,504)	(\$517,520)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$103,504)	(\$517,520)

FTEs	-2	-4
------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	<p>Matching Funds: ASPR and CDC may not award a cooperative agreement to a state or consortium of states under these programs unless the awardee agrees that, with respect to the amount of the cooperative agreements awarded by ASPR and CDC, the state will make available nonfederal contributions in the amount of 10% (\$1 for each \$10 of federal funds provided in the cooperative agreement) of the award. Match may be provided directly or through donations from public or private entities and may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment or services. Amounts provided by the federal government or services assisted or subsidized to any significant extent by the federal government may not be included in determining the amount of such nonfederal contributions. Please refer to 45 CFR § 92.24 for match requirements, including descriptions of acceptable match resources. Documentation of match, including methods and sources, must be included in the Budget Period 1 application for funds, follow procedures for generally accepted accounting practices, and meet audit requirements.</p> <p>We use FTE match from hospital emergency managers who work on HPP related projects, but are not paid salary from the grant, to satisfy our match requirement. (Ex. A hospital emergency manager earns \$50,000</p>
---	---

	<p>and works 50% FTE on projects funded by HPP, so that is a \$25,000 match toward total). We also provide opportunities for hospitals to note any in-kind match on equipment and supplies that are purchased but not funded through the grant, yet still contribute to grant outcomes.</p> <p>Maintenance of Funding (MOF) Awardees must maintain expenditures for healthcare preparedness and public health security at a level that is not less than the average level of such expenditures maintained by the awardee for the preceding two-year period. This represents an awardee's historical level of contributions or expenditures (money spent) related to federal programmatic activities that have been made prior to the receipt of federal funds. The MOF is used as an indicator of nonfederal support for public health security and healthcare preparedness before the infusion of federal funds. These expenditures are calculated by the awardee without reference to any federal funding that also may have contributed to such programmatic activities in the past. The definition of eligible state expenditures for public health security and healthcare preparedness includes - Appropriations specifically designed to support healthcare or public health emergency preparedness as expended by the entity receiving the award; and funds not specifically appropriated for healthcare or public health emergency preparedness activities but which support healthcare or public health emergency preparedness activities, such as personnel assigned to healthcare or public health emergency preparedness responsibilities or supplies or equipment purchased for healthcare or public health emergency preparedness from general funds or other lines within the operating budget of the entity receiving the award.</p> <p>Awardees must stipulate the total dollar amount in their cooperative agreement funding applications. Awardees must be able to account for MOF separate from accounting for federal funds and separate from accounting for any matching funds requirements; this accounting is subject to ongoing monitoring, oversight, and audit. MOF may not include any subawardee matching funds requirement where applicable.</p> <p>MOF does not apply to future contingent emergency response awards that may be authorized under 317(a) and 317(d) of the Public Health Service Act unless such a requirement were imposed by statute or administrative process at the time.</p> <p>The state of Utah does not contribute to this project, so we certify that MOF is \$0, and validate this by 'certifying with a sentence.'</p>
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	See below, no statute or rule change needed.
25 %	See below, no statute or rule change needed.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	5% Cut will result in a slight reduction of facility level funds for hospitals, long-term care facilities, and community health clinics. It will also result in a reduction in local health department funding, but only for funds that were allocated for shared healthcare coalition purchases. Additional slight losses would be seen in UDOH program elements, including available funds for EMS Strike Teams, Disaster Response Units, and other projects. Overall the impact would be minimal on achieving successful project outcomes.
25 %	A 25% cut would result in a loss of \$782,027 for the HPP program. In order to keep under the administrative cap of 15% per the ASPR HPP grant, at least 1 FTE would have to be cut from the 5 FTE currently funded under the program. Additionally, travel would be cut by 40%, and equipment and supplies would be cut by half. Facility level funds would be reduced by as much as 50%, as well as funding to local health districts by a similar

	amount. Funding for UDOH projects such as EMS Strike Teams and maintenance of disaster response trailers would also be cut by as much as half under this scenario. This would have a severe impact to the program in terms of meeting all proposed outcomes, but we could scale back expectations and pass-through funding and still have a viable program that demonstrates success. The bigger concern would be with the reduction of UDOH FTE that get paid off this program, unsure how we would cover these losses with other funds.
--	---

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
---	--

5 %	We have three projects that are essential for the HPP 1) ESAR-VHP (Utah Responds) – an electronic system that enrolls, tracks, credentials, and deploys healthcare volunteers; and 2) HAvBED (Utah Healthcare Resources Management System (UHRMS)) – an electronic system to track available beds in Utah hospitals. I anticipate under either scenario that we would need to maintain operability of these systems. Additionally, we fund Utah’s Health Alert Network (Utah Notification and Information System (UNIS)) which will need to continue operations.
25 %	Yes/Yes in part – See above. We would still need to sustain these programs, but it may be at the expense of other critical project components. The maintenance costs are fixed for these projects, and we could not cut them.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

Department of Health
Immunization and Vaccines for Children

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.268
Agency contact name and phone number	Rich Lakin, (801) 538-6905

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,267,645
Number of FTEs	22
Recipients/Clients Served	Utah's children
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	26.6% of Utah children are served through the Vaccine for Children Program

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$163,382)	(\$816,911)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$163,382)	(\$816,911)

FTEs	0	0
-------------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	No state matching dollars are required.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	The immunization programs ability to meet federal grant guidelines and reporting would be reduced. The reduction would not require a change in statute or rule.
25 %	The reduction would seriously impact the programs ability to oversee the accountability of 350 provider groups. The reduction would not require a change in statute or rule.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	There would be a 5% reduction in pass through funding in provider contracts. This impact would reduce immunization services.
25 %	There would be a 25% reduction in pass through funding in provider contracts. This impact would reduce immunization services significantly.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Health
Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.181
Agency contact name and phone number	Susan Ord 801-584-8441

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,351,885
Number of FTEs	4.6
Recipients/Clients Served	5,180
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Children birth to three with diagnosed conditions or moderate developmental delays and their families.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$267,594)	(\$1,337,971)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: Parent Fee	0	0
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$267,594)	(\$1,337,971)

FTEs	-0.25	-1.15
-------------	-------	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Non-supplanting requirement states that the same amount of state dollars must be spent on program activities as in the previous year.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Would not require a change in statute or rule. We would reduce either the amount of funding distributed to early intervention programs through contracts with local health departments, universities, and private non-profit agencies, or the amount of supplies, training and IT services purchased to implement systems activities.
25 %	Would reduce both the amount of funding distributed through contracts to early intervention programs, and the amount of supplies, training and IT services purchased to implement systems activities. Reduction to early intervention program contracts would require a change in child eligibility for services thereby limiting the number of children served in the program. This action would require approval from the federal funding agency, as well as a change in state rule R398.20.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Reduce funding of local health departments and other service provider's contracts by 5%. Limit local health departments and service provider's budgets for purchasing supplies, training, and IT support.
25 %	Reduce funding of contracts to local health departments and other service providers by 25%; Consider changing eligibility to serve only children with severe delays. This would reduce the number of children with developmental delays served.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	The state would be required to continue to provide the full array of services to all children enrolled in the early intervention program. These services are mandated by federal law. There are no other resources to meet these needs.
25 %	The state would be required to continue to provide the full array of services to all children enrolled in the early intervention program. These services are mandated by federal law. There are no other resources to meet these needs.

Department of Health
Maternal and Child Health Block Grant

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.994
Agency contact name and phone number	Lynne Nilson 801-694-3143

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 6,556,644
Number of FTEs	35
Recipients/Clients Served	33,819 clients served with Title V dollars. That included 7574 pregnant women, 5998 infants, 15234 children with special health care needs, and 2641 other.
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	These funds are used for all women of childbearing age and all children in the state.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$327,832)	(\$1,639,161)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: Collections/Clinical	0	0
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$327,832)	(\$1,639,161)

-	-1.75	-8.75
---	-------	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Per grant requirements, MOE is the amount spent in 1989 which is \$3,897,700. Match requirement is 3 state to 4 federal dollars and is not in addition to the MOE.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	This level of cut might result in RIFs to several staff, cuts of 5% to contracts
25 %	This level of cut would result in RIFs and/or dissolution of programs as well as cuts to contracts.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Reduce funding of contracts to LHDs and others by 5%, reduce current expenses by 5%, and reduce travel expenses. This cut would reduce the numbers of mothers, infants, children including those with special health care needs served in the Department (CSHCN clinics) and in local health departments.
25 %	Reduce funding of contracts to LHDs and others by 25%; reduce current expenses by 25%; reduce travel expenses by 25%; review all state positions to determine if cuts need to be made to get to a total reduction of 25%. Results of a 25% would limit our ability to serve mothers, infants, children including those with special health care needs, reduce the services provided by the State, local health departments, and others with whom we have contracts.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	We are required to use 30% of the federal funds for Children with Special Health Care Needs and another 30% for children. There are no additional resources that could be used to offset the cut.
25 %	We are required to use 30% of the federal funds for Children with Special Health Care Needs and another 30% for children. There are no additional resources that could be used to offset the cut.

Department of Health
Medicaid – Federal Survey and Certification Title 18

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.777
Agency contact name and phone number	Joel Hoffman, (801) 273-2804

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,307,470
Number of FTEs	24.5
Recipients/Clients Served	Health Facilities
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Home health agencies, hospitals, surgery centers, dialysis centers, hospice agencies

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$115,374)	(\$576,868)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$115,374)	(\$576,868)

FTEs	-1.25	-6.15
------	-------	-------

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	None
--	------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	This would not require a change in rule or statute. A 5% cut would result in the reduction of one staff that inspects surgery centers, home health and hospice agencies, hospitals and dialysis centers. These inspections are done to certify these health providers to receive Medicare funding for health services. Staff also completes complaint investigations on these types of facilities. This would reduce the ability of the office to respond to complaints from the public.
25 %	This would not require a change in rule or statute. A 25% cut would result in the reduction of 5 staff that inspects surgery centers, home health and hospice agencies, hospitals and dialysis centers. These inspections are done to certify these health providers to receive Medicare funding for health services. Staff also completes complaint investigations on these types of facilities. This would significantly reduce the ability of the office to respond to complaints from the public. Federal requirements for survey could not be met and the State Survey Agency would receive non-performance budget reductions.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	If this reduction was implemented, our office would not be able to meet the Federal survey requirements to ensure that health providers are in compliance with Medicare requirements. Certification of these health providers to obtain Medicare funding may be in jeopardy.
25 %	If this reduction was implemented, our office would not be able to meet the Federal survey requirements to ensure compliance with Medicare requirements. Certification of these health providers to obtain Medicare funding may be in jeopardy. A 25% cut would result in a large number of health providers not being able to maintain certification for Medicare funds.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	There is no state money to support this function. Certification for Medicare is solely based on the Federal requirement for facilities that receive Medicare funding.
25 %	There is no state money to support this function. Certification for Medicare is solely based on the Federal requirement for facilities that receive Medicare funding.

Department of Health
Medicaid – Federal Survey and Certification Title 19

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.777
Agency contact name and phone number	Joel Hoffman, (801) 273-2804

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,081,079
Number of FTEs	14.5
Recipients/Clients Served	Health Facilities
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Nursing Care Facilities, Hospitals

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$54,054)	(\$270,270)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$54,054)	(\$270,270)

FTEs	-1.25	-2.75
------	-------	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Match rate is 75/25 or 50/50 depending on activity.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	This would not require a change in rule or statute. A 5% cut would result in the reduction of 1 staff that inspects nursing facilities. These inspections are done to certify these providers to receive Medicaid funding for health services. Staff also completes complaint investigations on these types of facilities. This would reduce the ability of the office to respond to complaints from the public.
25 %	This may require a change in the state Medicaid Plan. A 25% cut would result in the reduction of 3 staff that inspects nursing facilities. These inspections are done to certify these providers to receive Medicaid funding for health services. If they cannot be certified, then Federal funding would not be available. Staff also completes complaint investigations on these types of facilities. This would significantly reduce the ability of the office to respond to complaints from the public.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	If this reduction was implemented, our office would not be able to meet the Federal survey requirements to ensure that nursing home providers are in compliance with Medicaid requirements. Certification of these health providers to obtain Medicaid funding may be in jeopardy.
25 %	If this reduction was implemented, our office would not be able to meet the Federal survey requirements to ensure that nursing home providers are in compliance with Medicaid requirements. Certification of these health providers to obtain Medicaid funding would be in jeopardy.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	There is no extra state money to support this function of certification inspections. Certification for Medicaid is based on the State and Federal requirements for facilities that receive Medicaid funding.
25 %	There is no extra state money to support this function of certification inspections. Certification for Medicaid is based on the State and Federal requirements for facilities that receive Medicaid funding.

Department of Health
Medicaid – Medical Assistance Program
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.778
Agency contact name and phone number	Shari Watkins, (801) 538-6601

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,551,139,209
Number of FTEs	N/A
Recipients/Clients Served	307,295 / month
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	People with low income, with physical or mental disabilities, and the aged.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$77,556,960)	(\$387,784,802)
State:		
General Fund	(9,165,492)	(58,767,161)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Hospital Provider Assessments #2241		(48,500,000)
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Nursing Care Facilities Account #1223		(25,064,300)
Dedicated Credits	(22,773,534)	(25,154,197)
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$109,495,986)	(\$545,270,460)

FTEs	0	0
-------------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Under the MOE provisions, to receive federal Medicaid funds, states cannot impose eligibility and enrollment policies that are more restrictive than those in place at the time the ACA was enacted (March 23, 2010) until 2014 for adults and until 2019 for children in Medicaid and CHIP. It is assumed that some restrictions under this legislation will be lifted if either 5% or 25% cuts are required.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	<p>Coverage groups eliminated: Presumptive Eligibility for Pregnant Women (Baby your Baby), Foster Care Independent Living, and Breast & Cervical Cancer.</p> <p>Services Eliminated: Vision & Dental for Pregnant Women, Interpretive Services, Personal Care, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Podiatry and Hospice.</p> <p>Programs Eliminated: Graduate Medical Education (GME), University of Utah Medical Group (UUMG) Physician Enhanced Payments, Inpatient Upper Payment Limit (UPL), and Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) payments.</p> <p>Administrative Functions: Funds for administrative functions would be lost for DOH, Division of Medicaid, DWS and DHS. This would result in the reduction of staff which would impact the following: services to clients/patients, oversight and management of programs and services, fiscal functions, and IT related services.</p>
------------	---

25 %	<p>All the same from the 5% group and:</p> <p>Eliminate Coverage for Medically Needy Individuals. Eliminate the Nursing Home Assessment. Eliminate the Hospital Assessment. Eliminate Outpatient Upper Payment Limit (UPL). Eliminate Nursing Home Quality Incentive Payments. Eliminate Nursing Facility Upper Payment Limit (UPL). Eliminate Affordable Care Act Physician Enhancement payments. Considerable reduction in administrative staff and services.</p>
-------------	---

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	2,857 individuals will lose coverage. 10,305 individuals will lose partial coverage. The University of Utah will take reductions in funding from the Physician Enhancement. All hospitals that have Graduate Medical Education (GME) and Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) programs will take reductions. All hospitals participating in the Inpatient UPL program will take reductions. The loss of administrative funds will result in the loss of services where program staff is reduced. The oversight of programs would also be lost which could result in disallowances.
------------	---

25 %	<p>All the same from the 5% scenario plus:</p> <p>28,806 more individuals will lose coverage. All hospitals in the state will take a dramatic reimbursement reduction. All nursing homes will take a significant reimbursement reduction. Physician reimbursement will be reduced from recently increased levels related to ACA. People that usually qualify for Medicaid when a catastrophic event occurs (such as a premature birth) will no longer have that safety net. All hospitals participating in the Outpatient UPL program will take additional reductions. Nursing homes will see reductions from the Quality Incentive Payments program and Nursing Facility UPL program. The University of Utah Hospital will take another large cut due to the elimination of the Inpatient UPL.</p>
-------------	---

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	All programs cuts are optional and coverage groups are optional; however, many of the individuals who are cut may qualify through the spend down program. We assume federal maintenance of effort requirements will be lifted if the federal funding is cut.
25 %	Nothing mandated; however, uncompensated care costs to hospitals will increase. We assume federal maintenance of effort requirements will be lifted if the federal funding is cut.

A Department of Health
National Cancer Prevention and Control

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283, 93.752
Agency contact name and phone number	Lynette Phillips (801) 538-7049

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,764,693
Number of FTEs	25
Recipients/Clients Served	4,330
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Uninsured or underinsured Women age 50 to 64

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$138,235)	(\$691,173)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$138,235)	(\$691,173)

FTEs	0	0
-------------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	<p>The Breast and Cervical Program funded through this grant requires Maintenance of Effort funding of \$489,500 of State general funds which is equal to the average amount of State expenditures for breast and cervical cancer programs and activities for the two year period prior to the first Federal fiscal year of funding for NBCCEDP. The total Maintenance of effort amount is required in order to accept any Federal funding by terms of the grant award.</p> <p>The grantor requires the Cancer Program provide matching participation from non-Federal funding sources in the amount of \$1 for every \$3 of federal funding. Matching funds may be cash, in-kind, or donated services.</p>
---	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	The Utah Cancer Control Breast & Cervical Cancer Screening program would reduce the number of Clinical Breast Exams, Pap tests, mammograms from 4,915 screens to 4,670 (a reduction of 245 screens). This would not require a change in statute or rule.
25 %	The UCCP screening program would reduce the number of Clinical Breast Exams, Pap tests, mammograms from 4,915 screens to 3,440 (a reduction of 1,475 screens). This would not require a change in statute or rule.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Women served by the program would receive 245 less screening services. Also, Local Health Departments and Community Health Centers currently receive \$478,790 to implement the UCCP screening program and outreach activities. With a 5% cut this amount would be reduced by \$23,939.
25 %	Women served by the program would receive 1,475 less screening services. Also the amount received by Local Health Departments and Community Health Centers would be reduced by \$119,697.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No and No
25 %	No and No

Department of Health
Preventive Block

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.758
Agency contact name and phone number	Heather Borski, (801) 538-9998

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,198,280
Number of FTEs	2
Recipients/Clients Served	Statewide
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Prevention Block Grant funds a number of different programs with statewide reach, including efforts to promote physical activity and healthy eating, prevent unintentional injuries, such as motor vehicle crashes, falls and suicide, and prevent sexual assault.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2012:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$59,914)	(\$299,570)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$59,914)	(\$299,570)

FTEs	0	-2
------	---	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	N/A
--	-----

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Efforts to promote physical activity and healthy eating will be reduced.
25 %	Efforts to promote physical activity and healthy eating, and prevent unintentional injuries at the community level will be drastically reduced.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Fewer citizens will be reached with critical information, education, and resources that promote physical activity and healthy eating.
25 %	Community, school and worksite-level efforts to increase physical activity, improve healthy eating, and prevent injuries will be dramatically reduced in all 13 local health department jurisdictions. Significantly fewer citizens will be reached with critical information, education, and resources that promote health.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	N/A
25 %	N/A

Department of Health
Public Health Emergency Preparedness

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.069
Agency contact name and phone number	Dean Penovich 801-273-6656

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 7,050,540
Number of FTEs	20
Recipients/Clients Served	UDOH, 12 LHDs, Tribes /Population of the State of Utah
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Public Health Preparedness efforts benefit the population of Utah. Funds go to four UDOH bureaus, all LHDs and tribes. No direct daily services are provided to individuals, but efforts are in place to protect all Utah citizens during emergencies. Funds go toward enhancing the public health system to protect citizens from laboratory functions to epidemiology and risk communication.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	\$352,527	\$1,762,635
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _Parent Fee		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	\$352,527	\$1,762,635

FTEs	-1	-5
-------------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	<p>Matching requirement is 10% of Federal Funds. Groups that receive pass through funds, e.g. LHD's, match the 10% on the portion received.</p> <p>Per grant provisions: CDC may not award a cooperative agreement to a state or consortium of states under this program unless the awardee agrees that, with respect to the amount of the cooperative agreement awarded by CDC, the state will make available nonfederal contributions in the amount of 10% (\$1 for each \$10 of federal funds provided in the cooperative agreement) of the award.</p> <p>Match may be provided directly or through donations from public or private entities and may be in cash or in kind, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment or services. Amounts provided by the federal government or services assisted or subsidized to any significant extent by the federal government, may not be included in determining the amount of such non-federal contributions.</p> <p>Awardees must maintain expenditures for public health security at a level that is not less than the average level of such expenditures maintain by the awardee for the preceding two-year period. This represents an awardee's historical level of contributions related to federal programmatic activities that have been made prior to the receipt of federal funds "expenditures" (money spent). The MSF is used as an indicator of nonfederal support for public health security before the</p>
---	--

	<p>infusion of federal funds. These expenditures are calculated by the awardee without reference to any federal funding that also may have contributed to such programmatic activities in the past. Awardees must stipulate the total dollar amount in their cooperative agreement applications. Awardees must be able to account for MSF separate from accounting for federal funds and separate from accounting for any matching funds requirements; this accounting is subject to ongoing monitoring, oversight, and audit. MSF may not include any matching funds requirement.</p> <p>This requirement does not apply to future contingent supplemental emergency response awards that may be authorized under 317(a) and 317(d) of the Public Health Service Act.</p>
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	See below, no statute or rule change needed.
25 %	See below, no statute or rule change needed.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Reduce funding to LHDs and tribes by percentage (5%); reduce funds to epidemiology, laboratory, Public Information Office (PIO), and preparedness by percentage. 5% cut would be handled with reduction in certain preparedness funded activities and capabilities, including release of 1 FTE.
25 %	Reduce funding to LHDs and tribes by percentage (25%); reduce funds to epidemiology, laboratory, PIO, and preparedness by percentage. 25% cut would eliminate preparedness funded activities and directly effect FTEs paid for from cooperative agreement at the UDOH. EMS/P: 5% cuts plus cut other 50% of trainer, cut out of state travel by 75%, cut 25% of coordinator, no new computer equipment, cut planner to 50% FTE from 90% (change FTE to PT), cut 25% of the CRI coordinator, remove 114 phone and fax line, cut supplies and exercise funds, cut tribe funding more then 20% (29%). Chemistry & Bio laboratory: 5% cut plus 25% cut would greatly decrease lab capacity for public health response (cut service contracts and lab testing supplies), staff would be let go (2 FTE), systems ended, or tests would not be able to be done. Epidemiology: 5% cut plus 25% decrease would end National Electronic Disease Surveillance System (NEDSS) work, PIO: 5 and 25% cuts would decrease FTE status of employee.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	We have numerous performance measures that are expected to be maintained. One is required through Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act (PAHPRA) legislation which involves notification and assembly of emergency response personnel. No other resources are available to meet this need.
25 %	Same as answer above.

Department of Health
Ryan White Part B

(Ryan White Care Act Title II, Ryan White Part B Supplemental and ADAP Shortfall Relief)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.917
Agency contact name and phone number	Amelia Seif, 801-538-6221

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,587,911
Number of FTEs	5.8
Recipients/Clients Served	1847 (estimated; duplicated)
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	HIV positive individuals receive assistance in accessing HIV-related medications either through coverage of cost of medication or with insurance costs.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$279,396)	(\$1,396,978)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$279,396)	(\$1,396,978)

FTEs	0	0
-------------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There is matching and maintenance of effort requirements for the Ryan White Care Act Title II funding (ADAP Supplemental funding). Match amount for FY2015 is \$41,943.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Reducing this funding source by 5% would result in 25 HIV positive individuals being removed from the AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP). No change in statute or rules is required.
25 %	Reducing this funding source by 25% would result in 129 HIV positive individuals being removed from the AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP). No change in statute or rules is required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	The impact would be that the 25 individuals affected would not receive their HIV medications and would need to find another way to obtain HIV medications. The medications are expensive, the annual average cost per ADAP client is \$10,622.50 and individuals cannot afford them without assistance. There is no other state or local programs that assist with HIV medications.
25 %	The impact would be that there would be 129 individuals affected that would not receive their HIV medications and would need to find another way to obtain HIV medications. The medications are expensive, the annual average cost per ADAP client is \$10,622.50 and individuals cannot afford them without assistance. There is no other state or local programs that assist with HIV medications.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	The State is not obligated to provide medications to HIV positive individuals, but when the individuals become sick from lack of medications, the hospitals are obligated to provide medical care which would be much more expensive than the cost of the medications. Individuals may be able to receive the medications through a patient assistance program, but this is uncertain and depends on what HIV medications the person is on.
25 %	The State is not obligated to provide medications to HIV positive individuals, but when the individuals become sick from lack of medications, the hospitals are obligated to provide medical care which would be much more expensive than the cost of the medications. Individuals may be able to receive the medications through a patient assistance program, but this is uncertain and depends on what HIV medications the person is on.

Department of Health
Utah WISEWOMAN Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.094
Agency contact name and phone number	Lynette Phillips, (801) 538-7049

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,168,929
Number of FTEs	5.5
Recipients/Clients Served	4,140
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Funding provides cardiovascular and diabetes testing (cholesterol, glucose and blood pressure) and lifestyle counseling to uninsured or underinsured Utah women aged 50-64 who live at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL).

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$58,446)	(\$292,232)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$58,446)	(\$292,232)

FTEs	0	-1
------	---	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	None
--	------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Eliminate proposed evaluation activities designed to demonstrate the success of the program and would reduce the ability of the program to provide education and support materials to client to help them reach their physical activity, nutrition and weight loss goals. Additionally the program would be able to provide the services including lifestyle coaching to 207 fewer women (screening would be reduced from 4,140 to 3,933) This would not require a change in statute or rule.
25 %	Eliminate proposed evaluation activities designed to demonstrate the success of the program and would eliminate the ability of the program to provide education and support materials to client to help them reach their physical activity, nutrition and weight loss goals. Additionally the program would be able to provide the services including lifestyle coaching to 1,035 fewer women (screening would be reduced from 4,140 to 3,105) This would not require a change in statute or rule.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services?
What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	Reduce the amount of funding by \$38,5709 that the UDOH would give to Local Health Departments to provide the services (cholesterol, glucose, blood pressure testing and lifestyle counseling for nutrition, physical activity, and healthy weight) to Utah women aged 50-64 who live at or below 250% FPL. Program would offer services to fewer women and be required to evaluate the impact of the program with limited resources.
25 %	Reduce the amount of funding by \$154,316 that the UDOH would give to Local Health Departments to provide the services (cholesterol, glucose, blood pressure testing and lifestyle counseling for nutrition, physical activity, and healthy weight) to Utah women aged 50-64 who live at or below 250% FPL. Program would offer services to fewer women and be required to evaluate the impact of the program with extremely limited resources.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut?
Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Health
Vaccine Distributions

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.268
Agency contact name and phone number	Rich Lakin, (801) 538-6905

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 27,153,808
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	0
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Vaccine for Children clients and the underinsured (insurance does not cover vaccines)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,357,690)	(\$6,788,452)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$1,357,690)	(\$6,788,452)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	No state matching dollars are required.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	The reduction would impact our ability to respond during an outbreak. The reduction would not require a change in statute or rule.
25 %	The reduction would seriously impact our ability to serve the underinsured. The reduction would not require a change in statute or rule.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	The reduction would impact our ability to respond during an outbreak.
25 %	This change would send underinsured clients from their medical home to a Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC) or Rural Health Center (RHC).

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Health
Women, Infant and Children (WIC) Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015, projecting for FFY2016
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.557
Agency contact name and phone number	Chris Furner 801-273-2918

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 42,605,838
Number of FTEs	15
Recipients/Clients Served	Approx. 59,000/month
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Pregnant women, new mothers, and children up to the age of 5

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$2,130,292)	(\$10,651,460)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$2,130,292)	(\$10,651,460)

FTEs	-1	-5
-------------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	None
--	------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	5% cut to the WIC Program could encompass every funding source, including: NSA (Admin dollars), Food funding, Infrastructure, Operational Adjustment Funds and possibly breastfeeding, peer counseling dollars. No changes to state rules would need to be made. WIC does not believe a 5% cut would reduce their services or program operations.
25 %	25% cut to the WIC Program would encompass every funding source, including: NSA, Food, Operational Adjustment fundings. If Congress does not act and produce a budget for FFY2016, a funding reduction will immediately reduce our base budget which would require us to reduce local health department contracts. If we take a 25% reduction in monies, it would immediately force us into caseload management (CM). CM is where we are required to reduce our total benefitted participation counts by cutting out the "healthiest caseload" from the WIC roles first. This is completed with strict oversight from our funding agency, USDA. This would mean 4-year old children as well as post-partum women would be immediately affected if a 25% cut took place. Depending on whether these cuts would allow us to complete the year without a deficit would depend on how many individuals we would need to pull from the program. The last time Utah was forced into CM, due to tight

	financial times, many WIC families "auto-terminated" themselves from the Program without our knowledge or recommendation. It is a phenomenon that we cannot control.
--	--

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	No CM cuts expected if we only experience a 5% cut.
25 %	Immediate CM cuts would be expected if we experience a 25% cut from our funding streams.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	All WIC services would continue to be required.
25 %	All WIC services would continue to be required, though we would only be able to serve a reduced number of participants and state and local staffing ratios may be impacted.

Department of Health
Women, Infant and Children (WIC) Technology

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.578
Agency contact name and phone number	Chris Furner 801-273-2918

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,710,294
Number of FTEs	2
Recipients/Clients Served	8 state WIC programs
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	State WIC program operating systems for serving pregnant women, new mothers, and children up to the age of 5

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$85,515)	(\$427,574)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$85,515)	(\$427,574)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	None
--	------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	The Utah WIC Program currently holds the Maintenance and Enhancement Contract for the Mountain Plains States Consortium WIC Data System which consists of eight states. A 5% cut to this project could mean a decline in enhancement services, change ideas, and trouble shooting from our contractor and the possible inability to add new states to the current User Group. No changes to state rules would need to be made. WIC does not believe a 5% cut would reduce their services or program operations and believes it would still meet the USDA deadline for the implementation of electronic WIC vouchers.
25 %	The Mountain plains User Group is part of an overall FNS initiative to plan, develop, deploy, and maintain a model information systems used by and available for transfer to WIC State agencies. A 25% reduction to our base budget for the EBT Maintenance and Enhancement Contract to implement WIC Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) to the WIC Program would immediately hinder the progress on the State Agency Model mandate for designing, building, and implementing the Mountain Plains User Group WIC information systems.

	A 25% cut would affect the WIC programs of Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah. This reduction may halt ongoing maintenance and support by our contractor, Ciber.
--	--

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	No impact on recipients, however our services listed in the contract would need to be negotiated.
25 %	Immediate changes and delays in the implementation of WIC EBT would be expected if we experience a 25% cut from our funding streams.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	All WIC services would continue to be required, and all WIC State agencies would still be required to implement WIC electronic benefit transfer (EBT) statewide by October 1, 2020.
25 %	All WIC services would continue to be required, and all WIC State agencies would still be required to implement WIC electronic benefit transfer (EBT) statewide by October 1, 2020.

Department of Heritage and Arts
AmeriCorps (Corporation for National and Community Service)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	94.003, 94.006, 94.007, 94.009, 94.021
Agency contact name and phone number	LaDawn Stoddard, (801) 245-7223

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,378,895
Number of FTEs	1
Recipients/Clients Served	75,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	UServeUtah, the Utah Commission on Service & Volunteerism, in partnership with the Corporation for National and Community Service, brings National Service programs to Utah. Programs operate in almost every region of the state, bringing much needed support and training to rural and urban Utah. 1200 AmeriCorps members currently serve across the state serving thousands of clients. The Utah portfolio comprises 12 AmeriCorps programs that target underserved populations in the areas of: Economic Opportunity, Education, Environmental Stewardship, Disaster Preparedness, Healthy Futures and Veterans and Military Families. Programs currently operating in the state include the USU/Utah Conservation Corps; Association for Utah Community Health; Salt Lake City; Playworks; Boys and Girls Club; Utah Campus Compact; Red Cross; Four Corners School; Habitat for Humanity; and BYU.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$168,945)	(\$844,724)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$168,945)	(\$844,724)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There is a 1:1 match required on the \$250,000 administrative funding provided for the program. This match is met through a General Fund appropriation and in-kind contributions. Match on pass-thru program funding is met by individual organizations receiving grant funds.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in less program funding for support of local AmeriCorps members. Fewer members would be available to serve throughout the state. Admin funding is guaranteed at the Small State Minimum of \$250,000. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in less program funding for support of local AmeriCorps members. Fewer members would be available to serve throughout the state. Admin funding is guaranteed at the Small State Minimum of \$250,000.No change in statute would be required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	There would be fewer AmeriCorps members serving/volunteering throughout the state, which would directly impact children tutored, individuals receiving health care resource services, children served in after school programs, resources for the homeless and land maintenance projects completed.
25 %	There would be significantly less AmeriCorps members serving/volunteering through the state, which would directly impact children tutored, individuals receiving health care resource services, children served in after school programs, resources for the homeless and land maintenance projects completed.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No, there are no mandated services.
25 %	No, there are no mandated services.

Department of Heritage and Arts
Division of Arts and Museums

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	45.025
Agency contact name and phone number	Kristen Darrington, (801) 236-7552

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 940,573
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	1,500,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Arts organizations, individual artists, students, schools, teachers, communities, and people attending events funded by the division.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$47,029)	(\$235,143)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$47,029)	(\$235,143)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	National Endowment for the Arts grant requires a one-to-one match in state dollars.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Grants to nonprofit arts organization, schools and school districts would be reduced. No change in statute or rules.
25 %	Grants to nonprofit arts organizations, schools, and school districts would be cut and program budgets would be reduced.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	Funding opportunities for arts organizations, schools, and school districts to support projects and programs would be limited.
25 %	Funding opportunities would be limited for arts organizations, schools, and school districts to support projects and programs. Program budgets would be reduced limiting the outreach capabilities of the division.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No. No.
25 %	No. No.

Department of Heritage and Arts
Division of State History

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.069, 15.224, 15.904
Agency contact name and phone number	Jim Grover (801) 245-7207 or Jill Flygare (801) 245-7206

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 843,932
Number of FTEs	6
Recipients/Clients Served	3,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	State-wide oil, gas, highway, water, power, and housing and development projects received expedited assistance prior to project onset, as required by state and federal laws; Utah archaeological consultant firms receive ongoing cost-saving online access to approximately 100,000 archaeological records and 120,000 historic site records; State-wide local governments with historic preservation commissions receive technical assistance and preservation grants; Utah building owners obtain approximately \$20 million in historic preservation tax credits; Utah building owners are assisted with listing properties on the National Register, stimulating heritage tourism and economic development; the division formally interacts with 80 federal, state, and local agencies who receive on-going technical assistance and services.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$42,197)	(\$210,983)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$42,197)	(\$210,983)

FTEs	0	-2
------	---	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	\$111,777 of the federal funds listed above are derived from cooperative agreements with BLM and USDA and have no matching or maintenance of effort requirements. The remaining federal funds, \$732,155 are State Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) grants, for which half of the matching share is provided through sub-recipient match from local governments. The remaining HPF match is provided by general fund appropriations to the Historic Preservation program for state-mandated functions.
---	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Reduction in grants to local governments. Impact would be negligible – No change to statutes or rules.

25 %	Reduction in grants to local governments and reduced funding for cultural resource management staff. This reduction of staff would not materially impact federally mandated services, but may impact services provided to state and local districts. This would not require a change in statute or rules.
------	---

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	Negligible impact requiring no changes to programs or services.
25 %	Reduction in cultural resource management staff (private sector) would slow down, but not stop the delivery of services to state and federal agencies. No changes in programs or services would be needed.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	No. No.
25 %	No. No.

Department of Heritage and Arts
Utah State Library General Operations

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	45.310
Agency contact name and phone number	Donna Jones Morris, State Librarian (801) 715-6770 or Jill Flygare (801) 245-7206

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,765,761
Number of FTEs	0
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Blind Library Program provides materials for blind, visually and print impaired; physically disabled populations; Lender Support Program supports 24 Utah libraries that that lend their materials to people outside their service areas; Public Pioneer Program provides educational and informational online premium resources to anyone in Utah. Library Development LSTA grants supports 14 academic libraries; 57 public libraries; 1236 schools; and 240 special libraries with grants to support underserved and rural Utah citizens

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$88,288)	(\$441,440)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$88,288)	(\$441,440)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The total annual match for this grant equal 51.5%. It is a combination of General Fund, MOE, and local funds collected through dedicated credits.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	The Lender Support Program that provides financial support for lending library materials to Utah's outside the libraries service area may see a reduction of services based on the same percentage of reduction in funding
25 %	Additional reductions or possibly the elimination in services to the Lender Support Program may occur in specific areas. Library Development LSTA grants that provide funding support for Utah libraries and Bookmobile Libraries providing service in underserved rural areas would see additional reductions in services. Additionally funding for the Public Pioneer Program would be reduced.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
--	--

5 %	A reduction in funding to Lender Support Program may result in users not being able to request and obtain materials not in their local library without a fee for service. A reduction in funding to the Library Development LSTA grants would reduce support for Utah libraries; this would mean that, on average, 2 – 6 Utah libraries applying for assistance in providing technology, building collections of materials, and digitizing print resources would be turned away.
25 %	Reduction of 25% to the Lender Support Program may reduce incentives for libraries to lend materials to users in other libraries, thus making it difficult or impossible for Utah's library users to obtain materials not in their own library without a fee for service. Library Development LSTA grants allow libraries in Utah to provide technology for users, to build collections of materials needed by customers, and digitize and make publicly available valued and historical print resources. A reduction in funding would result in an average of 10 Utah libraries who apply for grants to be rejected because of lack of funds. Reduction in funding may result in the decline of the Public Pioneer online Program. They could be a reduction of 1 to 3 online statewide resources-databases; Local public libraries would have to provide these resources themselves if they had funds available. Smaller and poorer communities, in particular, would lose access to these resources.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
--	--

5 %	The Library of congress may contract with public or non-profit libraries to carry out their mission (2 U.S.C. Section 135b). Utah's Blind Library Program is under contract to serve as a center of circulation. There is currently statewide access to a selection of audiobooks for blind and disabled library users. There are no other State Library resources available to meet these needs.
25 %	The Library of congress may contract with public or non-profit libraries to carry out their mission (2 U.S.C. Section 135b). Utah's Blind Library Program is under contract to service as a center of circulation. There is currently statewide access to a selection of audiobooks for blind and disabled library users. There are no other State Library resources available to meet these needs.

Department of Human Services
Divisions of Substance Abuse & Mental Health (DSAMH) and
Executive Director of Operations (EDO)

Access to Recovery

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.275
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen (538-3956), Don Moss (538-4142)

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,751,563
Number of FTEs	2.0
Recipients/Clients Served	2,604
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Individuals who reside in Salt Lake, Utah or Weber County, have an identified substance use disorder and are: 1) National Guard Members and their Families or Significant Other, 2) Referred from Primary Health Care Providers, or Other Health Care Entity, 3) Referred from Faith-Based Organizations or, 4) Self-referred, and 5) Shall not be subject to a court order or condition of probation that dictates a specific treatment or recovery support service, and 6) Do not have the ability to pay for services.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$87,578)	(\$437,891)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$87,578)	(\$437,891)

FTEs	-0.1	-0.4
------	------	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	None.
--	-------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Funding ends 9/29/2015.
25 %	See above.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Funding ends 9/29/2015.
25 %	See above.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No.
25 %	No.

Department of Human Services
Divisions of Child & Family Services (DCFS) and
Executive Director Operations (EDO)

Adoption Assistance Title IV-E

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.659
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen 538-3956; Don Moss 538-4142

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 8,595,921
Number of FTEs	135
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	5,541
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Clients are children with special needs who are adopted from foster care or who are recipients of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) due to disability who are adopted.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$429,796)	(\$2,148,980)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$429,796)	(\$2,148,980)

FTEs	-6.5	-32.5
------	------	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Title IV-E requires state match as follows: *Adoption Assistance Payments – FMAP Rate *Adoption Assistance Administration – 50% *Enhanced Training Match – 75% *Short Term Partner Training FFY 12 – 70% Social Security Act Part E, Section 474; 45 CFR 1356.60 The State is also required to meet MOE requirements pertaining to qualifying new IV-E adoptions under the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, Social Security Act Subsection 473(a)(8).
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Reduction would impact funding for monthly subsidies to help families meet the needs of adoptive children with special needs. Reduction would also impact on one-time reimbursement for expenses associated with the adoption process. Change in statute or rules may be necessary if subsidies are reduced or eliminated.
25 %	Reduction would significantly impact funding for monthly subsidies to help families meet the needs of adoptive children with special needs. Reduction would also have a serious impact on one-time reimbursement for

	expenses associated with the adoption process. Change in statute or rules may be necessary if subsidies are reduced or eliminated.
--	--

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Children with special needs would receive fewer services and may remain longer in foster care. Compliance with federal requirements could be degraded. Request for replacement State funds is an option.
25 %	See above.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	The State would be mandated to continue to provide adoption assistance to children that meet Title IV-E eligibility requirements. Other resources are not available to meet these needs for adoptive children.
25 %	See above.

Department of Human Services
Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health (DSAMH)
Block Grants for Community Mental Health Services

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.958
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen 538-3956; Don Moss 538-4142

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,167,946
Number of FTEs	3.7
Recipients/Clients Served	49,494
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Adults with Serious and Persistent Mental Illness (SPMI) and Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) children.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$158,397)	(\$791,987)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$158,397)	(\$791,987)

FTEs	-0.2	-0.9
------	------	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Maintenance of effort is required by the grant. It is calculated on a 2-year rolling average. A dollar for dollar reduction in federal funds is assessed for failure to meet the MOE requirement. The penalty is assessed the year following MOE failure. The MOE requirement for FY 2015 was \$29,318,233. The current MOE requirement for FY 2016 is approximately \$30,552,600. Section 1915(b) of the Public Health Service Act.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Mental Health programs in the community would be decreased. Expenditures would be reduced by the amount of the funding decrease. No change would be required to Statute or Rule.
25 %	See above.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Local Mental Health Authorities would likely provide fewer services and could experience some staff reductions. Request for replacement State funds is an option.
25 %	Local Mental Health Authorities would see staff reductions and a significant reduction of services and clients served. Request for replacement State funds is an option.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Human Services
Divisions of Division of Child & Family Services (DCFS)
and Executive Director of Operations (EDO)

Child Welfare Title IV-B Subpart 1

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.645
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen 538-3956; Don Moss 538-4142

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,746,700
Number of FTEs	241
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	4,727
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	This funding supports child welfare services for adults and children for which child abuse or neglect is a risk or a concern, in a variety of programs including, but not limited to, child protective services, in-home services, support services for children in foster care, adoption, and child abuse prevention.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$187,335)	(\$936,675)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$187,335)	(\$936,675)

FTEs	-2.9	-14.4
-------------	-------------	--------------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	State match is required at 25%. Social Security Act Title IV-B Subpart 1, Section 424.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	This funding supports child welfare services. Reduction of this funding would impact child welfare services provided statewide, to an extent. The reduction would not require a change in statute or rules, but would lessen our capacity to fulfill our statutory obligation for child welfare.
25 %	This funding supports child welfare services. Reduction of this funding would impact child welfare services provided statewide, to an extent. The reduction may require a change in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Fewer staff resulting in increasing caseloads and lower capacity for effective services. Request for replacement State funds is an option.
25 %	See above.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Yes, the State would continue to be obligated to provide core child welfare services including child protective services investigation, in-home services (pre-placement prevention activities to prevent entry into foster care), and supports for children in foster care, and adoption services. Other resources are limited.
25 %	Yes, the State would continue to be obligated to provide core child welfare services including child protective services investigation, in-home services (pre-placement prevention activities to prevent entry into foster care), and supports for children in foster care, and adoption services. Other resources would not have the capacity to fill in the gap in resources for a cut this severe.

Department of Human Services
Division of Child & Family Services (DCFS)
Family Violence Prevention and Services
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.671
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen 538-3956; Don Moss 538-4142

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,120,003	
Number of FTEs	0.9	
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)		(Individual information unavailable due to Federal guidelines.)
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Adults and children who are victims of domestic violence receiving services through domestic violence shelters.	

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$56,000)	(\$280,001)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$56,000)	(\$280,001)

FTEs	0	-0.25
-------------	---	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	None
--	------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Reduction would impact funding for domestic violence shelter services in thirteen communities in Utah. This reduction would not require a change in statute or rules.
25 %	See above.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	Domestic violence shelters could see some decreased ability to serve adults and children seeking safety and services. Request for replacement State funds is an option.
25 %	Domestic violence shelters would have a significant decreased capacity. A decision would likely have to be made to either close some shelters or seriously underfund them all. Request for replacement State funds is an option.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	The State would be obligated to continue to meet Federal grant requirements for remaining funds, in accordance with Federal law and rules. Federal services would not be mandated beyond funding capacity.
25 %	See above.

Department of Human Services
Divisions of Child & Family Services (DCFS),
Division of Juvenile Justice Services (DJJS), and
Executive Director Operations (EDO)

Foster Care Title IV-E

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.658
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen 538-3956; Don Moss 538-4142

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 24,359,686
Number of FTEs	381
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	4,885
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Clients are children in foster care that qualify for Title IV-E. These children are legal wards of the State.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,217,984)	(\$6,089,922)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,217,984)	(\$6,089,922)

FTEs	-16.9	-84.3
------	-------	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Title IV-E requires state match as follows: *Foster Care Maintenance – FMAP Rate *Foster Care Administration – 50% *Enhanced Training Match – 75% *Short Term Partner Training FFY 12 – 70% Social Security Act Part E, 474; 45 CFR 1356.60
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Loss of funding in this area impacts support and services for foster care. See below for further information from DCFS and JJS: DCFS: Reduction would impact funding to pay for room, board, and supervision of children in foster care, which are payments made to foster parents, small businesses that provide proctor or residential care, and local governments that provide shelter services; caseworkers (personnel) for children in foster care; administration of the foster care program; services to prevent entry into foster care; and training for staff, for individuals preparing for employment with DCFS, and for partner agencies. The reduction would not require a change in statute or
-----	--

	rules, per se, but the reduction does NOT reduce the number of clients that will need foster care services nor does it eliminate DCFS responsibility to care for the children in custody, which is a statutory responsibility (62A-4a-105). NOTE: Title IV-E is a Federal entitlement program, which means that the state may be reimbursed for all allowable costs on behalf of eligible children with no cap on funding. A major change in Federal law would be required to modify reimbursement to the State under this entitlement program. JJS: Community based services and case management – Title IV-E helps pay the room and board of eligible clients and the administrative costs associated with those clients, including case management. Most youth in the temporary custody of JJS receive community-based services that serve as a platform/base for other services that delinquent youth receive. The community-based services are delivered primarily through a network of private providers. Private providers also deliver other services to youth, such as mental health assessments; therapy; gender specific programming for issues such as sex offending, substance dependency, mental health issues, and behavioral issues; tracking; etc. Because the residential community-based services qualify as a Title IV-E foster care setting, JJS receives Title IV-E funding for eligible clients placed in those settings. A reduction in federal participation does not result in the elimination of the need for community-based services for delinquent youth committed by a Juvenile Court. A reduction in Title IV-E would not require a change in statute.
25 %	See above. Additional information from DCFS follows: DCFS: A cut in funding of this magnitude may require a change in statute to narrow the population that could be ordered into DCFS custody by the courts. Without a statutory change, the funding reduction would not reduce the number of clients that will need foster care services nor would it eliminate DCFS responsibility to care for the children in custody (62A-4a-105). A major change in Federal law would be required to modify reimbursement to the State under this entitlement program.

	What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?
5 %	DCFS would see some reduced ability to provide basic care and supervision and clients' personal needs. Also impacted would be administrative and accountability functions, recruitment and retention of foster parents, and possibly some local agencies going out of business. JJS would experience a reduction in available community-based bed days resulting in increased pressure on more expensive and restrictive, less appropriate institutional placements. Request for replacement State funds is an option.
25 %	DCFS would see a significant reduced ability to provide basic care and supervision and clients' personal needs. Also impacted would be administrative and accountability functions, recruitment and retention of foster parents, and some local agencies going out of business. JJS See above

	Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?
5 %	DCFS: Yes, the state is obligated to provide foster care services and to complete administrative activities necessary to administer the Title IV-E plan. State general funds currently provide for these services for children that do not meet Title IV-E eligibility requirements. Other resources are not available to meet the needs currently funded by Title IV-E. JJS: The state would still be required to identify those clients who are Title IV-E eligible (in order to continue to receive the remaining 95% of federal funds). Although unlikely, other short-term federal grants may be available to address the Title IV-E loss impact. Otherwise, there are not any other resources available to meet these needs.
25 %	See above.

Department of Human Services
Division of Division of Child & Family Services (DCFS)
IV-B Subpart 2, Promoting Safe and Stable Families

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.556
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen (538-3956), Don Moss (538-4142)

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts *	\$ 2,143,497
Number of FTEs	11.9
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	1,008
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Children and families in which there is risk for child abuse and neglect, children in foster care or returning home from foster care and their parents, and children adopted from foster care or from other child welfare services and their adoptive parents.

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$107,175)	(\$535,874)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$107,175)	(\$535,874)

FTEs	-1.6	-8.2
-------------	------	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	State match is required at 25%. Social Security Act Title IV-B Subpart 2, particularly Section 434.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Reduction would impact a variety of services that are available for target clients, such as family support services/parenting skills training, family preservation/intensive in-home services, reunification services/mental health or substance abuse treatment to parents of foster children, and adoption support/post-adoption support services to parents of adoptive children with serious disabilities, mental health problems, or other special needs, or capacity for caseworker visits to clients. This would not require a change in statute or rules.
25 %	Reductions would impact the same categories of services described above because the grant requires a minimum percentage of services in each of four categories, but would result in a more significant cut in available support to children and families. This would not require a change in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Fewer grant funded services to fewer children and families, which may result in more and longer foster care. Non-profit agencies would likely reduce support services. Request for replacement State funds is an option.
25 %	See above.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	The State would be obligated to continue to meet Federal grant requirements for remaining funds, in accordance with Federal law and rules. There are some community programs that provide services in the family support area, but less so in the other mandated categories. These programs would probably not be able to pick up the gap, and in some cases are the programs funded by this grant.
25 %	The State would be obligated to continue to meet Federal grant requirements for remaining funds, in accordance with Federal law and rules. There are some community programs that provide services in the family support area, but less so in the other mandated categories. These programs would not be able to pick up the gap, and in some cases are the programs funded by this grant.

Department of Human Services
Divisions of Office of Recovery Services (ORS) and
Executive Director of Operations (EDO)
IV-D Child Support Collections / Incentives
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.563
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen (538-3956), Don Moss (538-4142)

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 18,002,009
Number of FTEs	267
Recipients/Clients Served	335,578
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Mothers, Fathers, & Children

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$900,100)	(\$4,500,502)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$900,100)	(\$4,500,502)

FTEs	-14	-65
------	-----	-----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The State is required to contribute 34% to all IV-D (Child Support) expenditures. This contribution must be in the form of State General Funds and cannot be replaced with Fees assessed to clients receiving the service. See 45 CFR 304, 305.34, & 305.35, Section 455 of the Social Security Act. Utah's maintenance of effort requirement (required General Fund contribution for the IV-D program) is \$7,453,438.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	All services provided by the IV-D program are required. Expenditures within the IV-D program either support basic infrastructure that must remain in place for any IV-D program to exist or are related to personnel; therefore, any significant funding cut to the IV-D program will result in a decrease in personnel. Personnel cuts would reduce the time and resources that could be spent on individual cases. Ultimately this would reduce collections and increase complaints from constituents receiving services. A change to statute would not be required.
25 %	The same answer would apply for a 25% cut except the cuts would be magnified to a level where minimum Federal performances standards may not be met. This would jeopardize future Federal funding for the IV-D program and the TANF block grant.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Ability to adequately monitor cases and perform routine casework would be diminished, resulting in lower collections as well as a decrease in ability to establish legal paternity, establish support orders and modify orders to match current earning capacity. Lowered collections affects State funds and other State agencies as well as custodial parents' ability to provide for their children. Additional public assistance applications for the neediest families would likely occur. Request for replacement State funds would be an option. Increased payment processing fees could be considered but only to a level where the fee does not exceed the cost of the service provided.
25 %	See above

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	All services provided by ORS are mandated and would be required to be maintained. As a result, the cuts would be absorbed through additional staff reductions. This would increase case load sizes for remaining staff and reduce the time and quality of services that could be provided.
25 %	A 25% cut would magnify the problem described above.

Department of Human Services
Divisions of Division of Substance Abuse & Mental Health (DSAMH) and
Executive Director of Operations (EDO)

MH&SA Projects of Regional and National Significance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions

Based on Fiscal Year 2015

—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.243
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen (538-3956), Don Moss (538-4142)

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,484,160
Number of FTEs	4
Recipients/Clients Served	10,232
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Substance Abuse prevention services to adults from 25 – 55 years of age. Substance Abuse prevention activities also included physician and pharmacy training, prescription drug take-back events, and website creation and maintenance. Services were also provided to mentally ill youth to assist them to successfully transition to adulthood. Recipients shown are a duplicated count due to the nature of prevention service delivery and data collection

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$124,208)	(\$621,040)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$124,208)	(\$621,040)

FTEs	-0.2	-1.0
------	------	------

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	None
---	------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	A reduction in funds would result in a decrease in services provided to assist mentally ill adolescents successfully transition to adult living, mentally ill adults needing supported employment assistance, and community based substance abuse prevention activities. No change in statute or rules needed.
25 %	See above

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Amounts paid to providers (mostly local Substance Abuse and Mental Health Authorities) would be reduced. These entities would likely serve fewer clients. Program expenditures would be reduced by the same amount as the revenue reduction. A funding decrease could result in a loss of jobs for staff in the local communities.
25 %	See above.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Human Services
Divisions of Substance Abuse & Mental Health (DSAMH) and
Executive Director Operations (EDO)

Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.959
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen 538-3956; Don Moss 538-4142

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 16,546,243
Number of FTEs	9.0
Recipients/Clients Served	16,128
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Number of clients is a duplicated count. DSAMH does not collect data in a way that allows for unduplicated counting. The clients served are those who were at risk of abusing substances and/or abused substances during the period reported.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$827,312)	(\$4,136,561)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$827,312)	(\$4,136,561)

FTEs	-0.5	-2.3
------	------	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Maintenance of effort is required by the grant. It is calculated on a 2-year rolling average. A dollar for dollar reduction in federal funds is assessed for failure to meet the MOE requirement. The penalty is assessed the year following MOE failure. The MOE requirement for FY 2015 was \$19,164,522. The MOE requirement for FY 2016 is approximately \$19,762,500.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Substance Abuse programs in the community would be decreased. Expenditures would be reduced by the amount of the funding decrease. No change would be required to Statute or Rule.
25 %	See above.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Majority of impact would be to Local Substance Abuse Authorities who would receive reduced funding. The Local Authorities would likely provide service to fewer clients. Expenditures would be reduced by the amount of the funding decrease. A funding decrease could result in a loss of jobs for staff in the local communities.
25 %	See above.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	No.
25 %	No.

Department of Human Services
Executive Director of Operations (EDO),
Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health (DSAMH),
Division of Services for People with Disabilities (DSPD),
Division of Child & Family Services (DCFS0),
Division of Aging & Adult Services (DAAS), and
Division of Juvenile Justice Services (JJS)

Social Services Block Grant, Discretionary and TANF Transfers

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.667
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen 538-3956; Don Moss 538-4142

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 22,882,929
Number of FTEs	951
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	84,085
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Funds are used for support and delivery of social services. Clients include vulnerable population of the state such as the elderly, at-risk children, and individuals with disabilities.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,144,146)	(\$5,720,732)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$1,144,146)	(\$5,720,732)

FTEs	-10.1	-50.0
------	-------	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	None
---	------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	These funds are integral to the Human Service programs. If funds were cut across the board, see below for examples of impact: DSAMH: A reduction in funds would limit the Division's ability provide oversight of Mental Health programs. DSPD: Services to people with intellectual disabilities, conditions related to intellectual disabilities, brain injuries and physical disabilities that do not qualify for Medicaid would be reduced. DCFS: Reduction would impact funding for child protective services investigations, domestic violence shelters and treatment services, in-home services for families in which child safety is a concern, and for support services for foster and adoptive children. These costs are both personnel and purchase service contract costs. Change in statute or rules would not be necessary if federal funds are reduced. DAAS: All SSBG is pass-through to AAAs. There will be reduced funds for services. JJS: JJS utilizes Title XX funding to deliver case management services. Case managers assess, develop treatment plans, arrange appropriate placements, and monitor progress of delinquent youth committed to JJS custody. A reduction in Title XX funding would not reduce the need for case management services. Recidivism outcomes could be negatively affected as case load sizes increase on remaining case managers. A reduction in Title XX would not require a change in statute or rules. EDO: Reduction of funds distributed to local governments and for support services.
25 %	See above

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	There will be reduced funding to support the vulnerable populations of the State.
25 %	See above.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	Yes, the funding is integral to Human Services programs. Resources for these programs are limited.
25 %	See above.

Department of Human Services
Division of Aging and Adult Services (DAAS)
**Title III Grants for State & Community Programs on Aging
and Nutritional Services Incentive Program (NSIP)**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.043, 93.044, 93.045, 93.052, 93.053
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen (538-3956), Don Moss (538-4142)

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 8,083,433
Number of FTEs	12.1
Recipients/Clients Served	31,420
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Duplicate count of vulnerable adults receiving home delivered meals, congregate meals, personal care, supportive services, transportation, nutrition counseling, etc.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$404,172)	(\$2,020,858)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$404,172)	(\$2,020,858)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The Division must certify yearly that Maintenance of Effort requirement have been met. MOE includes: 25% State match for State Admin; 1/3 of 25% match for AAA Admin; 5% match for IIIB, IIIC1, IIIC2, and AAA Ombudsman programs; and 25% match for IIIE programs. None required for the NSIP grant or IIID. OAA Section 1321.47 & 49. See OMB A-133 Compliance Supplement.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Meals and support services will be reduced.
25 %	Meals and support services will be reduced. State program oversight would be impacted.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Fewer meals served, longer waiting lists, hours of operation at local senior centers would be reduced. Request for replacement State Funds is an option.
25 %	See above.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	The Older Americans Act requires these programs to be run. Less funding would impact extent of services.
25 %	See above.

Utah Labor Commission
UOSH (Utah OSHA) Compliance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.503
Agency contact name and phone number	David Lamb (801-530-6816)

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,646,069
Number of FTEs	25.5
Recipients/Clients Served	1701 workplace interventions; OSHA has jurisdiction over 1.3 million employees and 89,415 employers
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Employers and employees that have significant workplace safety risks

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$82,303)	(\$411,517)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Workplace Safety	0	0
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$82,303)	(\$411,517)

FTEs	-1	-5
------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The agreement with federal OSHA requires that the state maintain a program that is "as effective as" the federal program. The agreement requires that a certain number of employees be dedicated to compliance work. In addition, the State is required to provide a 50/50 state fund to federal fund match for compliance activities.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	UOSH compliance efforts would have to be reduced. This reduction would not require a change in statute or rules.
25 %	Same as 5% above.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Compliance with federal and state workplace safety rules may decrease if public and private employers become aware that inspections will be reduced. Safety of private employees, and state and local governmental workers could be compromised.
25 %	Same as 5% above.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Yes, there are mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain. At a 5% reduction, the State could maintain the level of service required by Utah statute and the existing agreement with federal OSHA.
25 %	Yes, there are mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain. At a 25% reduction, federal OSHA would need to determine whether the baseline requirement for compliance efforts would remain in effect, since resulting staffing reductions would likely bring the Division under the staffing levels required under our federal agreement.

Utah National Guard
Law Enforcement Assistance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	16.000
Agency contact name and phone number	Michael J. Norton (801) 432-4445

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 4,496,968
Number of FTEs	68
Recipients/Clients Served	US Dept. of Justice
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$224,848)	(\$1,124,242)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$224,848)	(\$1,124,242)

FTEs	-3	-17
-------------	----	-----

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	No State matching funds. This program is managed in accordance with a Labor hour contract and reimbursement agreement between the U.S. Department of Justice and the Utah National Guard. It is important to note that this is a law enforcement sensitive program. Support is directly to the national level, but information is shared by DEA with multiple federal and state agencies.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	The program provides linguist support for the Counter Drug Program. This program supports hundreds of Drug Enforcement Agency cases each year. A 5% funding reduction would result in a corresponding cut in cases supported. This would result in a reduction of about 3 FTE. It would not require a change in statute or rules.
25 %	A 25% funding reduction would result in a corresponding cut in cases supported. This would result in a reduction of about 17 FTE. It would not require a change in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	A 5% reduction would cause a corresponding reduction in translation capabilities of the Counter Drug program. The program would become moderately smaller, fewer services provided to DEA, and expenditures would be reduced. The program does not collect fees.
------------	--

25 %	A 25% reduction would adversely affect the translation capabilities of the Counter Drug program. The program would become significantly smaller with fewer services provided to DEA. The program does not collect fees.
-------------	---

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	No
25 %	No

Utah National Guard
Military Construction Cooperative Agreement
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	12.400
Agency contact name and phone number	Michael J. Norton (801) 432-4445

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 20,537,325
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	Communities, Utah, U.S. Army
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Military Construction provides construction and major capital improvements of facilities necessary to support the 5,600 Soldiers of the UNG and over 11,000 Soldiers who train here from other states. These facilities are essential to National Guard readiness to respond to national and state emergencies. UNG facilities become an integral part of their communities supporting, directly or indirectly, all citizens of the community.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,026,866)	(\$5,134,331)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$1,026,866)	(\$5,134,331)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Most Military Construction (MILCON) projects require a State share determined in accordance with National Guard Regulation (NGR 5-1 National Guard Grants and Cooperative Agreements) and the Master Construction Cooperative Agreement. Upon completion, projects on State land become state owned facilities. Depending on the type of facility, there is a State cost share of the operations and maintenance. MILCON projects are approved individually and are usually programmed years in advance. In 2017, UNG expects to be funded for a \$37 million readiness center at Camp Williams.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Large military construction projects are approved at the national level by project. A 5% funding cut would cause a minor change in the scope of a project. The funding cuts would result in 0 FTE staffing reduction. The reduction would not require any change in statute or rules.
25 %	A 25% funding cut would dramatically affect the scope of a project and may cause a project to be cancelled or funds redirected to another project. This could result in the completion of a lower priority project which fits within available funding or cancelling or postponing a project. A funding cut would not directly result in a staff reduction. The reduction would not require any change in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	A 5% funding reduction could result in a reduction in scope of work with a minor reduction in the effectiveness of a given facility or project and a corresponding minor impact to the effectiveness of training Soldiers for federal and state missions.
25 %	A 25% budget cut would dramatically alter the scope or result in postponement or cancellation of a construction project. This would cause a lack of a training facility, forcing units to travel elsewhere or make due with inadequate facilities. It would result in additional training costs to travel to an adequate facility. It could result in the loss or damage of expensive military equipment without adequate and secure storage. The mission readiness of the Utah National Guard would be affected by a reduced or delayed facility. Many older facilities suffer health and safety problems which may cause additional expenses to correct without a new or improved facility. The expected \$37 million MILCON project in 2017 is a 140,000 square foot readiness center for the UNG 19 th Special Forces units. A 25% funding reduction would make this facility inadequate to support the training needs for this military unit. 19 th Special Forces units are often deployed around the world. This facility is critical to their mission. A 25% federal funding reduction would likely result in a request from UNG to the State building board for funding to complete the project.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	No
25 %	No

Utah National Guard
Military Operations and Maintenance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	12.401
Agency contact name and phone number	Michael J. Norton (801) 432-4445

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 43,339,847
Number of FTEs	148
Recipients/Clients Served	State, Army, Air Force
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The UNG has entered into a Master Cooperative Agreement with the National Guard Bureau (NGB). Under the terms of the various appendices of this agreement, NGB reimburses UNG for certain operations and maintenance expenses. These agreements provide federal funding in whole or in part to various programs necessary to support the 5,600 Soldiers and 1,600 Airmen of the Utah National Guard. It provides funds for facility maintenance of Army National Guard armories in 23 communities throughout Utah and the Air National Guard base at the Salt Lake Airport. These activities are essential to the National Guard readiness to respond to national and state emergencies. National Guard units become an integral part of their communities, supporting, directly or indirectly, all citizens of Utah.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$2,166,992)	(\$10,834,962)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$2,166,992)	(\$10,834,962)

FTEs	-7	-37
------	----	-----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	<p>UNG and NGB have entered into a Master Cooperative Agreement with 13 appendices. Funding share is determined by the appendices as outlined below.</p> <p>1 – Army National Guard (ARNG) Facilities Program: various percentage of federal reimbursement based on the type of facility and type of cost. Some costs are 100% federal, 100% state, 75%/25%, or 50%/50%.</p> <p>2 – ARNG Environmental Program: 100% federal reimbursement.</p> <p>3 – ARNG Security Program: 100% federal reimbursement.</p> <p>4 – ARNG Electronic Security Systems: 100% federal reimbursement.</p> <p>5 – ARNG "Telecommunications" Program: 100% federal reimbursement.</p> <p>7 – ARNG Training Support System Program: 100% federal reimbursement.</p> <p>10 – ARNG Antiterrorism Program: 100% federal reimbursement.</p> <p>11 – ARNG Emergency Mgmt. Program: 100% or 70% federal reimbursement.</p> <p>15 – ARNG Petroleum Program: 100% federal reimbursement.</p> <p>21 – Air National Guard (ANG) Facilities Program: 75% federal reimbursement.</p> <p>24 – ANG Fire Protection: 100% federal reimbursement.</p> <p>40 – ARNG Distributed Learning Program: 100% federal reimbursement.</p> <p>41 – Family Program: 100% federal reimbursement.</p>
--	--

<p>Federal funding reductions will result in reducing expenditures in these programs. However, some costs, such as facility O&M, security, telecommunications, and emergency management, may continue without regard to federal funding.</p> <p>The federal funding for these programs is appropriated by congress and then apportioned and distributed by the Army and Air Force through NGB to the UNG. All federal funding is not interchangeable. To comply with federal fiscal law, there is limited local ability to reprogram federal funds.</p> <p>It is not likely that there would be a 5% or 25% "across the board" funding reduction. More likely, is a funding cut that would devastate some programs and leave others less effected. For this reason it is not possible to accurately present the effects of cuts to each program. The effect on personnel could vary widely depending on which program is cut. For example, a \$2 million cut in the Family Program would cut about 10 FTE. A \$2 million cut in the ARNG Facilities Program may not effect FTE.</p> <p>In 2015, total federal funding to the UNG was about \$228 million. Only a portion of that is represented in the State budget with the rest being spent directly through federal programs and payroll. A 5% cut would be about \$11.4 million. A 25% cut would be about \$57 million. A 25% cut could dramatically reduce UNG readiness to respond to state and federal missions. The FTE cuts presented here only address State of Utah employees. Depending on the federal program being cut, we could also expect UNG federal employee cuts.</p> <p>A short term funding decrease will have less effect than a long term funding decrease. For example, some facility repair or maintenance may be delayed in a short term funding reduction with little long term effect. A long term funding reduction causing a long term facility repair or maintenance delay could lead to a more expensive facility failure. The longer funding levels are reduced, the greater the negative effects.</p>
--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	A 5% cut in federal funding would have a minor effect on the UNG facilities programs and a significant effect if applied solely to other programs. A 5% reduction in funding will have a measurable effect on the training readiness of National Guard Soldiers and Airmen. A general 5% funding cut may result in a 7 FTE cut. If applied specifically to certain programs, the FTE cut could be greater. The reduction would not require any change in statute or rules.
25 %	A 25% funding cut would adversely affect the operation, training, and readiness of the Utah National Guard. We would expect deterioration of facility conditions due to the lack of maintenance funds. Multiple years of reduced funding could result in health, life, safety, and security problems in facilities. We would have to consider closing facilities. We would have to dramatically reduce our telecommunications, security surveillance, and fuel support to training units. It would devastate family programs which provide essential support to military families prior to, during, and after deployment. A general 25% funding cut could result in 37 FTEs staffing reduction. Depending on which programs are effected, FTE cuts could be more or less. The reduction would not require any change in statute or rules.
What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	A 5% federal funding reduction would have a measurable effect on the readiness of the Utah National Guard. There could be a negative effect on training and logistical readiness. It could also adversely affect facility maintenance. Depending on the program cut, some programs may need to be discontinued or dramatically curtailed. The National Guard would still maintain the capability to deploy in support of State and national emergencies.

25 %	A 25% cut would have a devastating effect on the training, operations, maintenance, and mission readiness of the Utah National Guard. We would have to consider closing National Guard facilities which would have a dramatic impact on the local community. The mission readiness of National Guard units would noticeably decrease. Critical training facilities and activities would have to be reduced. The ability to respond to state and local emergencies would be reduced. It may reduce the personnel strength of the National Guard. The reduced readiness would directly or indirectly affect each community and the State.
------	---

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut?
Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	No
-----	----

25 %	Mandated federal requirements such as facility operations costs (utilities, for example), some telecommunications, and security must be maintained. We expect that a federal funding cut would consider and prioritize where the cuts would be made to ensure the most critical needs are funded and cuts come from lower priority programs. An "across the board" 25% cut or a cut applied to one of these critical requirements would likely require the State to maintain some critical services.
------	--

(This page intentionally left blank.)

Department of Natural Resources
Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.236, 15.252
Agency contact name and phone number	Paula Dupin-Zahn (801) 538-5309

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,812,521
Number of FTEs	11
Recipients/Clients Served	3,000,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Abandoned Mine Lands Program (AMRP) protects public health and safety, improves the environment by sealing open mines, stabilizes coal waste and revegetates areas disturbed by mining past mining activities and returns these lands to productive use. Therefore all citizens of the State, Visitors to the State, Outdoor recreation users including OHV users and hikers, and downstream communities of local mining districts are impacted by this grant.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$190,626)	(\$953,130)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$190,626)	(\$953,130)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	No state match is required on the main source of federal funds for this program. However, sometimes there are projects with certain federal agencies which require state match funds, but only minimal state funds are available which restrict our participation.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	No change in statute or rules. The AMRP would reduce engineering and/or construction work designed to reclaim hazards at abandoned mine sites. Mine openings would remain open longer and threaten the public's health and safety.
25 %	No change in statute or rules. The AMRP would <u>greatly reduce</u> engineering and/or construction work designed to reclaim hazards at abandoned mine sites. Mine openings would remain open much longer and threaten the public's health and safety.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	The liability of the State would continue by allowing identified abandoned mine related hazards to remain open and unreclaimed longer.
25 %	The State would reduce the amount of work outsourced to engineering and design consultants and construction contractors. Local businesses that supply engineering and/or construction workers (motel, restaurant, grocery, etc.) would see reduction in income derived from abandoned mine reclamation work.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	If the AMRP is unable to perform these services, the State primacy program could return to the federal agency.
25 %	The AMRP is the only state agency with a mission to reclaim abandoned mine related hazards. Minimal State funding is available for these purposes. Until all sites are reclaimed, the State's liability on State owned property will remain.

Department of Natural Resources
Boating Safety Coast Guard

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	97.012
Agency contact name and phone number	Scott Strong 801 664-1381

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,140,461
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	25 State Parks and an estimate of 62,000 registered boats
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	State Parks boating projects, boats, ramps, etc.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$57,023)	(\$285,115)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$57,023)	(\$285,115)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	We do not receive a state match for this grant.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	The Program aims to educate and inform boat operators about boating laws and rules established to provide public safety and protect our natural resources on Utah's waterways. Our efforts are funded through boat registration fees, state taxes on gasoline used in motorboats, and federal boating safety grants. If the funding is reduced less money would be available to maintain boating.
25 %	A funding reduction would result in less money being available to us in maintaining and purchasing boats, building docks, etc.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	The impact on recipients would have a negative impact because fewer resources would be available to educate and inform boat operators about boating laws. Fewer boating related improvement projects would be constructed. These laws were established to provide public safety and protect our natural resources on Utah's waterways.
-----	--

25 %	The impact on recipients would have a negative impact because fewer resources would be available to educate and inform boat operators about boating laws. Fewer boating related improvement projects would be constructed. These laws were established to provide public safety and protect our natural resources on Utah's waterways.
------	--

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	There are no mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut.
25 %	There are no mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut.

Department of Natural Resources
Coal Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.250
Agency contact name and phone number	Paula Dupin-Zahn (801) 538-5309

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,931,649
Number of FTEs	17
Recipients/Clients Served	2,800,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Over 80% of the electricity generated in Utah is from coal. Therefore, all citizens of the state, coal mining operators and communities, downstream water users are impacted by this grant.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:
(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$96,582)	(\$482,912)
State:		
General Fund	(13,170)	(65,850)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$109,752)	(\$548,762)

FTEs	-1	-4
-------------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Funding is based on the percentage of federal lands involved in coal mining in Utah. Funding is approximately 88% federal funds and 12% General Funds (state match).
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	No change in statute or rules. The program would lose approximately 1 FTE. The permitting and inspecting process for coal mines would be performed by remaining staff, thus causing a slower response time to the coal mines.
25 %	No change in statute or rules. The program would lose approximately 4 FTEs. The permitting and inspecting process for coal mines would be performed by remaining staff, thus causing a <u>much slower</u> response time to the coal mines and not as many inspections will be completed.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	The impact to the mining community would be that the approvals of their permits would take longer and will slow down production and their ability to make money.
25 %	The impact to the mining community would be that the approvals of their permits would take much longer and the mandatory inspections would not get done and will slow down production and their ability to make money.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	We would still have to provide the services delegated to us by the cooperative agreement with the Secretary of the Interior.
25 %	We would still have to provide the services delegated to us by the cooperative agreement with the Secretary of the Interior. If we are unable to do these services, the federal agency may need to take back the primacy.

Department of Natural Resources
Cooperative Agreements

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.504, 15.529, 15.642
Agency contact name and phone number	Eric Hyatt, (801) 538-4850

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,186,995
Number of FTEs	13
Recipients/Clients Served	Public
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Co-Operative Projects, Watershed

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$109,350)	(\$546,749)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$109,350)	(\$546,749)

FTEs	-65	-3.25
------	-----	-------

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	N/A
--	-----

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	These are funds that are used for projects impacting a wide variety of species. These include, but are not limited to: owls, foxes, big horn sheep, birds, rabbits, range trend projects, guzzlers, and watershed projects.
25 %	These are funds that are used for projects impacting a wide variety of species. These include, but are not limited to: owls, foxes, big horn sheep, birds, rabbits, range trend projects, guzzlers, and watershed projects.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services?
What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	A reduction in funds would cause fewer projects to be completed. Because these projects affect everything from big game to fish, the quantity and quality for hunters and fishers would be diminished.
25 %	A reduction in funds would cause fewer projects to be completed. Because these projects affect everything from big game to fish, the quantity and quality for hunters and fishers would be diminished.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Natural Resources
Endangered Species

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.615
Agency contact name and phone number	Eric Hyatt, (801) 538-4850

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,503,610
Number of FTEs	1.5
Recipients/Clients Served	Endangered Species
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Statewide Endangered Species, Management Plans

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$75,181)	(\$375,903)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$75,181)	(\$375,903)

FTEs	-08	-38
-------------	-----	-----

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	State match of 10-25%. This most typically comes from outside sources when purchasing land for endangered species protection.
---	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Individual projects under this program can provide coordination, habitat acquisition and development, inventories and research, management of endangered wildlife species, as well as operation and maintenance of their respective habitats.
25 %	Individual projects under this program can provide coordination, habitat acquisition and development, inventories and research, management of endangered wildlife species, as well as operation and maintenance of their respective habitats.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services?
What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	A reduction in funds would cause a reduction in the number of opportunities to preserve endangered species.
25 %	A reduction in funds would cause a reduction in the number of opportunities to preserve endangered species.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Natural Resources
Fish, Wildlife, and Plant Conservation Resource Management

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.231
Agency contact name and phone number	Eric Hyatt, (801) 538-4850

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 4,730,213
Number of FTEs	3.5
Recipients/Clients Served	Public
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Watershed

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$236,511)	(\$1,182,553)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$236,511)	(\$1,182,553)

FTEs	-18	-88
-------------	-----	-----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	N/A
--	-----

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	These are funds that are used to assist in the advancement of watershed restoration, conservation, and the improvement and maintenance of fish and wildlife habitat
25 %	These are funds that are used to assist in the advancement of watershed restoration, conservation, and the improvement and maintenance of fish and wildlife habitat

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services?
What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	A reduction in funds would cause fewer projects to be completed. Because these projects affect everything from big game to fish, the quantity and quality for hunters and fishers would be diminished.
25 %	A reduction in funds would cause fewer projects to be completed. Because these projects affect everything from big game to fish, the quantity and quality for hunters and fishers would be diminished.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Natural Resources
Forestry, Fire, and State Lands

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.664, 10.676, 10.680, 10.688, 10.691, 15.239
Agency contact name and phone number	Roger Lewis, (801) 537-3206

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 4,598,196
Number of FTEs	28
Recipients/Clients Served	Approx. 2,500
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Private landowners of forested lands, fire departments, counties, cities, etc.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$229,910)	(\$1,149,549)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

Other:		

TOTAL	(\$229,910)	(\$1,149,549)

FTEs	-2	-6
-------------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Some grants do not require matching funds. Others require up to a 50% match. Depending on the grant, the match may be required from the private landowner or recipient of the service. State funds used for fire suppression efforts are used as match for some grants.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Hazardous fuels reduction and mitigation work in wildland urban interface (WUI) areas would decrease. With less preventative work, an increase in catastrophic wildfires and State suppression costs could occur. No changes to statutes would need to be made.
25 %	Hazardous fuels reduction and mitigation work in wildland urban interface (WUI) areas would decrease. With less preventative work, an increase in catastrophic wildfires and State suppression costs could occur. No changes to statutes would need to be made.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services?
What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	Fewer funds used to mitigate WUI areas would mean fewer landowners and areas would have access to sources to reduce fuels thus increasing the fuel loads in WUI areas along with increased threat to life and property. Rural fire departments would receive less funding to purchase supplies needed to fight wildfires. The division would have less funds to perform hazardous fuels reduction and would have to cut staff that perform fuel mitigation and suppression work.
25 %	Fewer funds used to mitigate WUI areas would mean fewer landowners and areas would have access to sources to reduce fuels thus increasing the fuel loads in WUI areas along with increased threat to life and property. Rural fire departments would receive less funding to purchase supplies needed to fight wildfires. The division would have less funds to perform hazardous fuels reduction and would have to cut staff that perform fuel mitigation and suppression work.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut?
Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	No. The only other funding source to continue this work would be State funds.
25 %	No. The only other funding source to continue this work would be State funds.

Department of Natural Resources
Recreational Trails Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	20.219
Agency contact name and phone number	Scott Strong (801)-664-1381

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,014,306
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	200,000 register OHV's statewide and unlimited patrons usage for non-motorized trails
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	City and County. Most funding is pass-through (\$929,823.20).

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$50,715)	(\$253,577)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$50,715)	(\$253,577)

FTEs	0	0
-------------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	We do not receive a state match for this grant.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	This National Trails program provides funding for cities and counties to improve and or build non-motorized trails. If this funding is not received there would be a reduction of funding available for non-motorized trails.
25 %	This National Trails program provides funding for cities and counties to improve and or build non-motorized trails. If this funding is not received there would be a reduction of funding available for non-motorized trails.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	There would be fewer non-motorized trails built or maintained if the services were not received or the funding was reduced.
25 %	There would be fewer non-motorized trails built or maintained if the services were not received or the funding was reduced.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	None
25 %	None

Department of Natural Resources
Sportfish Restoration

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.605
Agency contact name and phone number	Eric Hyatt, (801) 538-4850

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 6,696,349
Number of FTEs	69
Recipients/Clients Served	Public
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Sportfish Management, Hatchery Management, Aquatic Education, Motorboat Access

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$334,817)	(\$1,674,087)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Wildlife Resources Restricted Account - 1170	(111,606)	(558,029)
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$446,423)	(\$2,232,116)

FTEs	-3.45	-17.25
-------------	-------	--------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	State match is a required 25%. This match most typically comes from our restricted funds or license sales.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Individual projects under this program provide coordination, habitat and public access acquisition and development, inventories and research, management of cold and warm water sport fish, operation and maintenance of fish hatcheries, as well as operation and maintenance of fisheries habitat and related facilities throughout the state.
25 %	Individual projects under this program provide coordination, habitat and public access acquisition and development, inventories and research, management of cold and warm water sport fish, operation and maintenance of fish hatcheries, as well as operation and maintenance of fisheries habitat and related facilities throughout the state.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	A reduction in funds would cause a reduction in the output of fish grown at our hatcheries reducing both the quantity and quality of fish available to the fishing public.
25 %	A reduction in funds would cause a reduction in the output of fish grown at our hatcheries reducing both the quantity and quality of fish available to the fishing public.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Natural Resources
Wildlife Restoration

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.611
Agency contact name and phone number	Eric Hyatt, (801) 538-4850

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 10,098,033
Number of FTEs	71
Recipients/Clients Served	Public
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	All Big Game Species, Habitat Management, Hunter Education, Administration of Federal Funds

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$504,902)	(\$2,524,508)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Wildlife Resources Restricted Account - 1170	(168,299)	(841,494)
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$673,201)	(\$3,366,003)

FTEs	-3.55	-17.75
-------------	-------	--------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	State match is a required 25%. This match most typically comes from our restricted funds or license sales.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Individual projects under this program provide coordination, habitat and public access acquisition and development, inventories and research, management of big game, small game, furbearers and waterfowl, as well as operation and maintenance of their respective habitats.
25 %	Individual projects under this program provide coordination, habitat and public access acquisition and development, inventories and research, management of big game, small game, furbearers and waterfowl, as well as operation and maintenance of their respective habitats.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	A reduction in funds would cause a reduction in the quantity and quality of wildlife available to the hunting public.
25 %	A reduction in funds would cause a reduction in the quantity and quality of wildlife available to the hunting public.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No
25 %	No

Board of Education
ASPIRE

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.418
Agency contact name and phone number	Jennifer Roth, (801) 538-7746

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts (US Dept. of Education)	\$ 4,284,381
Number of FTEs (in Utah)	12
Recipients/Clients Served	2,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	ASPIRE is a US Department of Education award (PROMISE research study) in partnership with the Social Security Administration, Department of Labor and Health and Human Services. ASPIRE will enroll 2000 youth receiving Supplemental Security Income, and their families residing in six states – Arizona, Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota and Utah, and directly serve the 1000 youth randomly assigned to the treatment group.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$214,219)	(\$1,071,095)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

Other:		

TOTAL	(\$214,219)	(\$1,071,095)

FTEs	-1	-4
------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	N/A
--	-----

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	As a six-state consortium, reductions to funds in ASPIRE will directly impact the contracts with those states, their staff, any subcontractors/vendors providing services (there are currently 37) and limit the ability of ASPIRE to fulfill the requirements of the award from the US Department of Education. No state statute or rule change would be necessary.
25 %	As a six-state consortium, reductions to funds in ASPIRE will directly impact the contracts with those states, their staff, any subcontractors/vendors providing services (there are currently 37) limit the ability of ASPIRE to fulfill the requirements of the award from the US Department of Education. A reduction of 25% will result in USOR being unable to fulfill the requirements of the award from the US Department of Education. No state statute or rule change would be necessary.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	A 5% reduction in funds would result in ASPIRE not meeting its target to enroll 2000 youth and their families in six states. (target date is April 30, 2016) and continue to serve 1000 of the youth and families through September 2018. This amount cannot be solely absorbed by the ASPIRE Utah team and project leadership in USOR. Contracts with five states would have to be amended, reducing their funds, resulting in a reduction of staff, a minimum of one staff member in each state. Current budgets are proportionate to the number of youth served in each state, so a single state could not absorb the full cost. Fewer staff would result in higher caseloads for the remaining staff. Higher caseloads will result in not meeting the ASPIRE policy of providing services and supports, including monthly face to face meetings with the youth and families, thereby jeopardizing the research study outcomes.
25 %	A 5% reduction in funds would result in ASPIRE not meeting its target to enroll 2000 youth and their families in six states. (target date is April 30, 2016) and continue to serve 1000 of the youth and families through September 2018. This amount cannot be solely absorbed by the ASPIRE Utah team and project leadership in USOR. Contracts with five states would have to be amended, reducing their funds, resulting in a reduction of staff in the states, a minimum of one staff member each in MT, ND, SD and UT, two in CO and three in Arizona Fewer staff would result in higher caseloads for the remaining staff. Higher caseloads will result in not meeting the ASPIRE policy of providing services and supports, including monthly face to face meetings with the youth and families, thereby jeopardizing the research study outcomes. A reduction of 25% will result in ASPIRE not satisfying the requirements of the PROMISE/ASPIRE award from the US Department of Education.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	ASPIRE does not require any state or locally matched funds. If federal funds were to be cut 5%, it is anticipated that the US Department of Education would determine which areas of the ASPIRE research would be directly impacted.
25 %	ASPIRE does not require any state or locally matched funds. If federal funds were to be cut 25%, it is anticipated that the US Department of Education would determine that the ASPIRE research study would end.

**Board of Education
Assessment and Accountability**

**Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015**

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.369
Agency contact name and phone number	Jo Ellen Shaeffer, (801) 538-7811

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 6,533,216
Number of FTEs	11
Recipients/Clients Served	Students, Teachers and Administrators in Public Schools
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Administer all required student federal and state assessments and create all required federal and state accountability reports, and provide professional development and training for Assessment and data use to improve instruction.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$326,661)	(\$1,633,304)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$326,661)	(\$1,633,304)

FTEs	-2	-3
-------------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	None
---	------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Slow down assessment and testing development, and reduction of testing services
25 %	Significantly slow down assessment and testing development, and reduce testing services, and possible elimination of federally mandated tests.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Reduced ability to ensuring that the State's schools and local education agencies are held accountable for results. Possible impact on services to highly impacted students, and ability to target services and interventions for all students.
25 %	Reduced ability to ensuring that the State's schools and local education agencies are held accountable for results. Probable impact on services to highly impacted students, and ability to target services and interventions for all students.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	The WIDA assessment for English learners would be impacted, the DLM for significantly cognitively impaired population of students, The Center for Assessment technical Advisory group, and portions of the SAGE assessments are all at least partially or fully funded from federal sources.
25 %	A definite reduction or elimination of the WIDA assessments, the DLM, and elimination of services from the Center for the Assessment technical Advisory group and reduction of services around the end of level SAGE assessment system.

Board of Education
Career and Technology Education

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.002, 84.048
Agency contact name and phone number	Thalea Longhurst, (801) 538-7889

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 14,452,769
Number of FTEs	10
Recipients/Clients Served	274,533
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	School Districts and Charter Schools (school children), Technology centers (school children and adults), and Adult education.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Note: Education funding at district level will be impacted 64 percent of these funds flow to other organizations.

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$722,638)	(\$3,613,192)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$722,638)	(\$3,613,192)

FTEs	-5	-3
-------------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Both Perkins and AEFLA have state MOE requirements as well as state matching requirements. Levels of state funding would need to be maintained regardless of whether federal funds are reduced.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Reductions will impact both local and state-led projects as well as programs, equipment purchases, resource development, and professional development that support existing programs. Staffing will also be affected.
25 %	Reductions at this level would significantly impact state and local FTE to work on projects related directly to meeting program requirements including technical assistance, data reporting, and program monitoring. In addition, support for programs, equipment, resources, professional development would be reduced.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Recipients will have less funds to provide direct services to students. Services provided and numbers of students served would be reduced
25 %	Recipients will have significantly less funds to provide direct services to students. Services provided and numbers of students served would be reduced.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Federal services would still need to be maintained at the level that could be sustained with the available federal funds. This includes technical assistance, data reporting, and program monitoring.
25 %	Federal services would still need to be maintained at the level that could be sustained with the available federal funds. This includes technical assistance, data reporting, and program monitoring.

Board of Education
Child Nutrition Programs

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.553, 10.555, 10.556, 10.558, 10.559, 10.560, 10.568, 10.569, 10.574, 10.575, 10.579, 10.582
Agency contact name and phone number	Kathleen Britton, (801) 538-7513

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 171,356,548
Number of FTEs	25
Recipients/Clients Served	<p>There are 7 Family Day Care sponsors, serving about 16,300 children a day year round.</p> <p>There are 151 Child and Adult Care Food Program sponsors, serving about 21,700 children a day year round.</p> <p>There are 118 sponsors of School Nutrition Programs, serving approximately 575,000 children a day during the school year.</p> <p>There are 38 Summer Food Service Program sponsors, serving about 50,700 children a day during the summer months.</p>
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Children served by Local Education Agencies and Residential Child Care Institutions, children and adults served by the Child and Adult Care Programs, individuals and families are provided food through The Emergency Food Assistance Program

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$8,567,827)	(\$42,839,137)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$8,567,827)	(\$42,839,137)

FTEs	-1	-4
------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	<p>MOE requirement for USDA State Administrative Expenses grant is \$178,569. State appropriated funds of \$143,200 and \$36,369 from state liquor tax are used to meet this requirement (CFDA 10.560).</p> <p>MOE requirement, matching requirement and the salary for Commodities Assistance Program—Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Administrative Costs (CAP TEFAP) is from State appropriated funds (CFDA 10.568).</p> <p>MATCH-USDA National School Lunch Program State Revenue Matching Requirement, State FY2015-2017 is \$1,516,785 which is matched with state liquor tax. This dedicated credit is set by 32B-2-304 (4) Liquor Price—School Lunch Program.</p>
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	<p>10.555 - Block Grant- National School Lunch Program (Entitlement Grant) – To assist States, through cash grants and food donations, in providing a nutritious nonprofit lunch service for school children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities. No change in statute or rules. Entitlement Grants - Provide funds to specific grantees based on formula, prescribed by legislation or regulation. The formula is based on factors such as population, enrollment, per capita income or specific need. No change in statute or rules.</p> <p>10.560 - Child Nutrition Programs State Administrative Expenditures: To provide each State agency with funds for its administrative expenses in supervising and giving technical assistance to local schools, school districts and institutions in their conduct of Child Nutrition Programs. State agencies that administer the distribution of USDA Foods to schools and child or adult care institutions are also provided with State Administrative Expense funds. No change in statute or rules.</p> <p>10.568- The Emergency Food Assistance Program: To help supplement the diets of low-income persons by making funds available to States for processing, storage and distribution costs incurred by State agencies and local organizations, such as soup kitchens, food banks, and food pantries, including faith-based organizations, in providing food assistance to needy persons. No change in statute or rules.</p> <p>10.582-Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Program: To assist States, through cash grants, in providing free fresh fruits and vegetables to elementary schools with high percentages of children that receive free or reduced price meals through the National School Lunch Program.</p>
25 %	See program descriptions above and change in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	<p>10.555 - Block Grant- National School Lunch Program (Entitlement Grant) - Reducing this funding source by 5% would result in reduced reimbursements to schools and child care centers.</p> <p>10.560 - Child Nutrition Programs State Administrative Expenditures: This would impact training of state and local level of employees, audits, program compliance, travel, supplies, etc.</p> <p>10.568-The Emergency Food Assistance Program: This would reduce the amount that is flowed through to Utah Food Bank.</p> <p>10.582-Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Program: This would reduce the amount of funding flowed through to the elementary schools.</p>
25 %	<p>10.555 - Block Grant- National School Lunch Program (Entitlement Grant) - Reducing this funding source by 25% would result in reduced reimbursements to schools and child care centers. Which would likely reduce the quality of meals served, staffing levels at the sub-awardee level, participation in initiatives and auxiliary programs such as farm to school, universal breakfast, After School Snack Program (ASSP). It may also give them incentive to sell non-reimbursable items to compensate for the loss in revenue. Child Care Centers may choose not to participate in the program because the compensation may not be worth the administrative burden of running the program. For After School Meal Program sponsors they may halt the current expansion of sites and even eliminate some of the smaller programs from their list which may also have with our current Summer Sponsors.</p> <p>10.560 - Child Nutrition Programs State Administrative Expenditures: This would decrease the number of employees from 25 to 21. This would impact training of state and local level of employees, audits, program compliance, travel, supplies, etc. The subrecipient monitoring that is federally mandated would be impacted in timeliness and how often; which in turn would result in more findings.</p>

	10.568-Emergency Food Assistance Program: This would reduce the amount of funding that is flowed through to Utah Food Bank.
	10.582-Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Program: This would reduce the amount of funding flowed through to the elementary schools.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	The state would need to maintain their MOE and matching level for CFDA 10.560 and 10.555.
25 %	The state would need to maintain their MOE and matching level for CFDA 10.560 and 10.555.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

Board of Education
Elementary Secondary Education Act

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.010, 84.011, 84.013, 84.287, 84.365, 84.377
Agency contact name and phone number	Ann White (801) 538-7509

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 100,212,996
Number of FTEs	14
Recipients/Clients Served	40 districts 71 charter schools 298 schools Approximately 126,000 students
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Schools qualify for Title I funding if the school has at least a poverty rate of 35%. Students who are at-risk of failing to meet academic success are served through schools receiving funds for limited English proficiency, immigrant students, migrant students, and students participating in after school programs.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$5,010,650)	(\$25,053,249)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$5,010,650)	(\$25,053,249)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Maintenance of Effort requires that state and local fund expenditures cannot be less than 90% of the expenditures from the previous year.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Programs and services to help local educational agencies (LEA's) improve teaching and learning in high-poverty schools in particular for children failing, or most at-risk of failing, to meet challenging State academic achievement standards would have to be reduced.
25 %	Programs and services to help local educational agencies (LEA's) improve teaching and learning in high-poverty schools in particular for children failing, or most at-risk of failing, to meet challenging State academic achievement standards would have to be reduced.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Programs and services to help local educational agencies (LEA's) improve teaching and learning in high-poverty schools in particular for children failing, or most at-risk of failing, to meet challenging State academic achievement standards would have to be reduced.
25 %	Programs and services to help local educational agencies (LEA's) improve teaching and learning in high-poverty schools in particular for children failing, or most at-risk of failing, to meet challenging State academic achievement standards would have to be reduced.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and state funding efforts.
25 %	At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and state funding efforts.

Board of Education
Office of Rehabilitation, Disability Determination Services

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	96.001
Agency contact name and phone number	Jennifer Roth, (801) 538-7746

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 14,162,399
Number of FTEs	85
Recipients/Clients Served	21,670
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Citizens of Utah who have a physical or mental disability and are receiving or applying for assistance from social security.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$708,120)	(\$3,540,600)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$708,120)	(\$3,540,600)

Funds are used to determine eligibility for Social Security funds.

FTEs	-5	-22
------	----	-----

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	N/A
---	-----

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	The activities and expenditures that would impact would the payroll of the staff. The staff would possibly have to be reduced and that would impact the services to the clients and to ensure that proper federal guidelines are met for clients to receive funds and for the funds to be accounted for correctly.
25 %	Staff would not be able to process SSA claims for clients. The backlog of claims would be greater and the ability for people to use Social Security and Determination Services would be less.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	The backlog of SSA claims would be greater and the ability for people to use Social Security and Determination services would be less.
25 %	The backlog of SSA claims would be greater and the ability for people to use Social Security and Determination services would be less.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	No, if the SSA federal funds were cut, the State DDS would only be able to process the number of SSA disability claims for which they received funding. SSA works with the State DDS to set annual goals for the number of SSA disability claims to produce. Every fiscal year SSA agrees to provide the DDS with the funds to reach that goal. If the funds were to be reduced by Congressional Budget, then the goal would be reduced by same amount. In the past, Congress has limited funds to SSA Disability with the instructions that certain funds would only be used for certain types of claims (such as initial claims or Continuing Disability Claims). The DDS will then concentrate its available resources on the directive claims. If SSA funding were to be cut, the State would not need to make up the difference as the only claims the Utah DDS reviews are SSA claims. SSA directs the number of staff that the DDS can hire and places freezes on DDS hiring when SSA funding is restricted such as when a Continuing Resolution is in place that does not cover any additional hiring or when the Federal Government was shut down, SSA contracted to cover all DDS budgets when the funding was restored.
25 %	No, if the SSA federal funds were cut, the State DDS would only be able to process the number of SSA disability claims for which they received funding. SSA works with the State DDS to set annual goals for the number of SSA disability claims to produce. Every fiscal year SSA agrees to provide the DDS with the funds to reach that goal. If the funds were to be reduced by Congressional Budget, then the goal would be reduced by same amount. In the past, Congress has limited funds to SSA Disability with the instructions that certain funds would only be used for certain types of claims (such as initial claims or Continuing Disability Claims). The DDS will then concentrate its available resources on the directive claims. If SSA funding were to be cut, the State would not need to make up the difference as the only claims the Utah DDS reviews are SSA claims. SSA directs the number of staff that the DDS can hire and places freezes on DDS hiring when SSA funding is restricted such as when a Continuing Resolution is in place that does not cover any additional hiring or when the Federal Government was shut down, SSA contracted to cover all DDS budgets when the funding was restored.

Board of Education
Office of Rehabilitation, Vocational Rehabilitation

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.126
Agency contact name and phone number	Jennifer Roth, (801) 538-7746

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 30,226,637
Number of FTEs	294
Recipients/Clients Served	25,726
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Eligible Individuals with disabilities who require Vocational Rehabilitation services in order to obtain or maintain meaningful employment.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,511,332)	(\$7,556,659)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,511,332)	(\$7,556,659)

FTEs	-8	-37
-------------	-----------	------------

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	At a minimum a match of 21.3% is required for the Vocational Rehabilitation grant. Additionally, a maintenance of effort is required in an amount equal to or greater than what was spent 2 years prior. For example, in federal 2014, we must spend state funds in an amount equal to or greater than what was spent with state funds for the Vocational Rehabilitation grant in 2012.
---	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	The Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) program provides personalized services to eligible individuals with disabilities, ages 14 and up, to meet their specific needs in achieving a meaningful and integrated employment outcome. Examples of VR services include counseling and guidance, disability restoration interventions, assistive technology, training and job placement. This reduction would not require a change in statute or rules.
25 %	The Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) program provides personalized services to eligible individuals with disabilities, ages 14 and up, to meet their specific needs in achieving a meaningful and integrated employment outcome. Examples of VR services include counseling and guidance, disability restoration interventions, assistive technology, training and job placement. This reduction would not require a change in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	USOR's Vocational Rehabilitation Program is currently operating under an Order of Selection, which is a federally-sanctioned Wait List by which individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities are served first. At a 5% reduction USOR would have to reduce the number of Individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities who are released from the Wait List for services.
25 %	USOR's Vocational Rehabilitation Program is currently operating under an Order of Selection, which is a federally-sanctioned Wait List by which individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities are served first. A 25% reduction, USOR would be forced to close the first priority category of the Wait List, Individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities, in addition to keeping closed the other two categories, Individuals with Significant Disabilities and Individuals with Disabilities. This would substantially limit the provision of VR services to eligible individuals.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	As defined in federal regulations (34 CFR Part 361) the State is required to provide vocational rehabilitation services on a statewide level for eligible individuals with disabilities. There are no other comparable resources available to meet these needs.
25 %	As defined in federal regulations (34 CFR Part 361) the State is required to provide vocational rehabilitation services on a statewide level for eligible individuals with disabilities. There are no other comparable resources available to meet these needs.

Board of Education
Special Education IDEA

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.027, 84.173
Agency contact name and phone number	Glenna Gallo, (801) 538-7587

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 104,796,476
Number of FTEs	22
Recipients/Clients Served	77,825
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Students with disabilities attending Utah districts and charter schools (Local Education Agency or LEA).

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$5,239,824)	(\$26,199,119)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$5,239,824)	(\$26,199,119)

FTEs	-2	-5
------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	IDEA has a Maintenance of Effort requirement at both the State and LEA level. For Maintenance of State Fiscal Support the State must not reduce the amount of State financial support for special education and related services for children with disabilities below the amount of that support for the preceding fiscal year (34 CFR §300.163). Allocations included in this calculation include Special Education funds distributed in the Minimum School Program, funding for USDB, and some funding from other State Agencies such as the Department of Health. In addition to this State requirement, IDEA funds provided to the LEA must not be used to reduce the level of expenditures for the education of children with disabilities made by the LEA from state and/or local funds below the level of those expenditures for the preceding fiscal year (34 CFR §300.203). In limited circumstances, the LEA may apply for an exception to the Maintenance of Effort requirement (34 CFR §300.204 & 205).
---	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	A 5% reduction in federal funds would result in a reduction of statewide activities that support the implementation of IDEA. These statewide activities eliminate unnecessary expenditure on the part of each LEA. Examples of statewide activities that would be impacted include: Technical Assistance to LEAs, grants to Utah's colleges and universities provided to increase the number of qualified special education teachers, professional development activities for teachers and administrators, special education support publications,
-----	--

	projects designed to meet the unique needs of students with specific types of disabilities, projects designed to improve academic outcomes for students with disabilities, and support to LEAs with critical needs. In addition to these changes in statewide activities, the amount of funding provided to each Utah LEA for services to students with disabilities would be reduced by 5%.
25 %	A 25% reduction in federal funds would result in elimination or reduction of statewide activities that support the implementation of IDEA. Examples of statewide activities that would be eliminated or reduced include: Technical Assistance to LEAs, grants to Utah's colleges and universities provided to increase the number of qualified special education teachers, professional development activities for teachers and administrators, special education support publications, projects designed to meet the unique needs of students with specific types of disabilities, projects designed to improve academic outcomes for students with disabilities, and support to LEAs with critical needs. In addition to these changes in statewide activities, the amount of funding provided to each Utah LEA for services to students with disabilities would be reduced by 25%.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services?
What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	96% of IDEA funds are distributed to LEAs by formula. In addition, a portion of the funds reserved for statewide activities is distributed to LEAs, IHEs, and other state agencies. This reduction would require LEAs to reorganize programs of service delivery for students. LEAs may not charge fees for special education services. LEAs may not restrict or adjust services required by the Individualized Education Program based on budget reductions. LEAs may need to use funds intended for the operation of general educational programs to maintain the level of services that are required for students to receive a Free and Appropriate Public Education, as required by IDEA.
25 %	96% of IDEA funds are distributed to LEAs by formula. In addition, a portion of the funds reserved for statewide activities is distributed to LEAs, IHEs, and other state agencies. This reduction would require LEAs to reorganize programs of service delivery for students. LEAs may not charge fees for special education services. LEAs may not restrict or adjust services required by the Individualized Education Plan based on budget reductions. It is expected that LEAs will begin using general education funding to support special education programs with a cut at this level. Therefore, these cuts will likely impact all Utah students and not only those with disabilities. A cut of this magnitude would result in the elimination of all funds distributed to IHEs and other state agencies, and also of funds distributed to LEAs in addition to the formula. LEAs may need to use funds intended for the operation of general educational programs to maintain the level of services that are required for students to receive a Free and Appropriate Public Education, as required by IDEA.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut?
Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	Special Education and Related Services as described on the Individualized Education Program for each student with a disability must be provided even though federal funding is cut. State special education funds currently account for 73% of special education funding. Due to Maintenance of Effort requirements, LEAs may not reduce the state and/or local contribution to special education services even when federal funds are reduced.
25 %	Special Education and Related Services as described on the Individualized Education Program for each student with a disability must be provided even though federal funding is cut. State special education funds currently account for 73% of special education funding. Due to Maintenance of Effort requirements, LEAs may not reduce the state and/or local contribution to special education services even when federal funds are reduced.

Board of Education
Teaching and Learning

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.366, 84.367
Agency contact name and phone number	Diana Suddreth, (801) 538-7739

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 15,626,844
Number of FTEs	2
Recipients/Clients Served	Teachers in 41 Districts and 105 Charter Schools
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Public Schools (School Children) Level 1 teachers, higher ed

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$781,342)	(\$3,906,711)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$781,342)	(\$3,906,711)

FTEs	-0.5	-1.5
------	------	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Both State and local expenditures for free public education within the State must be considered in determining whether a State has maintained effort under Title II, Part A. LEAs are required to maintain fiscal effort in order to receive their full allocation of Title II, Part A funds for any fiscal year. An LEA has maintained effort when either the combined fiscal effort per student, or the aggregate expenditures of the LEA and the State with respect to the provision of free public education for the preceding fiscal year, was not less than 90 percent of the combined fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures for the second preceding fiscal year (34 CFR 81.41). If the LEA fails to meet the requirements for maintenance of effort, the SEA reduces the LEA's allocation of Title II, Part A funds in any fiscal year in the exact proportion by which an LEA fails to meet the 90 percent test mentioned in the preceding answer, using the measure most favorable to the LEA Section [9521(b)(2)].
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Formula funds to LEAs would be reduced by 5%. Programs supported would need to be reduced or eliminated including support for endorsements, EYE, class-size reduction, high quality teacher preparation, and other local professional development initiatives. Funding would not be available for additional math-science partnership grants.
-----	---

25 %	Formula funds to LEAs would be reduced by 25%. Programs supported would need to be reduced or eliminated including support for endorsements, EYE, class-size reduction, high quality teacher preparation, and other local professional development initiatives. Funding would not be available for additional math-science partnership grants and existing grants may need to be scaled back.
------	---

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services?
What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	Teachers would be required to personally fund some coursework to become highly qualified or to gain required endorsements sometimes imposed due to shortages in critical areas. In some LEAs class sizes in grades K-3 would increase and teachers would lose jobs.
-----	---

25 %	Teachers would be required to personally fund additional coursework to become highly qualified or to gain required endorsements. Many LEAs would need to increase K-3 class size and lay off teachers. USOE would be severely hampered in efforts to support teacher quality, including potential impact to programs in teacher effectiveness and endorsement support. USOE may need to lay-off one or two specialists.
------	---

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut?
Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	Receipt of Title IIA and Title IIB monies requires monitoring and support. Loss of FTE's would require existing personnel to provide these services along with their state-funded duties.
-----	---

25 %	Same as above with greater impact due to additional FTE loss. We would no longer be able to fund outside monitoring that we currently use. There are no other funds to support this.
------	--

Department of Public Safety
Emergency Management Federal Funds

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2016
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	20.703, 97.023, 97.036, 97.039, 97.042, 97.045, 97.046, 97.047, 97.067
Agency contact name and phone number	Jona Whitesides, (801) 538-9613; Matt Ferguson (801) 538-3435

Fiscal Year 2016 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 12,501,036
Number of FTEs	50
Recipients/Clients Served	120
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	State, local, Tribal governments, special service districts, and school districts are primary customers served. Several programs reach to community, faith-based, and individual citizen levels as well as the Special Needs Registry which include the Be Ready Utah outreach program and the Citizen Corps Program which reaches out to Citizen Corps Councils throughout the State which include citizen volunteers for the Community Emergency Response Team, Volunteer in Police Service, Fire Corps, Medical Reserve Corps, and Neighborhood Watch programs.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$625,052)	(\$3,125,259)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$625,052)	(\$3,125,259)

FTEs	-1	-6
------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The State General Fund is used by the Division for cash match. In-kind match is provided by the Department of Public Safety and local jurisdictions participating as subgrant recipients.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	The division's budget profile consists of; 75% - 80% pass thru to local and Tribal governments, special service districts, and school districts. A 5% reduction would be a \$494,187 reduction to local and Tribal governments, special service districts, and school districts; \$80,305 reduction in state personnel costs; \$37,064 reduction in current operating expenses for preparation, mitigation, response, and recovery programs; and another \$6,178 reduction in technology and other expenses. A 5% reduction in federal funding would not significantly impact the function of the division.

25 %	The division's budget profile consists of; 75% - 80% pass thru to local and Tribal governments, special service districts, and school districts. A 25% reduction would mean a \$2.47 million reduction to local and Tribal governments, special service districts, and school districts; \$401,527 reduction in state personnel costs; \$185,320 reduction in current operating expenses for preparation, mitigation, response, and recovery programs; and another \$30,887 reduction in technology and other expenses. A 25% reduction in federal funding would significantly impact the function of the division.
------	---

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
--	--

5 %	One FTE position would need to be eliminated with a 5% reduction in federal funds. The division would likely be able to absorb this reduction through attrition and other cost savings. Local agencies would be impacted, where some local and tribal jurisdictions would not be able to support a local emergency program manager with a 5% reduction in federal funds.
-----	--

25 %	Approximately 6 positions will need to be eliminated with a 25% reduction in federal funds. Local emergency management positions would be significantly impacted and many local emergency program managers throughout the state would be eliminated without the support of federal funding. The State and local agencies would be forced to discontinue preparedness outreach programs and additional capabilities would be greatly impacted at this funding reduction level.
------	---

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
--	--

5 %	None
-----	------

25 %	None
------	------

Department of Public Safety
Highway Safety Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	16.727, 20.614, 20.616, 20.600, 20.601, 20.602, 20.610, 20.612
Agency contact name and phone number	Kristy Rigby, (801) 366-6040

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 4,004,222
Number of FTEs	16
Recipients/Clients Served	Statewide
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Subgrantee's include Utah state, county and city governmental units, and some non-profit, traffic-safety oriented organizations. Benefits residents and visitors statewide.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$200,211)	(\$1,001,056)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$200,211)	(\$1,001,056)
FTEs	0	-2

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	None.
---	-------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	A 5% reduction would result in selected decreases in activities related to police traffic services, occupant protection, impaired driving, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and motorcycle safety.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in losing up to 4 FTE's and significant decreases in activities related to police traffic services, occupant protection, impaired driving, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and motorcycle safety.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services?
What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	A 5% reduction would result in limited cutbacks in funding related to police traffic services, occupant protection, impaired driving, pedestrian and bicycle safety and motorcycle safety which are sub-awarded to state, local and non-profit agencies.
-----	--

25 %	A 25% reduction would result in severe cutbacks in funding related to police traffic services, occupant protection, impaired driving, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and motorcycle safety which are sub-awarded to state, local and non-profit agencies.
------	---

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut?
Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	Not mandated.
25 %	Not mandated.

Department of Transportation
Highway Planning and Construction Program
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	20.205
Agency contact name and phone number	Bill Lawrence, (801) 964-4468

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 304,002,438
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	State and Local Governments, and Metropolitan Planning Organizations
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	To assist State transportation agency in the planning and development of an integrated, interconnected transportation system important to interstate commerce and travel by constructing and rehabilitating the National Highway System (NHS), including the Interstate System; and for transportation improvements to most other public roads; to provide aid for the repair of Federal-aid highways following disasters; to foster safe highway design; to replace or rehabilitate deficient or obsolete bridges; and to provide for other special purposes. The Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP), as an adjunct to the Federal Aid Highway Program, provides assistance to the Federal Land Management Agencies (FLMAs) for roads that access federal lands. It provides transportation engineering services for planning, design, construction, and rehabilitation of the highways and bridges providing access to federally owned lands. The Federal Lands Highway organization also provides training, technology, deployment, engineering services, and products to other customers.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:
(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Note: Potential 5% and 25% federal receipts reductions are based on Federal Apportionment and not FY 15 receipts.

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$16,802,692)	(\$84,013,459)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$16,802,692)	(\$84,013,459)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The Federal government does not pay for the entire cost of construction or improvement (with a few exceptions) of Federal-aid highways. To account for the necessary dollars to complete the project, Federal funds must be matched with funds from other sources. The required matching funds come from State or local government funds.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	The State is given an Apportionment amount of funding in the Federal Transportation Program. Of the Apportioned amount UDOT programs at a lower level (approximately 92% of the Apportioned level), called an Obligation Limit level. A reduction of 5% in the Federal program (or a 5% rescission), would not impact the program or actual projects. This is because it would lower the Apportionment amount only, bring the Apportionment and Obligation Limit levels closer together in value, but at 5%, not lower than the Obligation Limit Level, the level of funding programmed at. No change in statute or rules would be required.
25 %	A reduction of 25% in the Federal program (a 25% rescission), would impact the program and actual projects. This is because it would lower the Apportionment amount below the obligation limit or the actual programmed amount. Approximately the first 8% of the rescission would have no impact bringing the Apportioned level to the Obligation Limit level. The remaining 17% would be an actual reduction in programmed funding that would lead to delays and halts in ongoing projects and new project starts. The primary use of these funds is for rehabilitation and preservation of the system. This would directly impact one of UDOT's primary drivers, "Preserve Infrastructure". No change in statute or rules would be required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	No impact.
25 %	This would lead to delays and halts in ongoing projects and new project starts, impacting the consulting and contracting community that assist in design and construction of these projects. The primary use of these funds is for rehabilitation and preservation of the transportation system. This would directly impact one of UDOT's primary drivers, "Preserve Infrastructure".

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No mandated federal services to maintain.
25 %	No mandated federal services to maintain.

Department of Transportation
Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	20.218, 20.237
Agency contact name and phone number	Chad Sheppick, Director of Motor Carriers, (801) 965-4105

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,964,792
Number of FTEs	91
Recipients/Clients Served	6,549,051 commercial vehicles operated through the Ports of Entry
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	<p>20.218 - The MCSAP is a Federal grant program that provides financial assistance to States to reduce the number and severity of accidents and hazardous materials incidents involving commercial motor vehicles (CMV). The goal of the MCSAP is to reduce CMV-involved accidents, fatalities, and injuries through consistent, uniform, and effective CMV safety programs. Investing grant monies in appropriate safety programs will increase the likelihood that safety defects, driver deficiencies, and unsafe motor carrier practices will be detected and corrected before they become contributing factors to accidents.</p> <p>20.237 - The CVISN grant program provides financial assistance to eligible States to (1) improve the safety and productivity of commercial vehicles and drivers; and (2) reduce costs associated with commercial vehicle operation and federal and State commercial vehicle regulatory requirements. The program shall advance the technological capability and promote the deployment of intelligent transportation system applications for commercial vehicle operations, including commercial vehicle, commercial driver, and carrier-specific information systems and networks.</p>

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$198,240)	(\$991,198)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$198,240)	(\$991,198)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	<p>In accordance with the provisions of 49 CFR Part 350.301, States must maintain a level of effort to qualify for MCSAP funding, including:</p> <p>(a) The State must maintain the average aggregate expenditure of the State and its political subdivisions, exclusive of Federal funds and State matching funds, for CMV safety programs eligible for funding under this part at a level at least equal to the average level of expenditure for the 3 full fiscal years beginning after October 1 of the year 5 years prior to the beginning of each Government fiscal year.</p> <p>(continued)</p>
--	--

	<p>(b) Determination of a State's level of effort must not include the following three things:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Federal funds received for support of motor carrier and hazardous materials safety enforcement. 2. State matching funds. 3. State funds used for federally sponsored demonstration or pilot CMV safety programs. 4. <p>(c) The State must include costs associated with activities performed during the base period by State or local agencies currently receiving or projected to receive funds under this part. It must include only those activities which meet the current requirements for funding eligibility under the grant program.</p> <p>All MCSAP eligible costs, whether they are billed to the grant or not, must be tracked and included in the MOE calculation.</p> <p>Indirect costs are MCSAP-eligible expenses as defined in 49 CFR 350.311 and include such costs as overhead personnel, accounting or human resources staff, office space, supplies, utilities, etc. Although the State may choose not to seek MCSAP reimbursement for indirect costs, indirect costs (either the State's approved indirect cost rate or actual indirect costs) are MCSAP-eligible expenses and, therefore, must be included in the State's MOE calculation. An MOE calculation template is available as an Excel spreadsheet at: www.fmcsa.dot.gov/safety-security/safety-initiatives/mcsap/mcsapforms.htm to assist the State in providing the minimum level of budgetary information as required.</p> <p>The FMCSA will provide reimbursement for not more than 80 percent of all eligible costs (with few exceptions), and recipients will be required to provide a 20 percent match.</p>
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	We receive approximately 2 million dollars in our Motor Carrier Assistance Program (MCSAP). Half the grant amount is shared with the Utah Highway Patrol for their involvement in commercial vehicle safety initiatives. Of the \$1,000,000, we budget \$400,000 for salaries and benefits. The remainder of the funds are used for program enhancements i.e. computers, training, education and outreach and ITS system development. These enhancement activities can be reduced based on received funds. The CVISN project would not be affected at this level. This would not require any change in statute or rule.
25 %	A 25% reduction would be addressed in the same manner as indicated above with a more significant cut in the MCSAP program. A 25% reduction in the CVISN program would require a reduction in new technologies being developed for our Ports of Entry. The current technology projects are: automated routing program for oversize vehicles and loads, license plate readers, dot number readers and other vehicle sorting systems for the Ports of Entry. This would not require any change in statute or rule.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	No impact.
25 %	At this level, this could have an impact on the services we provide to the commercial carriers.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No.
25 %	No.

Department of Transportation
Public Transit Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	20.509, 20.513, 20.516, 20.521, 20.528
Agency contact name and phone number	Tim Boschert, Director Public Transit Plans & Programs, (801) 964-4508

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 7,312,187
Number of FTEs	2.5
Recipients/Clients Served	36 Recipients/ 68,691 Clients served
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	<p>20.509 - Support public transportation for the general public in non-urbanized areas: Cache County, Park City, Ute Indian Tribe, Navajo Nation Indian Tribe, Uintah Basin and Cedar City areas. Also, assists in the development and support of Intercity Bus transportation.</p> <p>20.513 - Assist the transportation needs of the elderly and persons with disabilities when the transportation service provided is unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate.</p> <p>20.516 - JARC addresses the unique transportation challenges faced by welfare recipients and low-income persons seeking to obtain and maintain employment.</p> <p>20.520 - Activities for metropolitan and statewide planning. These activities include planning studies for an alternative transportation system, including evaluation of no-build and all other reasonable alternatives, traffic studies, visitor utilization studies, transportation analysis, feasibility studies, and environmental studies.</p> <p>20.521 - Provides additional tools to overcome existing barriers facing Americans with disabilities seeking integration into the work force and full participation in society.</p> <p>20.528 - To improve public transportation safety by assisting States with the financing of safety oversight of fixed guideway public transportation systems in the jurisdiction of the state not regulated by the Federal Railroad Administration.</p>

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$365,609)	(\$1,828,047)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$365,609)	(\$1,828,047)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	No state funds are used for match. All matching funds are provided by either the local sales tax revenue or by local agencies.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	All program aspects would be okay for the next couple of years, but if funding remained at the lower rate the programs would be reduced across the board 5%. No change in statute or rules would apply.
25 %	All program aspects would be okay for the next couple of years, but if funding remained at the lower rate the programs would be reduced across the board 25%. No change in statute or rules would apply.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Recipient Programs would need to be cut to match available funds for services locally. Possible reduction in services provided.
25 %	Recipient Programs would need to be cut to match available funds for services locally. Likely reduction in services provided.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Yes, the mandates follow the funds; however, services would need to be adjusted to meet the amount of reduced funding. No, there are no other resources available to meet these needs.
25 %	Yes, the mandates follow the funds; however, services would need to be adjusted to meet the amount of reduced funding. No, there are no other resources available to meet these needs.

Department of Veterans Affairs
Veterans Nursing Homes

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	64.015, 64.012
Agency contact name and phone number	Raitos Archuleta 801-326-1834

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 20,253,395
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served/Patient Beds	417
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Elderly nursing home patients

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,012,670)	(\$5,063,349)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$1,012,670)	(\$5,063,349)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	No matching state funds
---	-------------------------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	The federal VA pays approximately 50% of the nursing home costs, and the resident/family has to pay the remainder. A 5% decrease would result in an increased financial burden on the families of the veterans in the nursing homes and/or a reduction in services provided to the residents.
25 %	A 25% reduction would place a very heavy burden on the families of the veterans and require substantial decreases in services and could result in the closure of the facility – denying benefits to all veterans.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	The residents would not have the full range of nursing home services that they now enjoy, or the financial burden to veterans and their families would be proportionally greater.
25 %	The financial burden to the residents/families would be so great as to impact their ability to stay in the nursing home. Loss of enough residents could cause the facility to close, thus denying nursing home benefits to all. Such a reduction in services would essentially end the program services. Many residents of limited income would be forced to leave the nursing home and seek alternative placement in facilities with Medicaid beds (the State Veterans Homes have only 52 Medicaid beds.) This would take them out of the desired environment of a Veterans facility and force them to scatter into many other nursing homes where there are no special programs or efforts to benefit veterans. This would also greatly increase the burden of care to the state Medicaid funds. There could be many dozen additional nursing home patients on the Medicaid rolls if this were to occur.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Yes. At the current time there are inadequate state resources or other resources to meet these needs. The State does not presently contribute to the care of the residents of the State Veterans Homes. A five percent cut would most likely be absorbed by the families of the nursing home residents, but some might be forced to rely on State Medicaid funds.
25 %	Yes. At the current time there are no state resources or other resources to meet these needs. Some veterans with limited incomes would be forced to rely on state Medicaid funds in order to receive nursing home care, placing a much greater burden on Medicaid.

Department of Workforce Services
Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.002
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,275,191
Number of FTEs	11.67
Recipients/Clients Served	N/A
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The purpose of this funding is to gather labor market information and for special projects related to this data. Our clients include partner state agencies, private industry constituents, policy makers, academia, the nation, state and local economic communities, jobseekers, employers, and the general public. All of these client groups use, and benefit from, labor market information. Further, the Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) mainframe system is being maintained by Utah for the National Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$63,760)	(\$318,798)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$63,760)	(\$318,798)

FTEs	-0.58	-2.92
------	-------	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There are no maintenance-of-effort or match requirements for this program.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.	
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	In light of recent federal measures to save federal Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) dollars, additional reductions in BLS funding would have a noticeable impact. If we were to experience a 5% reduction, meeting our BLS program deliverables as they currently exist would be a challenge.
25 %	A 25% BLS budget reduction would significantly compromise the state's ability to meet our BLS program deliverables. Even with a commensurate reduction in deliverable requirements and workload, it is very likely that the loss of experienced FTEs would lead to a considerable deterioration of the quality of BLS estimates and the widely-used economic indicators that are derived from those estimates.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Responses to data request from employers, partner agencies, and other clients could be delayed as remaining resources would be more heavily focused on immediate deliverables. Data integrity could also become an issue with reduced effort toward data collection. All states would be negatively impacted by delayed use of the National QCEW system.
25 %	Adjustments to our federal BLS deliverable requirements would be made under this level of budget reduction. Specific program changes are at this time unknown; however, data completeness, data quality, and data timelines are all probably areas of concern to our client groups under a 25% budget reduction. All states would be non-functional without the use of the National QCEW system.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	None anticipated
25 %	It would depend on the mandated federal services required under the reduced funding.

Department of Workforce Services
Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.575
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 61,192,436
Number of FTEs	38.87
Recipients/Clients Served	5,900 Average Monthly Child Care Caseload
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Children of low-income, working parents

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$3,059,622)	(\$15,298,109)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$3,059,622)	(\$15,298,109)

FTEs	0	-2.0
-------------	---	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	CCDF requires annual maintenance-of-effort of \$4,474,924 per 45 CFR Parts 98 and 99.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.	
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Reduce quality activities to accommodate the federal funds receipts reduction. Quality activities that could be affected may include afterschool programs, infant/toddler programs, career ladder programs, and child care resource and referral agencies.
25 %	CCDF is broken up into 3 funding lines by Congress. The Mandatory grant is unlikely to be subject to cuts. If the cut affected the Matching or Discretionary grant, however, the impact would be significant. First would be scaling back quality activities as much as allowable under Federal regulations which currently require 4% of spending on quality activities. If we are not able to meet the cut through these measures, the next step would be to either reduce the population served or reduce the amount of the subsidy. If the population served was reduced, there could be a reduction of 2.0 FTEs.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Depending upon the services reduced there could be fewer after-school programs or greater turn-over at child care facilities if the career ladder programs were cut back.
25 %	Cutting back quality activities would have a long lasting impact including reductions in the skill level and training of child care providers and reductions in available child care. Reducing the population served and reducing the amount of the subsidy would have similar effects. The child care subsidy allows low-income, working parents to work while their children are cared for in safe, quality facilities. Without the subsidy, parents could lose jobs or place children in unsafe child care environments.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	CCDF requires we spend certain amounts on infant toddler, quality expansion, and resource and referral grants/services. There aren't other resources available to meet these needs.
25 %	CCDF requires we spend certain amounts on infant toddler, quality expansion, and resource and referral grants/services. There aren't other resources available to meet these needs.

Department of Workforce Services
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	14.228
Agency contact name and phone number	Kimberley Brown Schmeling, (801) 503-8970

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 4,490,846
Number of FTEs	3.2
Recipients/Clients Served	384 residential households, 47 businesses, and 29,564 citizens benefited from community projects
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The State of Utah Community Development Block Grant program provides grants to cities and towns of fewer than 50,000 in population and counties of fewer than 200,000 people. The purpose of the Small Cities program is "to assist in developing viable communities by providing decent housing, a suitable living environment, and expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate incomes.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$224,542)	(\$1,122,712)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$224,542)	(\$1,122,712)

FTEs	0	-1.0
------	---	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Administrative funding is 2% of the total grant plus \$100,000. Only the 2% portion must be matched 1:1. No match is required on pass-thru funds, although most projects include other funding in their project total.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.	
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$4,510 less in admin funding and \$220,032 less in program funding for local projects. Approximately 0.1 FTE would be redeployed to another program. No change in statute would be required.

25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$22,954 less in admin funding and \$1,099,758 less in program funding for local projects. It is likely that the 25% fewer program dollars would not create the demand necessary for 3 FTEs and the program would be reduced by 1.0 FTEs. No change in statute would be required.
------	---

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	Because CDBG funds are used in concert with other available local funds and are spread across counties all across the state, the 5% decrease will not likely have significant impact on any one project or region.
25 %	The CDBG program has already diminished in the past few years as more Utah communities gain enough population to begin receiving CDBG entitlement funds directly. An additional \$1 million cut to the program, while significant, would not shut down the program. Even though CDBG funds are used in concert with other available local funds, a cut of this size would mean there would be fewer projects completed.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	There are no mandated services.
25 %	There are no mandated services.

Department Workforce Services
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.569
Agency contact name and phone number	Kimberley Brown Schmeling, (801) 503-8970

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,475,993
Number of FTEs	3
Recipients/Clients Served	217,658 individuals and 70,567 families
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The DWS State Community Services Office, of which CSBG is one funding source, provides guidance, oversight, and funding to help communities assist people to become more self-sufficient socially, physically, culturally, and economically by reducing poverty and improving the quality of life for low-income Utahans.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$173,800)	(\$868,998)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$173,800)	(\$868,998)

FTEs	0	-1.0
------	---	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There is no match requirement.
--	--------------------------------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.	
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$8,690 less in admin funding and \$165,110 less in program funding for local projects. Approximately 0.25 FTEs would be redeployed to another program. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$44,350 less in admin funding and \$824,648 less in program funding for local projects. It is likely that 25% fewer program dollars would not create the demand necessary for 3 FTEs and the program would be reduced by at least 1.0 FTEs. No change in statute would be required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Because CSBG funds are used to leverage local funds and are spread across all counties of the state, the 5% decrease will not likely have a significant impact on any one project or region.
25 %	Because CSBG funds are used to leverage local funds and are spread across all counties of the state, a 25% decrease could seriously affect local delivery of poverty mitigation programs.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	There are no mandated services.
25 %	There are no mandated services.

Department Workforce Services
Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	14.231
Agency contact name and phone number	Kimberley Brown Schmeling, (801) 503-8970

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,240,655
Number of FTEs	1.2
Recipients/Clients Served	2,040 individuals and 368 families
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The DWS State Community Services Office, of which ESG is one funding source, provides guidance, oversight, and funding to understand, prevent and address homelessness through the administration of funding for emergency housing, shelters, and other programs/services to prevent or mitigate homelessness.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$62,033)	(\$310,164)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$62,033)	(\$310,164)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There is no match requirement in ESG.
--	---------------------------------------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.	
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$3,101 less in admin funding and \$58,932 less in program funding for local projects. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$15,508 less in admin funding and \$294,656 less in program funding for local projects. Approximately 0.3 FTE would be redeployed to another program. No change in statute would be required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Because ESG funds are used to leverage local funds and are spread across all counties of the state, a 5% reduction will not likely have significant impact on any one project or region.
25 %	Because ESG funds are used to leverage local funds and are spread across all counties of the state, a 25% reduction could affect local delivery of poverty mitigation programs.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	There are no mandated services.
25 %	There are no mandated services.

Department of Workforce Services
Employment Service Cluster

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	Wagner-Peyser: 17.207 Veterans: 17.801 and 17.804
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	Wagner-Peyser: \$ 5,222,629 Veterans: \$ 1,194,288
Number of FTEs	Wagner-Peyser: 98.26 Veterans: 14.5
Recipients/Clients Served	Employers Served: 9,006 Job Seekers Served: 253,505
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Job seekers; in the case of Veterans, job seekers who have served in the US military

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$320,846)	(\$1,604,230)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

Other:		

TOTAL	(\$320,846)	(\$1,604,230)

FTEs	-5.64	-28.19
------	-------	--------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	None
--	------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.	
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Both Wagner-Peyser and Veterans are almost completely FTE driven; thus, a 5% reduction in funding would result in a reduction of staffing. No change in statute would be necessary.
25 %	A 25% reduction in funding would result in a corresponding reduction of staffing. No change in statute would be necessary.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	A reduction of these FTEs would not seriously impact services rendered to recipients.
25 %	A reduction of these FTEs would limit the availability of services to clients coming into employment centers, and employers seeking for assistance in recruiting.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	No mandatory services will be affected.
25 %	Mandatory services will still be provided, but the speed, efficiency, and quality of providing those services would be affected.

Department of Workforce Services
Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.568
Agency contact name and phone number	Kimberley Brown Schmeling, (801) 503-8970

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 16,784,052 Home Heating Assistance and \$ 4,812,980 Weatherization Assistance
Number of FTEs	5.9
Recipients/Clients Served	32,737 Households Served with Home Heating Assistance and 471 Households Served with Weatherization Assistance
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) provides winter home heating assistance and year-round energy crisis intervention for eligible low-income households throughout Utah. LIHEAP also provides funds to the State Weatherization Program to help weatherize homes and to provide emergency repair or replacement of defunct furnaces and air conditioning units. These programs assist individuals and families in the lowest income brackets.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,079,852)	(\$5,399,258)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,079,852)	(\$5,399,258)

FTEs	0	-0.5
-------------	---	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	No matching funds are required.
--	---------------------------------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$49,242 less in admin funding, \$814,026 less in program funding for heat assistance payments to approximately 1,615 individuals/families, and \$216,584 less in program funding for weatherization improvements to approximately 24 individuals/families. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$229,258 less in admin funding, \$4.07 million less in program funding for heat assistance payments to 8,075 individuals/families and \$1.1 million less in program funding for weatherization improvements to approximately 118 individuals/families. No change in statute would be required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Local agencies hire seasonal workers to process LIHEAP applications across the state and complete weatherization measures in low-income homes. Approximately 3 fewer LIHEAP workers and 1 fewer weatherization workers may be hired. Individuals and families slated to receive benefits would no longer receive the utility payment benefits. Individuals and families slated to have their homes weatherized would remain on the waiting list and pay higher utility bills for a longer period of time, creating a tremendous burden on these low-income clients.
25 %	Local agencies hire seasonal workers to process LIHEAP applications across the state and complete weatherization measures in low-income homes. Approximately 18 fewer LIHEAP workers and 3 fewer weatherization workers may be hired or hours would be significantly curtailed. Individuals and families slated to receive benefits would no longer receive the utility payment benefits. Individuals and families slated to have their homes weatherized would remain on the waiting list and pay higher utility bills for a longer period of time, creating a tremendous burden on these low-income clients.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	There are no mandated services.
25 %	There are no mandated services.

Department of Workforce Services
Refugee and Entrant Assistance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	CFDA 93.566
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 7,692,520
Number of FTEs	10.86
Recipients/Clients Served	2,500
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Recently resettled Refugees

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$384,626)	(\$1,923,130)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$384,626)	(\$1,923,130)

FTEs	-4.14	-10.86
------	-------	--------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	None.
--	-------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.	
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Refugee cash and medical assistance are mandated activities by federal statute and regulation. Services that must be maintained are refugee cash assistance, refugee medical assistance, refugee medical screening, and unaccompanied refugee minor assistance. These benefits cannot be eliminated without statute and regulation changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act. Refugee assistance funds are also used to help refugees become economically self-sufficient as quickly as possible, primarily through the provision of employment services. Administrative costs can be reduced by reducing the number of FTEs working on these activities.
25 %	Refugee cash and medical assistance are mandated activities by federal statute and regulation. Services that must be maintained are refugee cash assistance, refugee medical assistance, refugee medical screening, and unaccompanied refugee minor assistance. These benefits cannot be eliminated without statute and regulation changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act. Refugee assistance funds are also used to help refugees become economically self-sufficient as quickly as possible, primarily through the provision of employment services. A 25% reduction would impact our ability to provide employment services to refugees. Administrative costs can be reduced by reducing the number of FTEs working on these activities.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	A reduction of 5% would eliminate approximately 4 FTEs assigned to work on these activities.
25 %	A reduction of 25% would essentially eliminate all FTEs assigned to work on these activities and would critically impact services to refugees as well as other community partners serving these customers.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Refugee cash and medical assistance are mandated activities by federal statute and regulation. Services that must be maintained are refugee cash assistance, refugee medical assistance, refugee medical screening, and unaccompanied refugee minor assistance. These benefits cannot be eliminated without statute and regulation changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act.
25 %	Refugee cash and medical assistance are mandated activities by federal statute and regulation. Services that must be maintained are refugee cash assistance, refugee medical assistance, refugee medical screening, and unaccompanied refugee minor assistance. These benefits cannot be eliminated without statute and regulation changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Department of Workforce Services
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.551, 10.561
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 330,822,675
Number of FTEs	278.75
Recipients/Clients Served	Average monthly caseload: 91,740
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Low income households—employed and unemployed, with and without children

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$16,541,134)	(\$82,705,669)
State:		
General Fund	(\$833,347)	(\$4,166,736)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$17,374,481)	(\$86,872,405)

FTEs	-17.54	-87.72
-------------	--------	--------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Most non-benefit expenditures require a 50/50 match.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.

Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	This program provides financial assistance to purchase food. Any cuts that affect the benefit levels increase hunger and food insecurity in the community. This is an entitlement program and we must serve whomever is eligible for the program. Eligibility rules are set by federal regulation.
25 %	This program provides financial assistance to purchase food. Any cuts that affect the benefit levels increase hunger and food insecurity in the community. This is an entitlement program and we must serve whomever is eligible for the program. Eligibility rules are set by federal regulation.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	If the cut is to non-benefit funding only, we would need to reduce staffing and this would decrease service levels and accuracy for the customers. If benefits were cut, the impact could be significant with an increase in hunger and food insecurity.
25 %	A reduction this large would have an impact on services. We are mandated to serve all who are eligible so the service levels and program accuracy would potentially suffer. Cuts of this magnitude to benefits would have far reaching impacts in the general economy. An \$87 million lost to the food industry would have a significant impact with a ripple of lost jobs, hunger, and homelessness.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	All eligible persons must be served.
25 %	All eligible persons must be served.

Department of Workforce Services
Temporary Assistance For Needy Families (TANF)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.558
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, 801-526-9402

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 54,846,164
Number of FTEs	300.09
Recipients/Clients Served	21,593 Individuals 8,787 Households
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Unemployed and underemployed families with dependent children

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$2,742,308)	(\$13,711,541)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$2,742,308)	(\$13,711,541)

FTEs	-15.00	-75.02
-------------	--------	--------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The state provides annual maintenance-of-effort (MOE) of \$24,889,035. This amount includes \$4,474,924 of Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) MOE which can also be counted towards meeting the MOE requirement for TANF.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.

Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	If cuts are left to the discretion of the Department, the activities most likely to be eliminated are those that are not employment-related (e.g., after school care to vulnerable children and two-parent family formation and maintenance activities). No change in statute would be necessary. However, it is anticipated that the current TANF reserve would be sufficient to provide all services for a minimum of one year.
25 %	If cuts are left to the discretion of the Department, the activities listed in the 5% reduction scenario above would be eliminated first, followed by other non-employment activities (e.g., homelessness prevention, home baby visits, and other discretionary contractual spending). Also likely to be cut would employment-related but non-mandatory programs (e.g., mental health counseling and training to non-Family Employment Program customers). In order to reach the 25% target, the Department would also have to reduce the amount of TANF that is transferred to CCDF to pay for child care related activities, seriously impacting the program. With the reduction of the above-mentioned services, an accompanying reduction of staff by approximately 25% would also be likely. Another option is to cut or reduce the amount of TANF transferred to the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG). Currently, 10% of the base TANF grant is transferred annual to the Department of Human

	Services (DHS) for SSBG. However, it is anticipated that the current TANF reserve would be sufficient to provide all services for a minimum of one year.
--	--

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	The elimination of the after school programs would affect at-risk youth throughout the state who utilize the programs to develop critical life skills and are encouraged through those programs to avoid out-of-wedlock pregnancies. A reduction in TANF funding would eliminate funding available for the Marriage Commission which provides two-parent family formation activities; thus, persons considering marriage would have less information available to them regarding the development and maintenance of successful marriages.
25 %	In addition to the impact described in the 5% reduction scenario, many other individuals and families throughout the state would be affected if the 25% reduction scenario were enacted. The working poor would be the hardest hit, no longer having access to such programs as housing assistance, training, mental health counseling, winter shelter, and subsidized child care.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	No mandated services will be affected.
25 %	If the activities discussed above are sufficient to meet the 25% cut, then no mandated services will be affected. However, if the cuts fall short of the target, the Department will likely reduce the amount of grant funds given to each client. No other funding resources are available to meet these needs.

Department of Workforce Services
Trade Adjustment Assistance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.245, 17.225
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,613,765
Number of FTEs	3.69
Recipients/Clients Served	167
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Dislocated workers from Trade Adjustment Assistance Act impacted companies. Services include job training, Unemployment Insurance, and wage subsidies.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:
(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$80,688)	(\$403,441)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$80,688)	(\$403,441)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There are no maintenance-of-effort or match requirements for this program.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.	
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	This is a mandatory and entitlement based federal program driven by approval on a company by company basis. Any funding cuts would require corresponding program changes, resulting in fewer approvals and, therefore, fewer customers served. A 5% reduction would not require a statutory change.
25 %	This is a mandatory and entitlement based federal program driven by approval on a company by company basis. Any funding cuts would require corresponding program changes, resulting in fewer approvals and, therefore, fewer customers served. A 25% reduction would not require a statutory change.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	No impact.
25 %	Impact would only be minimal to the customers as the majority of Trade funds are entitlement funds based on eligible clients.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Services would continue. Funding is available to expend for 3 years. Funds are expended based on eligible clients.
25 %	Services would continue. Fewer clients would be served or additional funds would be requested based on program needs. Trade unemployment insurance benefits and wage subsidies are based on need and would not be reduced if there are eligible clients. Training services would be reduced unless additional federal funds are acquired.

Department of Workforce Services
Unemployment Insurance (UI)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.225
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 30,344,280
Number of FTEs	275.68
Recipients/Clients Served	Total Determinations: 318,131 Volume Counts (Claims): 84,863
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Unemployment Insurance claimants, employers

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,517,214)	(\$7,586,070)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$1,517,214)	(\$7,586,070)

FTEs	-13.78	-68.92
-------------	--------	--------

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	None.
---	-------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.

Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	Very little impact, all UI program activities should be able to continue with little interruption.
25 %	Significantly longer call wait times, UI benefit payments may take longer to get issued, integrity and compliance programs would be reduced leading to reduced detection of UI benefit overpayments, less employer audits, and less collections—all of which results to a negative impact on the UI Trust Fund.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	Slightly longer call wait times on UI claimants filing initial claims or calling with questions
-----	---

25 %	Significantly longer call wait times, UI benefit payments may take longer to get issued, and appeals would take longer to be resolved. UI integrity and compliance programs would be reduced significantly leading to reduced detection of UI benefit overpayments, less employer audits, and less collections—all of which results to a negative impact on the UI Trust Fund.
------	--

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	The UI division is required to maintain efforts related to core UI activities including UI claims processing, appeals, quality control, tax assessments and collections, UI integrity and compliance activities. The state is given substantial leeway, however, in determining how much resources are allocated to each activity.
25 %	The UI Special Administrative Expense Account (SAEA) could potentially be used to help augment the UI administrative grant fund reduction; however, this would negatively impact the current training and re-employment programs the SAEA currently funds.

Department of Workforce Services
Weatherization Assistance Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	81.042
Agency contact name and phone number	Kimberley Brown Schmeling, (801) 503-8970

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,612,526
Number of FTEs	1.8
Recipients/Clients Served	148
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The U.S. Department of Energy funds the State Weatherization Assistance Program to help weatherize homes and to provide emergency repair or replacement of defunct furnaces and air conditioning units. This program assists individuals and families in the lowest income brackets.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$80,626)	(\$403,132)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other:		

TOTAL	(\$80,626)	(\$403,132)

FTEs	0	0
-------------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	No matching funds are required.
--	---------------------------------

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.	
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$7,276 less in admin funding and \$73,350 less in program funding for weatherization improvements to approximately 8 individuals/families. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$36,382 in admin funding and \$366,750 less in program funding for weatherization improvements to approximately 37 individuals/families. No change in statute would be required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Local agencies hire workers to complete weatherization measures in low-income homes. Approximately 1 fewer weatherization worker may be hired. Individuals and families slated to have their homes weatherized would remain on the waiting list and pay higher utility bills for a longer period of time, creating a tremendous burden on these low-income clients.
25 %	Local agencies hire workers to complete weatherization measures in low-income homes. Approximately 2 fewer weatherization workers may be hired. Individuals and families slated to have their homes weatherized would remain on the waiting list and pay higher utility bills for a longer period of time, creating a tremendous burden on these low-income clients.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	There are no mandated services.
25 %	There are no mandated services.

Department of Workforce Services
Workforce Innovation Fund (“GenLEX”)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,769,696
Number of FTEs	2.71
Recipients/Clients Served	Employers Served: 9,006 Job Seekers Served: 253,505
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	General job seekers and employers.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$88,485)	(\$442,424)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$88,485)	(\$442,424)

FTEs	0	0
------	---	---

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	There are no maintenance-of-effort or match requirements for this program.
---	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	This is a grant in the 4th year of 5 years. It is for a specific purpose, mostly to re-write the employment pieces of the UWORKS Management Information System for the Department of Workforce Services. Any funding cuts would require corresponding program changes, resulting in fewer changes to the UWORKS system. A 5% reduction would not require a statutory change.
25 %	This is a grant in the 4th year of 5 years. It is for a specific purpose, mostly to re-write the employment pieces of the UWORKS Management Information System for the Department of Workforce Services. Any funding cuts would require corresponding program changes, resulting in fewer changes to the UWORKS system. A 25% reduction would not require a statutory change.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	No impact.
25 %	No impact.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?

5 %	There are no mandated services.
25 %	There are no mandated services.

Department of Workforce Services
Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2015
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.258, 17.259, 17.278
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2015 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 15,566,174
Number of FTEs	101.40
Recipients/Clients Served	8,992
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	WIA clients are economically disadvantaged Adults and Youth, or Dislocated Workers who have lost employment in the past 2 years and are unlikely to return to their previous occupation or industry. Services include core, intensive and training services. The majority of WIA customers age 18 and older are also eligible to be served with Wagner-Peyser funding.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2015:

(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$778,309)	(\$3,891,544)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$778,309)	(\$3,891,544)

FTEs	-5.07	-25.35
------	-------	--------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There are no maintenance-of-effort or match requirements for this program
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.	
Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	The impact of a 5% reduction would be minimal.
25 %	Less training funds would be available to serve clients, with fewer DWS employees providing services. Unless the federal requirements also change, this would impact the number of clients served.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Minimal impact on clients.
25 %	The impact would be a significant reduction in the number of clients served with the available funds. DWS would serve far fewer clients than we currently serve.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	All requirements would be met.
25 %	All requirements would be met, but for a smaller number of dislocated workers and economically disadvantaged adults and youth.