

State of Utah

Federal Receipts Reporting

and

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 %

Federal Receipts Reductions

For State Fiscal Year 2012



To: The Executive Appropriations Committee

November 30, 2012

Prepared by: Department of Administrative Services, Division of Finance



This page intentionally left blank.

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	
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program	10
Insect and Animal Health Programs	12
Meat and Poultry Inspection	14
Board of Regents and Student Assistance Programs	
Federal College Access Challenge Grant (CACG).....	16
Student Loan Guarantee Program.....	18
Student Loan Purchase Program.....	20
Corrections	
Divisions of Institutional Operations	22
Environmental Quality	
Drinking Water Federal State Revolving Funds (FSRF).....	24
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST)	28
Nonpoint Source Project Grants	30
Performance Partnership Grant.....	32
Superfund Sites	34
Water Quality SRF Loans.....	36
Health	
ADAP Shortfall Relief-Ryan White Part B Supplemental	38
AIDS Prevention.....	40
Children’s Health Insurance Program – CHIP.....	42
Core Capacity Tobacco – Collaborative Chronic Disease.....	44
Epidemiology and Lab Capacity for Infectious Disease.....	46
Hospital Preparedness Program	48
Immunization and Vaccines for Children	50
Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities	52
Maternal and Child Health Block Grant	54
Medicaid — Medical Assistance Program	56
Medicaid — Federal Survey and Certification Title 18.....	58
Medicaid — Federal Survey and Certification Title 19.....	60

Continues

Health (continued)	
Medicaid — General Medicaid Administration Title 19	62
National Cancer Prevention and Control	64
Public Health Preparedness and Response for Bioterrorism	66
Vaccine Distributions.....	68
Women, Infant and Children (WIC) Program	70
Department of Heritage and Arts	
Americorp (Corporation for National Service).....	72
Division of Arts and Museums	74
Division of State History	76
Utah State Library General Operations.....	78
Human Services	
Access to Recovery.....	80
Adoption Assistance Title IV-E.....	82
Block Grants for Community Mental Health Services	84
Child Welfare Title IV-B Subpart 1.....	86
Family Violence Prevention and Services	88
Foster Care Title IV-E	90
Promoting Safe and Stable Families Title IV-B Subpart 2.....	92
Child Support Collections / Incentives Title IV-D	94
MH & SA Projects of Regional and National Significance.....	96
Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse	98
Social Services Block Grant, Discretionary and TANF Transfers	100
Title III Grants for State & Community Programs on Aging and Nutritional Services Incentive Program (NSIP)	102
Insurance	
Grants to States for Health Insurance Premium Review—Cycle I and Health Insurance Rate Review—Cycle II.....	104
Grants to State for Operation of Qualified High Risk Pools, HIPUtah ..	106
Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan – Federal-HIPUtah	108
Labor Commission	
UOSH (Utah OSHA) Compliance	110
National Guard	
Law Enforcement Assistance.....	112
Military Construction.....	114
Military Operations and Maintenance	116

Continues

Natural Resources	
Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program.....	118
Boating Safety Coast Guard.....	120
Coal Program	122
Cooperative Agreements.....	124
Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands	126
Recreational Trails Program	128
Sportfish Restoration	130
State Wildlife Grants.....	132
Wildlife Restoration.....	134
Public Education	
Assessment and Accountability	136
Career and Technology Education.....	138
Child Nutrition Programs.....	140
Office of Rehabilitation, Disability Determination Services	142
Office of Rehabilitation, Vocational Rehabilitation	144
Special Education IDEA.....	146
Teaching and Learning	148
Title I.....	152
Department of Public Safety	
Emergency Management Federal Funds.....	154
Highway Safety Program.....	156
Transportation	
Highway Planning and Construction Program	158
Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program	160
Public Transit Program	162
Veterans' Affairs	
Veterans Nursing Homes	164
Workforce Services	
Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).....	166
Child Care	168
Community Development Block Grant (HUD).....	170
Community Services Block Grant (HHS).....	172
HOME.....	174
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program	176
Neighborhood Stabilization Program	178
Refugee Cash and Medical Assistance	180
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.....	182
Temporary Assistance For Needy Families (TANF).....	184
Trade Adjustment Assistance	186
Unemployment Insurance	188
Wagner-Peyser/Veterans.....	190
Workforce Investment Act (WIA)	192

This page intentionally left blank.

Introduction

Section 63J-1-219 of the *Utah Code* requires the reporting of federal receipts received by certain state agencies and requires the report to contain a plan to operate the 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 certain State agencies and a summary of federal receipts for State colleges and universities and for local education districts and charter schools. 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 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. Although there was some ARRA money spent in fiscal year 2012, the amount compared to normal federal receipts was insignificant; therefore, the fiscal year 2012 ARRA federal receipts are presented separately and are 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 2012 Single Audit Report for State agencies and higher education colleges, universities, and applied technology colleges (ATCs). 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 total USHE \$4 billion budget is the University of Utah's hospital and clinics which has approximately \$1 billion in annual revenue. 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 that go towards 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. The institutions have also sought federal ARRA grants; however, many of these grants have ended as of fiscal year 2012. 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 separately as these funds go primarily to the student and may not actually be paid to the institution.

Local Education Agencies (LEAs) include local school 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, 2012, 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

The statute requires a "total budget" to be presented. For Utah State Higher Education (USHE) and Local Education Agencies "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 2012 State of Utah Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), Detail Budgetary Comparison Schedules.

The *Budgeted Expenditures* for Utah State Higher Education (USHE) are the expenditures as reported in the fiscal year 2012 State of Utah CAFR in the Statement of Activities for Component Units. Total expenditures are reported for USHE institutions because the USHE budget report was not available.

The *Budgeted Expenditures* for Local Education Agencies are from the Local Education Agencies' 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 2012 for receipts exceeding appropriations may include:

- Several federal programs are exempted from the approval process by statute (UCA 63J-5-103). Also exempted 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 grant.
- 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 certain 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 2012. To focus attention on material programs, State agencies were asked at a minimum to report on programs \$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 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, 2012

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	\$ 133,738	\$ 115,600	\$ (18,138)			\$ 6,687	\$ 33,435
ARRA funding	18,492	—	(18,492)				
	<u>\$ 152,230</u>	<u>\$ 115,600</u>	<u>\$ (36,630)</u>	\$ 53,450,000	0.3%		
Agriculture and Food							
Federal grants	\$ 6,063,866	\$ 6,304,900	\$ 241,034			\$ 303,193	\$ 1,515,967
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 6,063,866</u>	<u>\$ 6,304,900</u>	<u>\$ 241,034</u>	\$ 29,443,000	20.6%		
Board of Regents							
Federal grants	\$ 1,585,563	\$ 303,100	\$ (1,282,463)			\$ 79,278	\$ 396,391
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 1,585,563</u>	<u>\$ 303,100</u>	<u>\$ (1,282,463)</u>	\$ 31,236,000	5.1%		
Commerce							
Federal grants	\$ 417,283	\$ 644,800	\$ 227,517			\$ 20,864	\$ 104,321
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 417,283</u>	<u>\$ 644,800</u>	<u>\$ 227,517</u>	\$ 29,865,000	1.4%		
Corrections							
Federal grants	\$ 821,707	\$ 474,600	\$ (347,107)			\$ 41,085	\$ 205,427
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 821,707</u>	<u>\$ 474,600</u>	<u>\$ (347,107)</u>	\$ 264,567,000	0.3%		
Environmental Quality							
Federal grants	\$ 17,777,018	\$ 24,240,600	\$ 6,463,582			\$ 888,851	\$ 4,444,255
ARRA funding	299,897	—	(299,897)				
	<u>\$ 18,076,915</u>	<u>\$ 24,240,600</u>	<u>\$ 6,163,685</u>	\$ 49,895,000	36.2%		
Governor's Office of Economic Development							
Federal grants	\$ 1,040,574	\$ 550,000	\$ (490,574)			\$ 52,029	\$ 260,144
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 1,040,574</u>	<u>\$ 550,000</u>	<u>\$ (490,574)</u>	\$ 40,699,000	2.6%		
Health							
Federal grants	\$ 1,526,728,848	\$ 1,418,847,100	\$ (107,881,748)			\$ 76,336,442	\$ 381,682,212
ARRA funding	16,168,752	32,574,900	16,406,148				
	<u>\$ 1,542,897,600</u>	<u>\$ 1,451,422,000</u>	<u>\$ (91,475,600)</u>	\$ 2,395,562,000	64.4%		
Heritage and Arts							
Federal grants	\$ 38,766,920	\$ 75,343,600	\$ 36,576,680			\$ 1,938,346	\$ 9,691,730
ARRA funding	12,725,500	9,848,500	(2,877,000)				
	<u>\$ 51,492,420</u>	<u>\$ 85,192,100</u>	<u>\$ 33,699,680</u>	\$ 141,408,000	36.4%		
Human Services							
Federal grants	\$ 124,526,996	\$ 135,884,900	\$ 11,357,904			\$ 6,226,350	\$ 31,131,749
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 124,526,996</u>	<u>\$ 135,884,900</u>	<u>\$ 11,357,904</u>	\$ 661,933,000	18.8%		
Insurance							
Federal grants	\$ 1,773,366	\$ 15,902,000	\$ 14,128,634			\$ 88,668	\$ 443,342
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 1,773,366</u>	<u>\$ 15,902,000</u>	<u>\$ 14,128,634</u>	\$ 19,176,000	9.2%		
Labor Commission							
Federal grants	\$ 3,006,464	\$ 2,512,600	\$ (493,864)			\$ 150,323	\$ 751,616
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 3,006,464</u>	<u>\$ 2,512,600</u>	<u>\$ (493,864)</u>	\$ 12,645,000	23.8%		

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Designated State Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Continued

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>
National Guard							
Federal grants	\$ 45,126,722	\$ 32,160,600	\$ (12,966,122)			\$ 2,256,336	\$ 11,281,681
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 45,126,722</u>	<u>\$ 32,160,600</u>	<u>\$ (12,966,122)</u>	\$ 48,846,000	92.4%		
Natural Resources							
Federal grants	\$ 33,534,389	\$ 33,151,900	\$ (382,489)			\$ 1,676,719	\$ 8,383,597
ARRA funding	309,210	3,750,000	3,440,790				
	<u>\$ 33,843,599</u>	<u>\$ 36,901,900</u>	<u>\$ 3,058,301</u>	\$ 178,654,000	18.9%		
Public Education *							
Federal grants	\$ 488,753,893	\$ 371,319,400	\$ (117,434,493)			\$ 24,437,695	\$ 122,188,473
ARRA funding	37,792,991	1,951,800	(35,841,191)				
	<u>\$ 526,546,884</u>	<u>\$ 373,271,200</u>	<u>\$ (153,275,684)</u>	\$ 3,141,419,000	16.8%		
Public Safety							
Federal grants	\$ 41,293,184	\$ 45,707,200	\$ 4,414,016			\$ 2,064,659	\$ 10,323,296
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 41,293,184</u>	<u>\$ 45,707,200</u>	<u>\$ 4,414,016</u>	\$ 212,831,000	19.4%		
Public Service Commission							
Federal grants	\$ —	\$ —	\$ —			\$ —	\$ —
ARRA funding	819,000	1,864,500	1,045,500				
	<u>\$ 819,000</u>	<u>\$ 1,864,500</u>	<u>\$ 1,045,500</u>	\$ 5,961,000	13.7%		
Tax Commission							
Federal grants	\$ 505,489	\$ 501,200	\$ (4,289)			\$ 25,274	\$ 126,372
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 505,489</u>	<u>\$ 501,200</u>	<u>\$ (4,289)</u>	\$ 89,819,000	0.6%		
Technology Services							
Federal grants	\$ 330,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 420,000			\$ 16,500	\$ 82,500
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 330,000</u>	<u>\$ 750,000</u>	<u>\$ 420,000</u>	\$ 3,903,000	8.5%		
Transportation							
Federal grants	\$ 448,910,303	\$ 201,506,900	\$ (247,403,403)			\$ 22,445,515	\$ 112,227,576
ARRA funding	5,774,607	—	(5,774,607)				
	<u>\$ 454,684,910</u>	<u>\$ 201,506,900</u>	<u>\$ (253,178,010)</u>	\$ 2,030,010,000	22.4%		
Veterans' Affairs							
Federal grants	\$ 17,799,378	\$ 121,600	\$ (17,677,778)			\$ 889,969	\$ 4,449,845
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 17,799,378</u>	<u>\$ 121,600</u>	<u>\$ (17,677,778)</u>	\$ 5,314,000	335.0%		
Workforce Services							
Federal grants	\$ 614,945,713	\$ 416,392,400	\$ (198,553,313)			\$ 30,747,286	\$ 153,736,428
ARRA funding	14,156,165	232,530,700	218,374,535				
	<u>\$ 629,101,878</u>	<u>\$ 648,923,100</u>	<u>\$ 19,821,222</u>	\$ 731,465,000	86.0%		
TOTALS							
Federal grants	\$ 3,413,841,414	\$ 2,782,735,000	\$ (631,106,414)			<u>\$ 170,692,069</u>	<u>\$ 853,460,357</u>
ARRA funding	\$ 88,064,614	\$ 282,520,400	\$ 194,455,786				
	<u>\$ 3,501,906,028</u>	<u>\$ 3,065,255,400</u>	<u>\$ (436,650,628)</u>	<u>\$ 10,178,101,000</u>	34.4%		

* 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.

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Designated State Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Continued

Designated State Agencies with no Federal Receipts:

Alcoholic Beverage Control
Financial Institutions
Human Resource Management

Enterprise Funds

Enterprise funds are used to account 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. Some of these enterprise funds also have federal funds for administration 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	\$ 262,316,283	\$ 94,240,878	\$ 4,712,044	\$ 23,560,220
Unemployment Compensation Fund ARRA				
– Workforce Services		\$ 88,194,700	\$ 4,409,735	\$ 22,048,675
Water Loan Programs – Environmental Quality		\$ 17,816,481	\$ 890,824	\$ 4,454,120
Water Loan Programs Water Resources Investigation				
– Natural Resources		\$ 371,123	\$ 18,556	\$ 92,781
Federal Health Insurance Pool – Insurance		\$ 19,983,280	\$ 999,164	\$ 4,995,820
Housing Loan Programs – Workforce Services		\$ 6,284,849	\$ 314,242	\$ 1,571,212
Student Assistance Programs – Board of Regents		\$ 28,339,905	\$ 1,416,995	\$ 7,084,976

Sources:

Federal Funds Receipts — Fiscal Year 2012 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 2012 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, 2012

<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	\$ 52,024,182			—
ARRA	39,564,472			—
Research and Development	235,811,082			—
Student Financial Aid	35,544,670			—
	<u>\$ 362,944,406</u>	\$ 2,995,810,000	12.1%	<u>\$ —</u>
Utah State University				
Institution	\$ 24,487,092			\$ —
ARRA	5,654,165			—
Research and Development	101,456,575			3,902,300
Student Financial Aid	38,800,876			—
	<u>\$ 170,398,708</u>	\$ 564,672,000	30.2%	<u>\$ 3,902,300</u>
Weber State University				
Institution	\$ 2,657,278			\$ —
Research and Development	250,384			—
Student Financial Aid	30,889,635			—
	<u>\$ 33,797,297</u>	\$ 198,671,000	17.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
Southern Utah University				
Institution	\$ 5,731,824			\$ —
ARRA	117,065			—
Student Financial Aid	13,473,552			—
	<u>\$ 19,322,441</u>	\$ 112,145,000	17.2%	<u>\$ —</u>
Utah Valley University				
Institution	\$ 8,000,871			\$ —
Research and Development	39,546			—
Student Financial Aid	56,656,503			—
	<u>\$ 64,696,920</u>	\$ 279,702,000	23.1%	<u>\$ —</u>
Salt Lake Community College				
Institution	\$ 3,511,921			\$ —
ARRA	1,439,556			—
Student Financial Aid	43,120,919			—
	<u>\$ 48,072,396</u>	\$ 203,146,000	23.7%	<u>\$ —</u>
Dixie State College of Utah				
Institution	\$ 1,568,303			\$ —
Research and Development	73,002			—
Student Financial Aid	19,665,530			—
	<u>\$ 21,306,835</u>	\$ 85,122,000	25.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
Snow College				
Institution	\$ 953,317			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	6,101,065			—
	<u>\$ 7,054,382</u>	\$ 42,708,000	16.5%	<u>\$ —</u>
Total — Colleges and Universities	<u>\$ 727,593,385</u>	<u>\$4,481,976,000</u>	16.2%	<u>\$ 3,902,300</u>

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Institutions of Higher Education
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

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				
Institution	\$ 11,000			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	1,167,794			—
	<u>\$ 1,178,794</u>	\$ 15,420,000	7.6%	<u>\$ —</u>
Davis				
Institution	\$ 524,719			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	1,296,338			—
	<u>\$ 1,821,057</u>	\$ 19,466,000	9.4%	<u>\$ —</u>
Dixie				
Institution	\$ —			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	—			—
	<u>\$ —</u>	\$ 3,576,000	0.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
Mountainland				
Student Financial Aid	\$ 648,589			\$ —
	<u>\$ 648,589</u>	\$ 9,048,000	7.2%	<u>\$ —</u>
Ogden-Weber				
Institution	\$ 574,601			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	2,237,936			—
	<u>\$ 2,812,537</u>	\$ 21,328,000	13.2%	<u>\$ —</u>
Southwest				
Student Financial Aid	\$ 376,000			\$ —
	<u>\$ 376,000</u>	\$ 3,642,000	10.3%	<u>\$ —</u>
Tooele				
	<u>\$ —</u>	\$ 1,665,000	0.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
Uintah Basin				
Student Financial Aid	\$ 116,134			\$ —
	<u>\$ 116,134</u>	\$ 10,140,000	1.1%	<u>\$ —</u>
UCAT Administration				
	<u>\$ —</u>	\$ 4,766,000	0.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
Total — Utah College of Applied Technology				
	<u>\$ 6,953,111</u>	<u>\$ 89,051,000</u>	7.8%	<u>\$ —</u>

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Institutions of Higher Education
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

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	\$ 100,045,108			\$ —
ARRA	46,775,258			—
Research and Development	337,630,589			3,902,300
Student Financial Aid	<u>250,095,541</u>			<u>—</u>
Total — All Institutions of Higher Education	<u>\$ 734,546,496</u>	<u>\$4,571,027,000</u>	16.1%	<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 2012 Single Audit expenditures categorized by type of federal assistance: Institution, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), Research and Development, and Student Financial Aid. Institution is primarily the core instruction component and operation of the institution of higher education.

Budgeted Expenditures — FY 2012 State of Utah Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) college and university expenditures in the Statement of Activities for Component Units and final budget for Utah College of Applied Technology administration in the Budget and Actual Comparison for the General Fund.

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, 2012

<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.....	\$ 27,581,176	\$ 371,711,243	7.4%
Beaver District.....	732,358	11,642,111	6.3%
Box Elder District.....	5,091,353	64,930,203	7.8%
Cache District.....	7,185,312	94,820,409	7.6%
Canyons District.....	13,469,238	211,202,156	6.4%
Carbon District.....	2,329,500	27,173,100	8.6%
Daggett District.....	146,081	2,913,322	5.0%
Davis District.....	27,786,892	377,497,614	7.4%
Duchesne District.....	2,655,565	30,934,000	8.6%
Emery District.....	1,463,415	21,852,771	6.7%
Garfield District.....	1,205,405	8,120,352	14.8%
Grand District.....	872,046	11,451,383	7.6%
Granite District.....	40,159,902	410,955,059	9.8%
Iron District.....	5,105,232	50,455,206	10.1%
Jordan District.....	16,475,745	289,271,106	5.7%
Juab District.....	941,987	12,600,000	7.5%
Kane District.....	1,125,639	12,276,975	9.2%
Logan City District.....	5,066,728	36,751,350	13.8%
Millard District.....	1,928,863	22,996,033	8.4%
Morgan District.....	635,376	13,683,715	4.6%
Murray District.....	2,072,827	39,935,556	5.2%
Nebo District.....	12,448,304	171,489,694	7.3%
North Sanpete District.....	1,621,628	18,057,018	9.0%
North Summit District.....	559,865	7,705,740	7.3%
Ogden City District.....	15,431,970	116,493,724	13.2%
Park City District.....	1,801,120	45,036,281	4.0%
Piute District.....	427,395	4,035,193	10.6%
Provo District.....	11,381,865	90,740,870	12.5%
Rich District.....	326,956	5,875,506	5.6%
Salt Lake District.....	21,980,879	178,822,061	12.3%
San Juan District.....	8,404,503	31,918,996	26.3%
Sevier District.....	3,950,514	33,262,486	11.9%
South Sanpete District.....	1,945,952	25,627,204	7.6%
South Summit District.....	567,935	11,397,421	5.0%
Tintic District.....	170,367	2,945,375	5.8%
Tooele District.....	5,843,868	79,150,976	7.4%
Uintah District.....	4,618,532	47,500,000	9.7%
Wasatch District.....	1,680,062	35,804,934	4.7%
Washington District.....	14,796,859	164,051,777	9.0%
Wayne District.....	471,171	4,980,450	9.5%
Weber District.....	12,661,666	190,145,959	6.7%
Total School Districts.....	\$ 285,122,051	\$ 3,388,215,329	8.4%

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Local Education Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Continued

Charter Schools	Federal Revenues from All Sources *	Budgeted Expenditures	Percent of Budgeted Expenditures From Federal Revenues
Academy for Math, Science and Engineering (AMES).....	\$ 242,107	\$ 3,468,939	7.0%
Alianza Academy.....	368,137	2,827,181	13.0%
American Leadership Academy.....	829,641	10,446,477	7.9%
American Preparatory Academy – LEA.....	1,083,655	11,978,702	9.0%
Aristotle Academy **.....	—	300,000	—
Bear River Charter School.....	282,135	1,326,327	21.3%
Beehive Science and Technology Academy (BSTA).....	73,184	1,422,217	5.1%
C.S. Lewis Academy.....	227,996	2,692,101	8.5%
Canyon Rim Academy.....	189,310	2,987,414	6.3%
Channing Hall.....	196,545	4,245,737	4.6%
City Academy.....	87,291	1,774,960	4.9%
DaVinci Academy.....	235,827	5,729,451	4.1%
Dual Immersion Academy.....	485,663	2,872,500	16.9%
Early Light Academy at Daybreak.....	611,683	4,572,508	13.4%
East Hollywood High.....	142,466	2,176,558	6.5%
Edith Bowen Laboratory School.....	73,047	2,906,630	2.5%
Endeavor Hall.....	176,799	2,370,524	7.5%
Entheos Academy.....	316,385	3,408,063	9.3%
Excelsior Academy.....	358,201	3,797,626	9.4%
Fast Forward High.....	227,081	1,671,971	13.6%
Freedom Academy.....	434,145	4,147,638	10.5%
Gateway Preparatory Academy.....	340,357	3,668,863	9.3%
George Washington Academy.....	111,592	6,690,037	1.7%
Good Foundation Academy.....	204,023	2,076,955	9.8%
Guadalupe School.....	233,173	1,151,310	20.3%
Hawthorn Academy.....	437,269	4,453,575	9.8%
Intech Collegiate High School.....	103,426	1,332,275	7.8%
Itineris Early College High.....	18,523	1,786,864	1.0%
John Hancock Charter School.....	40,221	1,155,151	3.5%
Karl G. Maeser Preparatory Academy.....	42,756	13,712,756	0.3%
Lakeview Academy.....	318,093	4,698,207	6.8%
Legacy Preparatory Academy.....	226,563	5,490,880	4.1%
Liberty Academy.....	140,933	2,340,449	6.0%
Lincoln Academy.....	195,587	3,894,945	5.0%
Maria Montessori Academy.....	190,676	2,682,557	7.1%
Merit College Preparatory Academy.....	306,362	4,154,670	7.4%
Moab Charter High School.....	54,656	569,223	9.6%
Monticello Academy.....	440,216	4,354,634	10.1%
Mountainville Academy.....	148,701	17,681,855	0.8%
Navigator Pointe Academy.....	99,966	2,799,820	3.6%
No. UT Academy for Math Engineering & Science (NUAMES)..	25,182	3,099,400	0.8%
Noah Webster Academy.....	240,883	3,466,494	6.9%
North Davis Preparatory Academy.....	442,227	5,944,646	7.4%
North Star Academy.....	196,293	3,125,909	6.3%
Odyssey Charter School.....	171,392	3,025,765	5.7%
Ogden Preparatory Academy.....	886,376	6,830,488	13.0%
Open Classroom.....	142,826	2,358,622	6.1%
Open High School of Utah.....	197,518	2,092,534	9.4%
Oquirrh Mountain Charter School.....	409,483	4,060,916	10.1%
Pacific Heritage Academy **.....	—	165,000	—
Paradigm High School.....	194,807	3,653,398	5.3%

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Local Education Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2012

Continued

Charter Schools	Federal Revenues from All Sources *	Budgeted Expenditures	Percent of Budgeted Expenditures From Federal Revenues
Pinnacle Canyon Academy.....	459,182	3,897,842	11.8%
Pioneer High School for the Performing Arts **.....	—	192,940	—
Promontory School or Expeditionary Learning **.....	—	99,255	—
Providence Hall.....	388,064	7,629,837	5.1%
Quail Run Primary School.....	329,004	3,407,746	9.7%
Quest Academy.....	521,291	4,478,394	11.6%
Ranches Academy.....	126,970	2,050,393	6.2%
Reagan Academy.....	472,503	4,384,521	10.8%
Renaissance Academy.....	165,919	3,816,328	4.3%
Rockwell Charter High School.....	235,757	3,843,650	6.1%
Salt Lake Arts Academy.....	86,475	2,003,050	4.3%
Salt Lake Center for Science Education.....	103,900	1,987,473	5.2%
Salt Lake School for the Performing Arts.....	38,744	1,511,223	2.6%
Soldier Hollow Charter School.....	253,008	1,573,000	16.1%
Spectrum Academy.....	264,832	3,671,682	7.2%
Success Academy.....	42,166	2,004,353	2.1%
Summit Academy.....	213,511	6,583,045	3.2%
Summit Academy High School.....	216,760	6,446,700	3.4%
Syracuse Arts Academy.....	608,405	6,205,457	9.8%
Thomas Edison – LEA.....	187,176	6,640,411	2.8%
Timpanogos Academy.....	56,745	2,369,884	2.4%
Tuacahn High School for the Performing Arts.....	56,735	2,286,293	2.5%
Uintah River High.....	271,176	1,013,214	26.8%
Utah Connections Academy.....	199,761	2,197,850	9.1%
Utah County Academy of Science (UCAS).....	114,983	2,674,314	4.3%
Utah Virtual Academy.....	521,573	11,614,713	4.5%
Valley Academy **.....	—	222,559	—
Venture Academy.....	241,136	3,407,402	7.1%
Vista at Entrada School of Performing Arts and Technology.....	307,143	16,710,232	1.8%
Walden School of Liberal Arts.....	144,124	2,279,767	6.3%
Wasatch Peak Academy.....	295,815	2,441,575	12.1%
Weilenmann School of Discovery.....	214,691	12,672,760	1.7%
Total Charter Schools.....	\$ 20,338,927	\$ 331,959,585	6.1%
Total All Local Education Agencies.....	\$ 305,460,978	\$ 3,720,174,914	8.2%

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

** New charter school opened.

Source:

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

Department of Agriculture and Food
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012

—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.509 19.902
Agency contact name and phone number	Mark Quilter, (801) 538-9905

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,542,439
Number of FTEs	3
Recipients/Clients Served	35
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Farmers in the Uintah Basin, Manila, Green River, Muddy Creek, and Price San Rafael watershed. Assisted in converting to more efficient irrigation systems.

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	(\$127,122)	(\$635,610)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$127,122)	(\$635,610)

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 with this program. No maintenance requirements.
--	--

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 %	Awarded funds follow federal expenditures by one year. Funds reduced in current year will affect funds in the next year. There are no statutes or rules affect by this program. The funds are used to improve irrigation efficiency. The reduction of funds would reduce irrigation improvements in the Colorado River Basin.
25 %	Awarded funds follow federal expenditures by one year. Funds reduced in current year will affect funds in the next year. There are no statutes or rules affect by this program. The funds are used to improve irrigation efficiency. The reduction of funds would reduce irrigation improvements in the Colorado River Basin.

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 state would have one year before impact from funds reductions in this program. Impact to agency at this reduction would be insignificant.
------------	---

25 %	The state would have one year to adjust to this reduction as funds are received based on previous year's federal expenditures. There would be in the second year some reduction in state revenue that may require some reduction in travel and current expense.
------	---

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 Agriculture and Food
Insect and Animal Health Programs

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.025
Agency contact name and phone number	Clint Burfitt (801)538-7184, Dr. Wyatt Frampton (801)538-7165

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 917,526
Number of FTEs	3
Recipients/Clients Served	210 Farmers
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Insect program – Create cooperative treatment of insects on public and private lands to decrease production costs. Animal Health program – The Division of Animal Industry receives cooperative agreement funding to help fund several programs.

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	(\$45,876)	(\$229,382)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$45,876)	(\$229,382)

FTEs	-2.85	-2.25
-------------	-------	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Insect program – Matching requirement for Gypsy Moth portion of grant. Animal Health – The only cooperative agreement that may in the future require maintenance by the State is associated with animal disease traceability. A federal rule may require states to maintain a system that will allow the tracing of animals in the State for disease prevention and control purposes.
---	--

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 %	Insect program - When grant runs out of money, services would cease and production losses could be high. Animal Health program – At the present time, no programs would be impacted by total loss of funding. If a final rule is passed that requires states to maintain an animal disease traceability program, the State would need to fund such a program.
25 %	Insect program - When grant runs out of money, services would cease and production losses could be high. Animal Health program – At the present time, no programs would be impacted by total loss of funding. If a final rule is passed that requires states to maintain an animal disease traceability program, the State would need to fund such a program.

<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?</p>	
<p>5 %</p>	<p>Insect program - When this grant runs out of money the potential economic impact to agricultural producers is very high. Without means to suppress Orthopteran outbreaks in affected agricultural areas, production losses could be 80%. Orthopteran outbreaks can spread rapidly and last for 5-7 years. Incipient infestations are more cost effective to treat, before the insects spread and devastate large geographical areas.</p> <p>Animal Health program – No impact would be felt by recipients.</p>
<p>25 %</p>	<p>When this grant runs out of money the potential economic impact to agricultural producers is very high. Without means to suppress Orthopteran outbreaks in affected agricultural areas, production losses could be ~80%. Orthopteran outbreaks can spread rapidly and last for 5-7 years. Incipient infestations are more cost effective to treat, before the insects spread and devastate large geographical areas.</p> <p>Animal Health program – No impact would be felt by recipients.</p>

<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>	
<p>5 %</p>	<p>Insect program - Based on availability of funds - USDA APHIS' overall authority for this suppression program is based on Section 417 of the Plant Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. § 7717). SEC. 417 7 USC 7717 CONTROL OF GRASSHOPPERS AND MORMON CRICKETS.</p> <p>Historically, when USDA is unable to assist with suppression programs local political entities actively seek assistance from other sources.</p> <p>Animal Health program – At the present time, there are no federal mandates that require funding.</p>
<p>25 %</p>	<p>Insect program - Based on availability of funds - USDA APHIS' overall authority for this suppression program is based on Section 417 of the Plant Protection Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. § 7717). SEC. 417 7 USC 7717 CONTROL OF GRASSHOPPERS AND MORMON CRICKETS.</p> <p>Historically, when USDA is unable to assist with suppression programs local political entities actively seek assistance from other sources. Animal Health program – At the present time, there are no federal mandates that require funding.</p> <p>Animal Health program – At the present time, there are no federal mandates that require funding.</p>

Department of Agriculture and Food
Meat and Poultry Inspection

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.477
Agency contact name and phone number	Bruce King, (801) 538-7166

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,346,251
Number of FTEs	27.5
Recipients/Clients Served	34 processing plants
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Meat and poultry processing plants

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	(\$67,313)	(\$336,563)
State:		
General Fund	(64,807)	(324,037)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$132,120)	(\$660,600)

FTEs	-2	-9
-------------	----	----

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 at least equal to, with USDA Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS) regulations and the Federal meat and Poultry products inspection Acts.
--	---

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.

<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 %	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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.378
Agency contact name and phone number	Melissa Miller Kincart, (801) 366-8492

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,122,092
Number of FTEs	2.021
Recipients/Clients Served	389,956
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Low-income and underserved students: 389,129; Secondary school counselors, financial aid administrators, and college admissions counselors: 827.

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	(\$56,105)	(\$280,523)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$56,105)	(\$280,523)

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> (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 (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.
--	--

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 %	Decrease amounts of Sub-grant Awards and/or number of Sub-grants awarded. This program operates on available funding, and does not fund core operations of the State Board of Regents.
25 %	Decrease or eliminate any of our 17 awareness activities, i.e. Utah Scholars, StepUp to Higher Education, publications, financial aid outreach, and FAFSA completion events, professional development for secondary education personnel, and Sub-grant awards. 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 %	This would eliminate one institutional subgrants which includes activities such as, financial aid workshops, FAFSA completion, admissions application support, mentoring, tutoring, career and scholarship awareness, etc., servicing 200-300 middle/Jr. high through high school students.
25 %	This would eliminate some institutional subgrant funding, service less schools in our outreach components, reduce publications, and decrease grassroots initiatives and PR efforts servicing 50,000 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 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 41,127,555
Number of FTEs	50
Recipients/Clients Served	122,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Program provides guarantee services related to a student loan portfolio of \$1.5 billion pertaining to 122,000 borrowers (as of August 31, 2012).

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	(\$2,056,378)	(\$10,281,889)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund	0	0
Transportation Fund	0	0
Transportation Investment Fund	0	0
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____	0	0
Other Fund:		
_____	0	0
Dedicated Credits	0	0
Other: _____	0	0
Other: _____	0	0
TOTAL	(\$2,056,378)	(\$10,281,889)

FTEs	-2	-12
-------------	----	-----

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 50 to 48.
25 %	A 25% reduction in Federal receipts would cause a corresponding decrease in the number of FTE's from 50 to 38.

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 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	(\$13,017,390)	[Special Allowance Payments: (24,959,782) + Federal Interest Subsidy Payments: 11,942,392]
Number of FTEs	124	
Recipients/Clients Served	228,000	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Program manages the servicing activity for a student loan portfolio of \$3.4 billion pertaining to 228,000 borrowers (as of August 31, 2012).	

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	\$0	\$0
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund	0	0
Transportation Fund	0	0
Transportation Investment Fund	0	0
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____	0	0
Other Fund:		
_____	0	0
Dedicated Credits	0	0
Other: _____	0	0
Other: _____	0	0
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 (\$13,017,390) 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 %	N/A

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

25 %	N/A
-------------	-----

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

5 %	N/A
------------	-----

25 %	N/A
-------------	-----

Department of Corrections
Divisions of Institutional Operations
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	16.606
Agency contact name and phone number	Gary W. Sessions, (801) 545-5614

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 584,546
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	An average of 500 alien offenders
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	<p>Citizen of the State; local law enforcement agencies arrest, prosecute and convict citizen's that are sentence to jurisdiction of UDC (Public Safety)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reimbursement is the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAPP) for detaining individuals whom are believed to be criminal aliens based on investigative and other information, but for who no formal Department of Homeland Security documentation of alien status is available.

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	(\$29,227)	(\$146,137)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$29,227)	(\$146,137)

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.)	UDC has to incarcerate any person the courts have sentenced to incarceration. (Utah Code 76-3-208) The sentenced person is incarcerated on violation of the Utah State Criminal Code creating the liability for the state. Their alien status is secondary to the incarceration of Utah State Criminal Code violation. Thus, the state bares the financial liability to incarcerate those sentenced, regardless of the SCAPP grant. The grant amount awarded varies year to year, depending on federal funding level, the number of alien offenders UDC houses that fit that years criteria and the number of jurisdictions throughout the country that have applied for SCAPP grant funds.
---	---

d

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 %	UDC would absorb the cost of housing alien offenders, as offenders would be incarcerated on a commitment order sentencing to them to the jurisdiction of UDC. UDC does not determine who is incarcerated or when the offender is released.

25 %	UDC would absorb the cost of housing alien offenders, as offenders would be incarcerated on a commitment order sentencing to them to the jurisdiction of UDC. UDC does not determine who is incarcerated or when the offender is released.
------	--

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 Criminal Justice Agencies would have to determine alternatives to incarceration for offenders who are criminal aliens. UDC does not determine who is incarcerated or when the offender is released.
-----	---

25 %	Local Criminal Justice Agencies would have to determine alternatives to incarceration for offenders who are criminal aliens. UDC does not determine who is incarcerated or when the offender is released.
------	---

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
Drinking Water Federal State Revolving Funds (FSRF)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 10,022,674
Number of FTEs	24.5
Recipients/Clients Served	2,763,885
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Capitalization Grant purpose is to provide grant and low interest loans to Utah communities to construct infrastructure projects to replace aging, failing, and inadequate facilities to help achieve or maintain compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act requirement. The grant also allows a portion of the grant (up to 26%) to be set-aside (simply called set-asides) for specific activities. The Division of Drinking Water uses set-asides to administer the loan program, to supplement the division's program management and is used for direct technical assistance to the communities. Therefore the recipients may be any water system in the State of Utah (total active systems 1,006) and the clients served consists of the entire population in the State of Utah based on the 2010 census.

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	(501,134)	(2,505,669)
State:		
General Fund	(41,260)	(206,300)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Drinking Water Development Security Fund (5210)	(100,227)	(501,134)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$642,621)	(\$3,213,103)

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

<p>Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>10% of the total grant can be used for the following state programs: Program augmentation, Capacity Development, Source Water and Operator Certification.</p>
--	---

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 %	<p>A 5% reduction in federal loan amounts would directly reduce the amount of money available for loans and grants to water systems by the 5% estimated to be \$390,000. 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 exclusive of the Lake Powell Pipeline project and the Bear River project.</p> <p>A 5 % reduction would also reduce the amount of direct technical assistance we can offer to water systems. This change would not require any rule or statute changes. This could eliminate 1 FTE.</p>
25 %	<p>A 25% reduction in federal loan amounts would directly reduce the amount of money available for loans and grants to water systems by the 25% estimated to be \$1.9 Million. 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 exclusive of the Lake Powell Pipeline project and the Bear River project</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Up to five FTEs could be eliminated in these scenarios.</p> <p>Rules affected: R309-500, R309-105-12, R309-305</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 %	<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 this type of project. Commercial loans would be financially prohibitive 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 customers needs.</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 provide 65% of the Division's operating budget.</p> <p>If more than three FTEs were lost across the Division, we would contemplate implementing a fee for service program and/or request the State allocate more general funds to make up for loss of financial support of the Division's programs. A 25% reduction of this grant alone may total \$500,000 loss of set-asides, which totals about a 10% cut to the division's entire budget.</p>
--	--

<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>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>

This page intentionally left blank.

Department of Environmental Quality
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (LUST)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,191,205
Number of FTEs	7.64
Recipients/Clients Served	101 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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$59,560)	(\$297,801)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: PST Trust Fund	(6,610)	(33,089)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$66,170)	(\$330,890)

FTEs	-0.5	-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
Nonpoint Source Project Grants

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,206,671
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	25
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Local Land owners

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	(\$60,334)	(\$301,668)
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>	(40,222)	(201,112)
TOTAL	(\$100,556)	(\$502,780)

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 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 6,951,308
Number of FTEs	70
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$347,565)	(\$1,737,827)
State:		
General Fund	(43,454)	(217,272)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Environmental Quality Restricted Account	(14,662)	(73,308)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$405,681)	(\$2,028,407)

FTEs	-4	-18
-------------	----	-----

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 statues 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 statues 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 affect 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 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,365,904
Number of FTEs	15.84
Recipients/Clients Served	92 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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$118,295)	(\$591,476)
State:		
General Fund	(1,900)	(9,500)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$120,195)	(\$600,976)

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.)	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 stakeholder 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 SRF Loans

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 9,765,324
Number of FTEs	4.05
Recipients/Clients Served	76
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$488,266)	(\$2,441,331)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Wastewater Loan Program	(97,653)	(488,266)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____ In-Kind		
TOTAL	(\$585,919)	(\$2,929,597)

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, .2 FTE would be lost and 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.

<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 %	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
ADAP Shortfall Relief-Ryan White Part B Supplemental

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.917
Agency contact name and phone number	Cristie Chesler, (801) 538-9465

Fiscal Year 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 4,689,682
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	85
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	85 HIV positive clients receive HIV medications. The clients either have no insurance or are underinsured.

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	(\$234,484)	(\$1,172,421)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$234,484)	(\$1,172,421)

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 not matching or maintenance of effort requirements.
--	--

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 4 HIV positive individuals being removed from the Program. No change in statute or rules is required.
25 %	Reducing this funding source by 25% would result in 21 HIV positive individuals being removed from the Program. 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 change would be that the four individuals affected would not receive their HIV drugs and would need to find another way to obtain HIV drugs. The drugs are expensive (approximately \$9000 a year) and individuals cannot afford them without assistance. There is no other state or local programs that assist with HIV drugs.

25 %	The change would be that the twenty-one individuals affected would not receive their HIV drugs and would need to find another way to obtain HIV drugs. The drugs are expensive (approximately \$9000 a year) and individuals cannot afford them without assistance. There is no other state or local programs that assist with HIV drugs.
-------------	---

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 became 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. They may be able to receive the drugs through a pharmacy assistance program, but this is uncertain and depends on what HIV drugs the patient is on.
------------	--

25 %	The State is not obligated to provide medications to HIV positive individuals, but when the individuals became 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. They may be able to receive the drugs through a pharmacy assistance program, but this is uncertain and depends on what HIV drugs the patient is on.
-------------	--

Department of Health
AIDS Prevention

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.940, 93.944
Agency contact name and phone number	Lynn Meinor, (801) 538-6198

Fiscal Year 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,581,894
Number of FTEs	12
Recipients/Clients Served	21,916
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	7,000 clients were tested for HIV in 2011. In addition, 15,228 clients were reached through various interventions in the state.

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	(\$79,095)	(\$395,474)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$79,095)	(\$395,474)

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.)	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 2 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 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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 56,040,844
Number of FTEs	8.9
Recipients/Clients Served	37,372 / month
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	CHIP eligible children with family incomes less than or equal to 200% FLP

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	(\$2,802,042)	(\$14,010,211)
State:		
General Fund	(250,323)	(1,251,614)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Tobacco Settlement	(539,824)	(2,699,124)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits	(99,403)	(497,015)
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$3,691,592)	(\$18,457,964)

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) specifies 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.
--	--

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 1,991 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 35,381.
25 %	The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 9,956 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 27,416. This could be accomplished by capping CHIP family eligibility incomes at less than or equal to 150% FLP

<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?</p>	
5 %	<p>The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 1,991 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 35,381. 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.</p>
25 %	<p>The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 9,956 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 27,416. This could be accomplished by capping CHIP family eligibility incomes at less than or equal to 150% FLP. 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.</p>

<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 1,991 CHIP eligible lose coverage. It is likely that they will be uninsured. If a catastrophic event occurs, it will increase the amount of uncompensated care cost to hospitals.</p>
25 %	<p>This cut would make 9,956 CHIP eligible lose coverage. It is likely that they will be uninsured. If a catastrophic event occurs, it will increase the amount of uncompensated care cost to hospitals.</p>

Department of Health
Core Capacity Tobacco – Collaborative Chronic Disease

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,200,152
Number of FTEs	7.25
Recipients/Clients Served	200,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Utah tobacco users

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	(\$60,008)	(\$300,038)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$60,008)	(\$300,038)

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 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 %	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 health districts). 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
Epidemiology and Lab Capacity for Infectious Disease

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Melissa Stevens Dimond, (801) 538-6810

Fiscal Year 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,073,841
Number of FTEs	8.3
Recipients/Clients Served	Statewide
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Contractual funds were provided to UTA for bus ads (for the “Fight the Bite” WNV prevention campaign); Utah State University for tick studies (for Lyme Disease); and Collaborative Software Initiatives, Inc. for maintenance of the UT-NEDSS/TriSano surveillance system.

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	(\$53,692)	(\$268,460)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$53,692)	(\$268,460)

FTEs	0	-2.5
-------------	---	------

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, contracts would be severely impacted in order to maintain personnel. Contracts for activities associated with the “Fight the Bite”/WNV prevention campaign and tick surveillance and education would be eliminated. Funds available for the contract for maintenance of UT-NEDSS would be reduced, which could impact the system. This reduction would not require a change in statute or rule.
25 %	At the 25% level, contracts would be eliminated in order to preserve personnel; in addition, 2 to 3 FTEs would have to be eliminated at this level. This reduction would not require a change in statute or rule.

<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?</p>	
5 %	<p>At the 5% level, contracts with vendors would be impacted as described above. This would impact our ability to provide education and prevention messages for WNV and tick-borne diseases, and would impact UT-NEDSS maintenance. This could impact the use of the system by Local Health Departments and UDOH staff.</p>
25 %	<p>At the 25% level, all contractual funds would be eliminated as described above. In addition, personnel would be eliminated (presumably within Epidemiology and the Unified State Laboratories: Public Health), resulting in increased workload for existing staff which would result in problems with productivity, customer service, and morale.</p>

<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>No.</p>
25 %	<p>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 cut positions.</p>

Department of Health
Hospital Preparedness Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,184,701
Number of FTEs	5.4
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 strengths 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, 50 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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$159,235)	(\$796,175)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _Parent Fee		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$159,235)	(\$796,175)

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

<p>Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</p>	<p>Per ASPR HPP FOA FY11: HPP CA funding must be matched by nonfederal contributions beginning with the distribution of FY09 funds. Nonfederal contributions (match) may be provided directly or through donations from public or private entities and may be in cash or in-kind donations, fairly evaluated, including plant, equipment, or services. Amounts provided by the federal government may not be included in determining the amount of such nonfederal contributions. Awardees will be required to provide matching funds as described: • For FY11, not less than 10% of such costs (\$1 for each \$10 of federal funds provided in the CA).</p> <p>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 FY11 application for funds, follow procedures for generally accepted accounting practices and meet audit requirements. We use FTE match from 8 hospital emergency managers who work full time on HPP related projects to satisfy our match requirement. (Ex. A hospital emergency manager earns \$50,000 and works 100% FTE on projects funded by HPP, so that is a \$50,000 match toward total).</p>
--	--

	<p>MOF: Awardees must demonstrate that they intend to maintain expenditures for healthcare preparedness at a level that is not less than the average of such expenditures maintained by the entity for the preceding 2-year period. These expenditures encompass <u>all funds spent by the State</u> for healthcare preparedness. The awardee must 'certify with a sentence' that they have maintained the average level of expenditures required. All preparedness funds are Federal, so we report state expenditures as \$0 and 'certify 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 \$796,175 for the HPP program. In order to keep under the administrative cap of 15% per the ASPR HPP grant, at least 2 FTE would have to be cut from the 5.4 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 20%, 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 for FY11, 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 two projects that help define our performance benchmarks 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. UDOH does receive funding for the ESAR-VHP program through a separate grant, but not for the HAvBED. Additionally, we provide support to Utah’s Health Alert Network (Utah Notification and Information System (UNIS)) which will need to continue operations.
25 %	Yes/Yes in part – See above

Department of Health
Immunization and Vaccines for Children

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,990,082
Number of FTEs	19
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$149,504)	(\$747,521)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$149,504)	(\$747,521)

FTEs	-2	-10
-------------	----	-----

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 past through funding to local Health departments. A reduction in force (RIF) of 2 FTEs. Program staff would be required. This impact would reduce immunization services.
25 %	There would be a 25% reduction in past through funding to local Health departments. An additional 8 Program staff FTE would be reduced. 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 2012
—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 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,397,470
Number of FTEs	5.38
Recipients/Clients Served	7,393
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$269,874)	(\$1,349,368)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: Parent Fee	(13,800)	(69,000)
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$283,674)	(\$1,418,368)

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.)	Non-supplanting requirement states that the same amount of state dollars must 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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.994
Agency contact name and phone number	Nan Streeter 801-538-9363

Fiscal Year 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,668,230
Number of FTEs	42.76
Recipients/Clients Served	Not available
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$283,412)	(\$1,417,058)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: Collections/Clinical	(16,902)	(84,508)
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$300,314)	(\$1,501,566)

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.)	Per grant requirements, MOE is the amount spent in 1989 which is \$3,897,700. Match requirement is 3 state to 4 federal \$s 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 — Medical Assistance Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,275,173,058
Number of FTEs	N/A
Recipients/Clients Served	290,114 / 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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$63,758,653)	(\$318,793,265)
State:		
General Fund	(9,745,719)	(51,018,073)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Hospital and Nursing Home Assessments		(61,805,032)
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits	(18,496,006)	(28,366,811)
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$92,000,378)	(\$459,983,181)

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) specifies that existing coverage for adults under the Medicaid program will remain in place until the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that an Exchange established by the State under section 1311 of ACA is fully operational. It is assumed that this restriction 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: Optional Transplants, 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).</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 Disproportional Share Hospital (DSH) payments. Eliminate Coverage for Medically Needy Individuals. Eliminate the Nursing Home Assessment. Eliminate the Hospital Assessment. 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 %	<p>3,609 individuals will lose coverage. 19,236 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) 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.</p>
------------	--

25 %	<p>All the same from the 5% scenario plus:</p> <p>23,489 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. 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 qualifying for Disproportionate Share Payments (DSH) will take reductions. 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 %	<p>All programs cut 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.</p>
------------	--

25 %	<p>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.</p>
-------------	---

Department of Health
Medicaid — Federal Survey and Certification Title 18

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.777
Agency contact name and phone number	Joel Hoffman, (801) 538-6279

Fiscal Year 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,952,451
Number of FTEs	20.40
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$97,623)	(\$488,113)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$97,623)	(\$488,113)

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 %	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.

<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?</p>	
5 %	<p>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.</p>
25 %	<p>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. 25% would create a larger problem.</p>

<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>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.</p>
25 %	<p>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.</p>

Department of Health
Medicaid — Federal Survey and Certification Title 19

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.777
Agency contact name and phone number	Joel Hoffman, (801) 538-6279

Fiscal Year 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 853,021
Number of FTEs	15.96
Recipients/Clients Served	Health Facilities
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Nursing Care Facilities, Hospitals

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	(\$42,651)	(\$213,255)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$42,651)	(\$213,255)

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.)	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 .5 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.

<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?</p>	
5 %	<p>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.</p>
25 %	<p>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.</p>

<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>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.</p>
25 %	<p>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.</p>

Department of Health
Medicaid — General Medicaid Administration Title 19

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.777
Agency contact name and phone number	Joel Hoffman, (801) 538-6279

Fiscal Year 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 67,095,753
Number of FTEs	7.22
Recipients/Clients Served	Nursing Home Clients
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Medicaid eligible recipients entering nursing facilities.

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	(\$3,354,788)	(\$16,773,938)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$3,354,788)	(\$16,773,938)

FTEs	-5	-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>	Match rate is 25/75 and 50/50 depending on 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 %	A cut in this area would require rule changes to R414-501, Preadmission Authorization. This grant funds the process of preadmission screening for people eligible for nursing home services. A 5% cut would reduce staff by .5 FTE. This would have significant impact on the workload that is already stressed. Staffing mostly consists of registered nurses that complete medical screening for nursing home residents that seek admission, and continued stay eligibility. Funding also covers support and managerial staff that support the program. Preadmission and continued screening is tied to the Medicaid process for payment of nursing home residents. This area of the Bureau has been stressed with prior state funding cuts.
25 %	A cut in this area would require rule changes to R414-501, Preadmission Authorization. This grant funds the process of preadmission screening for people eligible for nursing home services. A 25% cut would reduce staff by 2.5 FTEs. This would have significant impact on the workload that is already stressed. Staffing mostly consists of registered nurses that complete medical screening for nursing home residents that seek admission, and continued stay eligibility. Funding also covers support and managerial staff that support the program. Preadmission and continued screening is tied to the Medicaid process for payment of nursing home residents. This area of the

	Bureau has been stressed with prior state funding cuts.
--	---

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 in this area would impact residents of nursing facilities. Authorization to receive funding for nursing stays would be delayed, causing a delay in services. The reduction would also create a problem with meeting Federal requirements regarding nursing facility admissions.
25 %	A reduction in funding in this area would severely impact residents of nursing facilities. Authorization to receive funding for nursing stays would be severely delayed, causing a delay in services. The reduction would also create a problem with meeting Federal requirements regarding nursing facility admissions, jeopardizing Federal funding.

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 may still be required to provide preadmission authorization even with funding cuts. There are no other state resources to meet these requirements. State funding has been cut in the past and staff in this area, are currently operating at minimal levels.
25 %	The state may still be required to provide preadmission authorization even with funding cuts. There are no other state resources to meet these requirements. State funding has been cut in the past, and staff in this area, are already operating at minimal levels. A 25% cut would severely impact this program.

Department of Health
National Cancer Prevention and Control

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Kathryn Rowley, (801) 538-6233

Fiscal Year 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,222,828
Number of FTEs	12.15
Recipients/Clients Served	5,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Uninsured or underinsured Women age 50 to 64

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	(\$161,141)	(\$805,707)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$161,141)	(\$805,707)

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 Maintenance of Effort requirement in the provisions of the NBCCEDP 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 Utah Cancer Control Breast & Cervical Cancer Screening program would reduce the number of Clinical Breast Exams, Pap tests, mammograms from 5,000 screens to 4, 600 (a reduction of 400 screens).
25 %	The UCCP screening program would reduce the number of Clinical Breast Exams, Pap tests, mammograms from 5,000 screens to 3,100 (a reduction of 1,900 screens).

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 Local Health Departments and Community Health Centers currently receive \$624,280 to implement the UCCP screening program. With a 5% cut this number is reduced by \$31,214 (for a total of \$593,066).

25 %	With a 25% reduction this number is reduced by \$156,070 (for a total of \$468,210)
-------------	---

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
Public Health Preparedness and Response for Bioterrorism

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$7,762,773
Number of FTEs	22.01
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 4 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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$388,139)	(\$1,940,693)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _Parent Fee	x	x
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$388,139)	(\$1,940,693)

FTEs	-1	-4.65
-------------	----	-------

<p>Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</p>	<p>Matching requirement is 10% of Federal Funds. We require those groups we pass money through to, e.g. LHD's, to match the 10% on the portion given to them.</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</p>
---	---

	<p>used as an indicator of nonfederal support for public health security 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. 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, 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 (let employee go), 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 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 PAHPA 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
Vaccine Distributions

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 21,573,406
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	437,645
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,078,670)	(\$5,393,352)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,078,670)	(\$5,393,352)

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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.557
Agency contact name and phone number	Chris Furner 801-538-6199

Fiscal Year 2012 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 47,165,897
Number of FTEs	12.55
Recipients/Clients Served	Approx. 69,000/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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$2,358,295)	(\$11,791,474)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$2,358,295)	(\$11,791,474)

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 %	Cuts to WIC could encompass every program to include: 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. We do not believe a 5% cut would reduce our services or program operations.
25 %	Cuts to WIC could encompass every program to include: NSA (Admin dollars), Food funding, Infrastructure, Operational Adjustment Funds and possibly breastfeeding, peer counseling dollars. It is difficult to project without a budget for FY13 since we are in a continuing resolution status until mid-January 2013. If Congress does not act and produce a budget for the remainder of FFY2013, sequestration will immediately reduce our base budget by 8.2% which would require us to reduce local health department contracts again. If we take a 25% reduction in monies, it would immediately force us into caseload management (CM). CM is where we would be required to reduce our total benefitted participation counts by cutting out the "healthiest caseload" with strict oversight from our funding agency, USDA. This would force us to cut 4-year old children as well as post-partum women. 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.

Department of Heritage and Arts
Americorp (Corporation for National Service)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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) 715-6716

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,729,525
Number of FTEs	3
Recipients/Clients Served	110,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Utah Commission on Volunteers, 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. When faced with challenges, our nation has always relied on the dedication and action of its citizens. Citizens, who proudly serve as national-service members, have an immense impact on quality of life in America and in other countries. They have pulled America through hard times, strengthened relationships among diverse peoples and communities, and made a major difference in our country's development.

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	(\$186,476)	(\$932,381)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$186,476)	(\$932,381)

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 \$200,000 administrative funding provided for the program. This match is met through a General Fund appropriation and in-kind contributions. No match is required on program 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 %	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$185,810 less in 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 \$200,000. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$929,050 less in 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 \$200,000. 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 simply be fewer AmeriCorps members serving/volunteering throughout the state.
25 %	There would be significantly less AmeriCorps members serving/volunteering through 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, 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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	45.025
Agency contact name and phone number	Lynnette Hiskey (801) 236.7552

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 589,063
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	1,500,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Arts Organizations, Individual Artists, Students, Schools, Teachers, and Communities.

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	(\$29,453)	(\$147,266)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$29,453)	(\$147,266)

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 National Endowment of the Arts grant requires 100% 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 organizations would be reduced. No change in statute or rules.
25 %	Grants to nonprofit arts organizations, schools and school districts would be reduced. Outreach to underserved communities would be limited. 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 %	Funding opportunities would be limited for arts organizations requesting financial support for projects and programs. Fewer numbers of organizations would receive funding.
25 %	Opportunities for artists, teachers, students, schools, and organizations for funding, training, technical assistance, visiting artists in schools, and certifications would be limited.

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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.069, 15.224, 15.904
Agency contact name and phone number	Londi Rowley (801) 533-3521 or Kim Hale (801) 245-7206

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$757,374
Number of FTEs	5
Recipients/Clients Served	4,447
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	2,650 state-wide oil, gas, highway, water, power, and housing and development project received expedited assistance prior to project onset, as required by state and federal laws; 224 Utah archaeological consultant firms received on-going cost-saving online access to 159,784 archaeological records and 120,041 historic site records; 100 complex cultural resource management cases received special consultation assistance, and innovative programmatic agreements streamlined development; 95 state-wide local governments with historic preservation commissions, received technical assistance and grants stimulating economic development; 400 Utah building owners obtained \$23.5 million in historic preservation tax credits, which created 832 state-wide local jobs; Mormon pioneer National Heritage Area, Great Basin National Heritage Area, Four Corners Heritage Council, This is the Place Heritage Park, and State Scene Byway Committee received assistance with heritage resources and history to increase heritage tourism; assisted 868 Utah building owners to list properties on National Register stimulating heritage tourism and economic development; provided on-going technical assistance and services to 34 state agencies and 37 federal agencies.

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	(\$37,869)	(\$189,344)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$37,869)	(\$189,344)

FTEs (Note: Grants are on continuing resolution; we do not anticipate a reduction for FY13.)	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 Historic Preservation Fund federal grant requires 40% match, however, at least 70% of this match is provided by local government grants matching share; the remaining federal match is provided by general fund appropriations to the Historic Preservation program for <u>state-mandated</u> 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 federally funded cultural resource management staffing assisting state and federal agencies with non-mandated delivery level of services. This would not require a change in statute or rules. The 1 federally funded FTE eliminated provides non-mandated delivery level of services.

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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	45.310
Agency contact name and phone number	Donna Morris, State Librarian, (801) 715-6770 or Kim Hale (801) 538-8707

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,955,741
Number of FTEs	3
Recipients/Clients Served	(A) Blind Library Program 15,014 patrons (B) Lender Support Program - 23 Utah Libraries (C) Public Pioneer Program - 2.7 million people (D) Library Development LSTA grants - 14 academic libraries; 55 public libraries; 760 school libraries and many special libraries
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	A) Blind, visually and print impaired; physically disabled populations (B) Libraries in Utah that lend their materials to people outside their service areas (C) Anyone in Utah with a need for educational and informational online premium resources (D) Utah's public libraries, Higher Education libraries, special and school libraries; and underserved and rural Utah citizens

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	(\$97,787)	(\$488,935)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: _____		
Other Fund: _____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$97,787)	(\$488,935)
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.)	This grant requires matching funds of 51.5% of the grant amount or \$1,007,207 and maintenance of effort expenditure of \$2,073,000 per year. Note: All MOE funding is 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 %	(B) Lender Support Program - provides financial support for lending library materials to Utah's outside the libraries service area (D) Library Development LSTA grants - provide funding support for Utah libraries and Mobile (Bookmobile) Libraries providing service in underserved rural areas
25 %	(B) Lender Support Program - as above (C) Public Pioneer Program - as above

	(D) Library Development LSTA grants - 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 %	<p>(B) Lender Support Program – \$25,000 reduction; reduce incentives for libraries to lend materials to users in other libraries; these users would find that their ability to obtain materials not in their local library would be reduced.</p> <p>(D) Library Development LSTA grants - \$72,790 reduction in support for Utah libraries; this would mean that, on average, 2 – 5 Utah libraries applying for assistance in providing technology, building collections of materials, and digitizing print resources would be turned away.</p>
25 %	<p>(B) Lender Support Program – Elimination of program (\$200,000) – this would eliminate 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.</p> <p>(C) Public Pioneer Program - \$70,000 reduction – elimination of at least 1 online statewide resource, in areas of business, Utah Newspapers, and / or genealogy; 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.</p> <p>(D) Library Development LSTA grants - \$218,950 reduction in grants to libraries; this would reduce the ability of all types of libraries in Utah to provide technology for users, to build collections of materials, and digitize and make publicly available valued and historical print resources. On average, 5 – 17 Utah libraries who applied for grants would be rejected because of lack of funds.</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>(A) Blind Library Program is federally mandated (2 U.S.C. 135a, 135a-1, 135b) Some libraries have collections of large print materials; There is currently statewide access to a selection of audiobooks for general library users.</p>
25 %	<p>(A) Blind Library Program is federally mandated (2 U.S.C. 135a, 135a-1, 135b) Some libraries have collections of large print materials; There is currently statewide access to a selection of audiobooks for general library users.</p>

Department of Human Services
Division: DSAMH
Access to Recovery

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,538,417
Number of FTEs	4.00
Recipients/Clients Served	2,619
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; 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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$126,921)	(\$634,604)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$126,921)	(\$634,604)

FTEs	0.00	0.00
-------------	------	------

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 %	This program provides vouchers which clients can use to pay for substance abuse treatment services. Number of vouchers distributed would depend on funding reduction. No change in statute or rule 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 %	The three Local Authorities operating the program would receive decreased funding. They would likely provide services to fewer clients. Expenditures would be reduced by the amount of the funding lost.
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.

GENERAL COMMENT:

The impact to State funding and Human Services programs from a loss of federal funds is not known. The impact depends on the nature and circumstances involving a federal funding reduction. How a federal cut is structured could influence the impact; a cut could involve a change in federal requirements, or a reduction in the federal participation rate (if applicable) may require additional State funds to participate in the program. Actions by Congress, Federal Agencies, or others unknown at this time may influence our response to a federal cut. Human Services plans to act reasonably and adjust as necessary for changes involving Human Services federal funds.

Department of Human Services
Divisions: DCFS, EDO
Adoption Assistance Title IV-E

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$7,351,211
Number of FTEs	14.79
Recipients/Clients Served	3,198
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$367,561)	(\$1,837,803)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$367,561)	(\$1,837,803)

FTEs	-0.62	-3.10
-------------	-------	-------

<p>Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</p>	<p>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 11 – 65% 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).</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 %	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.

GENERAL COMMENT:

The impact to State funding and Human Services programs from a loss of federal funds is not known. The impact depends on the nature and circumstances involving a federal funding reduction. How a federal cut is structured could influence the impact; a cut could involve a change in federal requirements, or a reduction in the federal participation rate (if applicable) may require additional State funds to participate in the program. Actions by Congress, Federal Agencies, or others unknown at this time may influence our response to a federal cut. Human Services plans to act reasonably and adjust as necessary for changes involving Human Services federal funds.

Department of Human Services
Division: DSAMH

Block Grants for Community Mental Health Services

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,669,428
Number of FTEs	2.08
Recipients/Clients Served	44,827
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$183,471)	(\$917,357)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$183,471)	(\$917,357)

FTEs	-08	-38
-------------	-----	-----

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 2012 was \$26,803,940. The current MOE requirement for FY 2013 is approximately \$26,781,400. 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.

GENERAL COMMENT:

The impact to State funding and Human Services programs from a loss of federal funds is not known. The impact depends on the nature and circumstances involving a federal funding reduction. How a federal cut is structured could influence the impact; a cut could involve a change in federal requirements, or a reduction in the federal participation rate (if applicable) may require additional State funds to participate in the program. Actions by Congress, Federal Agencies, or others unknown at this time may influence our response to a federal cut. Human Services plans to act reasonably and adjust as necessary for changes involving Human Services federal funds.

Department of Human Services
Divisions: DCFS, EDO

Child Welfare Title IV-B Subpart 1

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$3,390,000
Number of FTEs	52.6
Recipients/Clients Served	17,805
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$169,500)	(\$847,500)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$169,500)	(\$847,500)

FTEs	-2.63	-13.15
-------------	-------	--------

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.

GENERAL COMMENT:

The impact to State funding and Human Services programs from a loss of federal funds is not known. The impact depends on the nature and circumstances involving a federal funding reduction. How a federal cut is structured could influence the impact; a cut could involve a change in federal requirements, or a reduction in the federal participation rate (if applicable) may require additional State funds to participate in the program. Actions by Congress, Federal Agencies, or others unknown at this time may influence our response to a federal cut. Human Services plans to act reasonably and adjust as necessary for changes involving Human Services federal funds.

Department of Human Services
Division: DCFS

Family Violence Prevention and Services

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012

—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,129,518
Number of FTEs	0.49
Recipients/Clients Served	3,260
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$56,476)	(\$282,380)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$56,476)	(\$282,380)

FTEs	0	-0.49
-------------	---	-------

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.
------	------------

GENERAL COMMENT:

The impact to State funding and Human Services programs from a loss of federal funds is not known. The impact depends on the nature and circumstances involving a federal funding reduction. How a federal cut is structured could influence the impact; a cut could involve a change in federal requirements, or a reduction in the federal participation rate (if applicable) may require additional State funds to participate in the program. Actions by Congress, Federal Agencies, or others unknown at this time may influence our response to a federal cut. Human Services plans to act reasonably and adjust as necessary for changes involving Human Services federal funds.

Department of Human Services
Divisions: DCFS, JJS, EDO
Foster Care Title IV-E

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$22,806,662
Number of FTEs	165.58
Recipients/Clients Served	1,708
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,140,333)	(\$5,701,666)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,140,333)	(\$5,701,666)

FTEs	-7.98	-39.89
-------------	--------------	---------------

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-
------------	---

	<p>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.</p> <p>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 (as pass through expenditures)—the same providers also deliver other services to youth, such as mental health assessments, therapy, special programming for sex offenders, tracking, etc. Because the 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. A reduction in Title IV-E would not require a change in statute.</p>
25 %	<p>See above. Additional information from DCFS follows:</p> <p>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). 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.</p>

<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?</p>	
5 %	<p>JJS would experience a reduction of community-based bed days (1,000) resulting in increased pressure on more expensive and restrictive institutional placements. Request for replacement State funds is an option.</p> <p>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.</p>
25 %	<p>JJS would experience a reduction of community-based bed days (5,000) resulting in great pressure on more expensive and restrictive institutional placements. Request for replacement State funds is an option.</p> <p>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</p>

<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>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 that may be available to address the Title IV-E loss impact. Otherwise, there are not any other resources available to meet these needs.</p> <p>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.</p>
25 %	<p>See above.</p>

GENERAL COMMENT:

The impact to State funding and Human Services programs from a loss of federal funds is not known. The impact depends on the nature and circumstances involving a federal funding reduction. How a federal cut is structured could influence the impact; a cut could involve a change in federal requirements, or a reduction in the federal participation rate (if applicable) may require additional State funds to participate in the program. Actions by Congress, Federal Agencies, or others unknown at this time may influence our response to a federal cut. Human Services plans to act reasonably and adjust as necessary for changes involving Human Services federal funds.

Department of Human Services
Division: DCFS

Promoting Safe and Stable Families Title IV-B Subpart 2

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,932,573
Number of FTEs	11.03
Recipients/Clients Served	10,171
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Children and families in which there is risk for child abuse and neglect, children returning home from foster care and their parents, and children adopted from foster care or from other child welfare services and their adoptive parents.

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	(\$96,629)	(\$483,143)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$96,629)	(\$483,143)

FTEs	-0.55	-2.76
-------------	-------	-------

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 caseworkers visit 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.

GENERAL COMMENT:

The impact to State funding and Human Services programs from a loss of federal funds is not known. The impact depends on the nature and circumstances involving a federal funding reduction. How a federal cut is structured could influence the impact; a cut could involve a change in federal requirements, or a reduction in the federal participation rate (if applicable) may require additional State funds to participate in the program. Actions by Congress, Federal Agencies, or others unknown at this time may influence our response to a federal cut. Human Services plans to act reasonably and adjust as necessary for changes involving Human Services federal funds.

Department of Human Services
Divisions: ORS, EDO

Child Support Collections / Incentives Title IV-D

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 24,679,070
Number of FTEs	285
Recipients/Clients Served	329,459
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Mothers, Fathers, and Children

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	(\$1,233,954)	(\$6,169,768)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		
TITLE XIX		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,233,954)	(\$6,169,768)

FTEs	-15	-71
-------------	-----	-----

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.
--	--

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. Because of this, cuts would be spread across the entire program, which 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 %	Collections would drop, affecting State funds and other State agencies as well custodial parents' ability to provide for their children. Additional State assistance to the most needy would likely occur. Request for replacement State funds would be an option.
25 %	Collections would drop significantly, affecting State funds and other State agencies as well custodial parents' ability to provide for their children. Additional State assistance to the most needy would likely occur. Request for replacement State funds would be an option.

<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 %	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. Currently there are over 350,000 Child Support and Medicaid cases.
25 %	A 25% cut would magnify the problem described above.

GENERAL COMMENT:

The impact to State funding and Human Services programs from a loss of federal funds is not known. The impact depends on the nature and circumstances involving a federal funding reduction. How a federal cut is structured could influence the impact; a cut could involve a change in federal requirements, or a reduction in the federal participation rate (if applicable) may require additional State funds to participate in the program. Actions by Congress, Federal Agencies, or others unknown at this time may influence our response to a federal cut. Human Services plans to act reasonably and adjust as necessary for changes involving Human Services federal funds.

Department of Human Services
Divisions: DSAMH, EDO

**Mental Health and Substance Abuse Projects of
Regional and National Significance**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,924,680
Number of FTEs	2.00
Recipients/Clients Served	2,074,129
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The following clients are estimated to be served with these funds: Transition to adulthood for mentally ill youth – 165 Advocacy and support for mentally ill and prevention of mental illness – 1,050 Media campaigns related to substance abuse prevention – 2,072,914 Substance Abuse prevention activities also included physician and pharmacy training, prescription drug take-back events, website creation and maintenance, and a media campaign. The media campaign was estimated to reach 90% of the State's population through television and radio advertising, billboards, prescription drug "take-back" events and media coverage from news reports. 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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$96,234)	(\$481,170)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: _____		
Other Fund: _____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$96,234)	(\$481,170)

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.)	In-kind Match provided by counties to fulfill requirement of Data Infrastructure Grant (DIG). The other grants included in this CFDA title do not have a matching 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 reduction in funds would result in a decrease in services provided to assist mentally ill adolescents successfully transition to adult living. Substance Abuse Prevention services would also be reduced if delivered through the SPF-SIG program. Maintenance for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Information System (SAMHIS) would be reduced. Over time, this could affect our ability to provide federally required data. No change in statute or rule needed.
25 %	A reduction in funds would result in a decrease in services provided to assist mentally ill adolescents successfully transition to adult living. Substance Abuse Prevention services would also be reduced if delivered through the SPF-SIG program. Maintenance for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Information System (SAMHIS) would be reduced. Over time, this likely would affect our ability to provide federally required data. No change in statute or rule 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 %	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.

GENERAL COMMENT:

The impact to State funding and Human Services programs from a loss of federal funds is not known. The impact depends on the nature and circumstances involving a federal funding reduction. How a federal cut is structured could influence the impact; a cut could involve a change in federal requirements, or a reduction in the federal participation rate (if applicable) may require additional State funds to participate in the program. Actions by Congress, Federal Agencies, or others unknown at this time may influence our response to a federal cut. Human Services plans to act reasonably and adjust as necessary for changes involving Human Services federal funds.

Department of Human Services
Divisions: EDO, DSAMH

Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012

—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 17,035,279
Number of FTEs	11.40
Recipients/Clients Served	2,375,073
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. DSAMH estimates that 31,995 clients received substance abuse treatment and 2,343,078 (duplicated) were exposed to substance abuse prevention activities.

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	(\$851,764)	(\$4,258,820)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$851,764)	(\$4,258,820)

FTEs	-0.57	-2.85
-------------	-------	-------

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 2012 was \$18,893,772. The MOE requirement for FY 2013 is approximately \$18,277,100.
--	--

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.

GENERAL COMMENT:

The impact to State funding and Human Services programs from a loss of federal funds is not known. The impact depends on the nature and circumstances involving a federal funding reduction. How a federal cut is structured could influence the impact; a cut could involve a change in federal requirements, or a reduction in the federal participation rate (if applicable) may require additional State funds to participate in the program. Actions by Congress, Federal Agencies, or others unknown at this time may influence our response to a federal cut. Human Services plans to act reasonably and adjust as necessary for changes involving Human Services federal funds.

Department of Human Services
Divisions: EDO, DSAMH, DSPD, DCFS, DAAS, JJS
Social Services Block Grant, Discretionary and TANF Transfers

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$23,247,368
Number of FTEs	144.72
Recipients/Clients Served	12,350
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,162,368)	(\$5,811,842)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,162,368)	(\$5,811,842)

FTEs	-7.14	-36.21
-------------	-------	--------

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 %	<p>These funds are integral to the Human Service programs. If funds were cut across the board, see below for examples of impact:</p> <p>DSAMH: A reduction in funds would limit the Division's ability provide oversight of Mental Health programs.</p> <p>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: The AAA's receive SSBG funds. Fewer clients would be served.</p>
------------	--

	<p>JJS: Case management for community based services. JJS has identified Title XX funding to be used to help defray case management costs associated with providing community-based placements for delinquent youth. 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. A reduction in Title XX funding would not reduce the need to provide delinquent youth with community-based services nor the associated case management costs of delivering those placements. A reduction in Title XX would not require a change in statute.</p> <p>EDO: Reduction of funds distributed to local governments and for support services.</p>
25 %	See above.

<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?</p>	
5 %	<p>In DSPD, less services. In DCFS, staff, available services, funding for domestic violence shelters would all be reduced. In DSAMH, there would be some minor reductions in services and clients served through local authorities. JJS would see community-based beds shrink resulting in more restrictive and costly placements. DAAS would also see a reduction in services and people served. Request for replacement State funds is an option. There would be reduced funds for local governments.</p>
25 %	See above. Additionally, in DSAMH , these funds are used for service coordination and case management. The funding cut may create increased lengths of stay for children and adolescents at the Utah State Hospital.

<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 %	Yes. The funding is integral to Human Services programs. Resources for these programs are limited.
25 %	See above.

GENERAL COMMENT:

The impact to State funding and Human Services programs from a loss of federal funds is not known. The impact depends on the nature and circumstances involving a federal funding reduction. How a federal cut is structured could influence the impact; a cut could involve a change in federal requirements, or a reduction in the federal participation rate (if applicable) may require additional State funds to participate in the program. Actions by Congress, Federal Agencies, or others unknown at this time may influence our response to a federal cut. Human Services plans to act reasonably and adjust as necessary for changes involving Human Services federal funds.

Department of Human Services
Division: 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 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 8,313,115
Number of FTEs	11.46
Recipients/Clients Served	37,349
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$415,656)	(\$2,078,279)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$415,656)	(\$2,078,279)

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 division must certify yearly that Maintenance of Effort requirements have been met. MOE includes: 25% State match for State Admin; 1/3 of 25% match for AAA Admin; 5% match for IIIB, C1, C2, & AAA Ombudsman programs; and 25% for IIIE program. 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 & support services will be reduced.
25 %	Meals & 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, senior centers would be opened less often. 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.

GENERAL COMMENT:

The impact to State funding and Human Services programs from a loss of federal funds is not known. The impact depends on the nature and circumstances involving a federal funding reduction. How a federal cut is structured could influence the impact; a cut could involve a change in federal requirements, or a reduction in the federal participation rate (if applicable) may require additional State funds to participate in the program. Actions by Congress, Federal Agencies, or others unknown at this time may influence our response to a federal cut. Human Services plans to act reasonably and adjust as necessary for changes involving Human Services federal funds.

Department of Insurance
**Grants to States for Health Insurance Premium Review–Cycle I
and
Health Insurance Rate Review–Cycle II**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.511
Agency contact name and phone number	Doyle Christensen, (801) 538-3806 / Tanji Northrup, (801) 538-1801

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 837,869
Number of FTEs	3
Recipients/Clients Served	61 Health insurers offering products in the individual and small employer market, covering about 350,000 lives.
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The program serves both insurers and consumers of individual and small employer health benefit plans to assure that the rates being charged by insurers are reasonable and comply with insurance laws.

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	(\$41,893)	(\$209,497)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$41,893)	(\$209,497)

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 %	The program is fully funded by federal funds. If funding were to be cut the department would limit the continued development of a transparency database. Federal fund reductions will not result in a need to increase state funds.
25 %	The program is fully funded by federal funds. Grant funded FTE's are either temporary employees, or have alternate funding sources. If funding were to be cut the department may eliminate FTE's or limit the continued development of a transparency database. Federal fund reductions will not result in a need to increase state funds.

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 a 5% reduction were necessary, the transparency database may not be as robust.
25 %	If a 25% reduction were necessary, the transparency database may not be as robust and consumers and insurers may see a more limited review of rate increase requests.

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. However, if the state does not perform the duties made possible by the grant funds, the federal government may assume regulatory control.
25 %	No. However, if the state does not perform the duties made possible by the grant funds, the federal government may assume regulatory control.

Department of Insurance
**Grants to State for Operation of Qualified High Risk Pools
for the Utah Comprehensive Health Insurance Pool, HIPUtah**
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.780
Agency contact name and phone number	Tomi Ossana, (801) 485-2830

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$851,380
Number of FTEs	None – all Staff is contracted
Recipients/Clients Served	An average of 953 members out of an average 3,715 covered under HIPUtah
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Utah Comprehensive Health Insurance Pool (HIPUtah) continues to serve as an important safety net for individuals who have been denied health insurance coverage because of their medical status. The grant funding is used to for a Premium Assistance Subsidy (PAS) program for those individuals who are eligible for coverage under HIPUtah but cannot afford the premium due to their income level, below 300% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL).

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	(\$42,569)	(\$212,845)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$42,569)	(\$212,845)

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 high risk individuals covered under HIPUtah pay premiums that are approximately 140% higher than those one would find in the individual private insurance market. This difference in cost makes this program unaffordable for some Utahns. To help these individuals the HIPUtah Board approved the use of this grant to
------------	--

	<p>support a Premium Assistance Subsidy Program for potential and current HIPUtah applicants. The PAS Program provides a 25% discount on current premium per month with a Federal Poverty Level (FPL) between 0% and 150%, a 12.5% discount on current premium per month with a FPL between 150% and 250%, and a 4% discount on current premium per month with a FPL between 250% and 300%. The federal grant monies make up the difference of the discount.</p> <p>A reduction in funds would not require a change in statute or rules.</p>
25 %	Same as above.

<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?</p>	
5 %	<p>HIPUtah covers over 3,500 high risk individuals with approximately 23% participating in the Premium Assistance Subsidy Program (PAS). Individuals that receive help from this grant under the PAS program fall under 300% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL). With a 5% or 25% reduction in funds under this grant the program would have to be modified or discontinued which would result in a significant reduction in the number of members that could receive help under this program. For example, the grant funds were reduced by 40% in November of 2010. Due to this reduction the PAS program reduced its discount levels by half. Members covered under the PAS program went from 1,210 in November 2010 to 906 as of 793 in August 2012. Some of these individuals now go without health insurance coverage.</p>
25 %	Same as above.

<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>There are no mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain if the federal funding is cut. The PAS program would have to be modified i.e.; categories within federal poverty levels established under the program may have to be modified, the discounts under the program may have to be reduced, or the program is discontinued. This would leave individuals receiving help under this program without any other options for assistance unless the state provided additional funding to keep the program going.</p>
25 %	Same as above.

Department of Insurance
Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan – Federal-HIPUtah
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.529
Agency contact name and phone number	Tomi Ossana, (801) 485-2830

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$19,983,280
Number of FTEs	None – all Staff is contracted
Recipients/Clients Served	1,011
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	<p>The Federal Qualified High Risk Pool (FHRP) was designated in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), Public Law 111-148. Section 1101 of the new health insurance reform law establishes a “temporary high-risk health insurance pool program” to provide health insurance coverage to currently uninsured individuals with pre-existing conditions who’ve been without insurance for at least six months. This program is known as the “Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan (PCIP).”</p> <p>The Utah Insurance Department runs the program in parallel with its existing state high-risk pool, the Utah Comprehensive Health Insurance Pool, also known as HIPUtah, to capitalize on its 19 years of experience and expertise in the Utah marketplace. HIPUtah is a non-profit entity within the Department, and runs the PCIP as a separate program under the name Federal-HIPUtah.</p>

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.)

Please note: This Federal Program is Exempt from Sequestration; nevertheless the balance of the form is completed.

- See Appendix B. Preliminary Sequestrable/Exempt Classification by OMB Account and Type of Budgetary Resource:

Agency/Bureau/Account/Budgetary Resource

009-38-0113-551 Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan Program

Classification/Citation

1850- Spending authority, non-federal sources, mandatory. Exempt, 255(g)(1)(A) – voluntary payments

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$999,164)	(\$4,995,820)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$999,164)	(\$4,995,820)

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

<p>Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</p>	<p>There is a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement set forth in section 1101(b)(3) of the ACA. This MOE protects and supports the maintenance of funding for HIPUtah, Utah’s state high risk pool. Utah agreed to the MOE with the standard being the per member per month equivalent of funding appropriated in the 2010 General Session, which equals \$8.075 million.</p>
--	---

	In addition individuals covered under Federal-HIPUtah pay a monthly premium that helps to offset the claims incurred. Claims are always higher than the premiums collected, due to the nature of this program, and that difference is covered by the federal funds available under this contract.
--	---

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>Please note: This Federal Program is Exempt from Sequestration.</p> <p>Federal-HIPUtah is a federal-subsidized health insurance program it will only offer transitional coverage until 2014, when health insurance exchanges become available and pre-existing condition exclusions are prohibited. Federal-HIPUtah will receive over \$60 million out of \$5 billion allocated nationally to provide coverage for an estimated 2,400 Utah citizens. With this in mind it is unlikely that a reduction in federal funds would occur but if it did the HIPUtah Board would immediately take action with the Center for Consumer Information and Insurance Oversight (CCIIO) approval to discontinue new enrollments, establish an eligible enrollee waiting list, and/or take other actions to limit program costs.</p> <p>The direct impact in a reduction of federal funds would be decreased enrollment into the program and is explained in more detail in the next two sections.</p> <p>This reduction would not require a change in state statute or rules. This is a contract, not a grant, between HHS and the Utah Insurance Department and no state funds are used to run this program. HHS would be involved on how to move forward based on the impact of the reduction.</p>
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 %	<p>If enrollment under this program is capped those eligible for Federal-HIPUtah would now come to HIPUtah, Utah's state high risk health insurance pool, but may not be able to afford coverage as premiums are about 30% higher than Federal-HIPUtah. If these individuals go without insurance, they usually end up in the emergency room, receiving charitable care at a cost that is higher than for the insured. This is due to care delays, increased severity of their conditions, and loss of contracted discounts for care that are not available to the uninsured. In the end cost of those services comes back to the Utah taxpayers as uncompensated care.</p> <p>Again if the program has to cap enrollment or provide a waiting list the costs that are now being controlled by providing this insurance coverage to this group of profoundly sick and uninsurable citizens of Utah will be diminished. Federal-HIPUtah currently covers approximately 1,200 members.</p>
25 %	Same as 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 %	<p>This is a mandated federal service but that does not mean the state would have to maintain the program. With the passing of the ACA each state had the option to opt in to run the PCIP or opt out and let the Federal government run the PCIP. On June 25, 2010 Governor Herbert sent a letter to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS); Office of Consumer Information Oversight indicating that the State of Utah, utilizing the Utah Insurance Department and HIPUtah, would opt in and contract with HHS to operate the Federal Qualified High Risk Pool.</p> <p>No other resources are available at this time for the PCIP. The other potential resources would be coverage under HIPUtah. But Federal-HIPUtah in essence is protecting the financial viability of HIPUtah by providing accumulative savings with the transference of enrollment, and risk, from the state program to the federal program. In the event that the ACA is repealed HIPUtah would be solely responsible to provide insurance for the uninsurables of the state as it has done since 1991.</p>
25 %	Same as above

Department of Utah Labor Commission
UOSH (Utah OSHA) Compliance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.503
Agency contact name and phone number	Bobie Tupou, (801) 801-530-6335; David Lamb (801-530-6816)

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,842,525
Number of FTEs	30
Recipients/Clients Served	1,146,110 employees 82,603 employers
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	UOSH now exercises jurisdiction over employees and employers in Utah.

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	(\$92,126)	(\$460,631)
State:		
General Fund	(85,769)	(428,847)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: <u>WorkPlace Safety</u>	(6,357)	(31,784)
Other Fund: _____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$184,252)	(\$921,262)

FTEs	-2	-10
-------------	----	-----

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 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 %	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 %	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 %	See above
------	-----------

<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>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</p>
25 %	<p>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 as resulting staffing reductions would likely bring the Division under the staffing levels required under our federal agreement.</p>

Utah National Guard Law Enforcement Assistance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions Based on Fiscal Year 2012 —Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	16.001
Agency contact name and phone number	Todd Valline 801-432-4445

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$4,566,814
Number of FTEs	60
Recipients/Clients Served	2
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	State and Federal Counterdrug enforcement

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	\$ (228,341)	\$ (1,141,704)
State:	\$ -	\$ -
General Fund	\$ -	\$ -
Education Fund	\$ -	\$ -
Transportation Fund	\$ -	\$ -
Transportation Investment Fund	\$ -	\$ -
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____	\$ -	\$ -
Other Fund:		
_____	\$ -	\$ -
Dedicated Credits	\$ -	\$ -
Other: _____	\$ -	\$ -
Other: _____	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ (228,341)	\$ (1,141,704)

FTEs	-3	-16
-------------	----	-----

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 Reimbursement Agreement between the U.S. Department of Justice and the Utah National Guard.
---	---

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 programs funding is to provide staffing for the Counter Drug Enforcement Program. As a result of the 3% cut the program would have to reduce staffing by 3 positions. This reduction could be done through attrition. The affect would be minimal to the overall Counterdrug program. The reduction would not require a change in statute or rules.
25 %	The programs funding is to provide staffing for the Counter Drug Enforcement Program. The National Guard would have to reduce the program staffing by 15 positions. The staffing reduction would adversely affect the intelligent gathering capabilities of the Counter Drug program. The 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 %	The National Guard would have a moderate reduction in intelligent gathering capabilities for the Counter Drug Programs. Reducing would reduce law enforcement capabilities in stopping drug trafficking.

25 %	The staffing reduced would adversely affect the intelligent gathering capabilities for the Counter Drug Programs. Reducing law enforcement capabilities in stopping drug trafficking for both the State and the federal 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 %	There are no mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain in the event the federal funding is cut.
------------	---

25 %	There are no mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain in the event the federal funding is cut.
-------------	---

Utah National Guard
Military Construction

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	12.400
Agency contact name and phone number	Todd Valline 801-432-4445

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,221,814
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	2
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Military emergency support for the State of Utah and Federal military support for the Army.

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	(61,091)	(305,454)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(61,091)	(305,454)

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>	The State match will be determined in accordance with National Guard Regulations (NGR 5-1 National Guard Grants and Cooperative Agreements).
---	--

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 National Guard would see a moderate funding reduction for the Military Construction for the Utah National Guard facilities. This reduction would slow down the modification of existing facilities and the construction of new facilities needed for the mission of The Utah National Guard. The funding cuts would result in 0 FTEs staffing reduction. The reduction would not require any change in statute or rules.
25 %	The 25% funding cut would adversely affect the operation of the Utah National Guard. The Utah National Guard would have to prioritize the construction project and only complete emergency or mission essential project. The funding cuts would result in 0 FTEs staffing 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 %	The 5% cut would be a moderate cut for the construction operation of the Utah National Guard Cooperative Agreement program. The program would see a slowdown of expenditures reducing services provided to the Utah National Guard in meeting the mission needs. As a result of the reduction, the State of Utah would see a reduction in Federal fund expenditure and service provided by the Utah National Guard to the State and the nation.
25 %	The 25% cut would be a drastic cut for the Construction projects for the Utah National Guard. A cut of this magnitude would severally hamper the National Guard ability for maintaining the National Guard facilities for future military mission. The program would see a sever slowdown of expenditures reducing services provided to the Utah National Guard in meeting the mission needs. This reduction would impact both the State of Utah and local municipalities due to the reduction of Federal expenditures for supplies, wages and services. As a result of these cuts the National Guard's ability to respond to emergencies for the State of Utah would be reduced.

<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 %	No
25 %	No

Utah National Guard
Military Operations and Maintenance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	12.401
Agency contact name and phone number	Todd Valline 801-432-4445

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$39,338,094
Number of FTEs	132
Recipients/Clients Served	2
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Military emergency support for the State of Utah and Federal military support for the Army & Air Force.

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	(1,966,905)	(9,834,524)
State:		
General Fund	(74,390)	(371,950)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(2,041,295)	(10,206,474)

FTEs	-7	-33
-------------	----	-----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The State match will be determined in accordance with National Guard Regulations (NGR 5-1 National Guard Grants and Cooperative Agreements).
--	--

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 National Guard would see a moderate funding reduction for the following programs: facilities operation & maintenance, environmental resource management, base security, antiterrorism programs, fire protection for both the Army & Air National Guard, military family support, surface fuel for military vehicles, management of Camp Williams range control, operation & maintenance of electric security systems, and telecommunications support for National Guard personnel. The funding cuts would result in 7 FTEs staffing reduction. The reduction would not require any change in statute or rules.
25 %	The 25% funding cut would adversely affect the operation of the Utah National Guard. Each of the following Cooperative Agreement programs would have to prioritize expenditure and eliminate non essential mission function. The programs effected are: facilities operation & maintenance, environmental resource management, base security, antiterrorism programs, fire protection for both the Army & Air National Guard, military family support, surface fuel for military vehicles, management of Camp Williams range control, operation & maintenance of electric security systems, and telecommunications support for National Guard personnel. The funding cuts would result in 33 FTEs staffing 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 %	The 5% cut would be a moderate cut for the operation of the Utah National Guard Cooperative Agreement programs. Each program would see a slowdown of expenditures reducing services provided to the Utah National Guard in meeting the mission needs. As a result of the reduction, the State of Utah would see a reduction in Federal fund expenditure and service provided by the Utah National Guard to the State and the nation.
25 %	The 25% cut would be a drastic cut for the operation of the Utah National Guard Cooperative Agreement programs. A cut of this magnitude would not happen unless there was a significant reduction to the Utah National Guard manning or missions. The overall Federal budget for the Utah National Guard is over \$270 million dollars of which only \$39 million is processed through State of Utah as Grants or Cooperative Agreements. If the National Guard did have a significant reduction in manning or missions, the magnitude of the Federal funding cut would be significantly larger than the forecasted cut to Cooperative Agreement programs. This reduction would impact both the State of Utah and local municipalities due to the reduction of Federal expenditures for supplies, wages and services. As a result of these cuts the National Guard's ability to respond to emergencies for the State of Utah 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 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Natural Resources
Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.236, 15.252
Agency contact name and phone number	Jill Marriott, (801) 538-5381 or Paula Dupin-Zahn (801) 538-5309

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,284,872
Number of FTEs	10
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$164,244)	(\$821,218)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$164,244)	(\$821,218)

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 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,544,699
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	25 State Parks and an estimate of 70,000 registered boats
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	State Parks boating projects, boats, ramps, etc.

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

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$77,235)	(\$386,175)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$77,235)	(\$386,175)

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 matching 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 %	Less money to maintain and purchase boats, build docks etc
25 %	Less money to maintain and purchase boats, build 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 %	Less money to help boating projects at the State Parks

25 %	Less money to county and cities for boating projects
------	--

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
Coal Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.250
Agency contact name and phone number	Jill Marriott, (801) 538-5381 or Paula Dupin-Zahn (801) 538-5309

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,692,548
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$84,627)	(\$423,137)
State:		
General Fund	(11,540)	(57,700)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$96,167)	(\$480,837)

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 % 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. No change in statute or rules.
25 %	No change in statute or rules. The program would lose approximately 4 FTE's. 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. 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 %	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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.664, 15.504, 15.529, 15.642, Dept. of Interior Cooperative Agreements
Agency contact name and phone number	Eric Hyatt, (801) 538-4850

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 6,169,702
Number of FTEs	41.25
Recipients/Clients Served	Public
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Co-Operative Projects, Watershed

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	(\$308,485)	(\$1,542,426)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$308,485)	(\$1,542,426)

FTEs	-2	-9
-------------	----	----

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

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
Division of Forestry, Fire, and State Lands

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.664, 10.676, 10.680, 10.691, 15.228, 15.239, 15.242
Agency contact name and phone number	Roger Lewis, (801) 537-3206

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,704,214
Number of FTEs	27
Recipients/Clients Served	Aprox. 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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$285,211)	(\$1,426,054)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$285,211)	(\$1,426,054)

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.)	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 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,097,192
Number of FTEs	1
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 (\$993,933).

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	(\$54,860)	(\$274,298)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$54,860)	(\$274,298)

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>	We do not receive a state matching 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 %	Less money to county and cities to build trails
25 %	Less money to county and cities to build 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 %	Less money to county and cities

25 %	Less money to county and cities
------	---------------------------------

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 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,566,749
Number of FTEs	68.8
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$278,337)	(\$1,391,687)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Wildlife Resources Restricted Account - 1170	(92,779)	(463,896)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$371,117)	(\$1,855,583)

FTEs	-3.5	-17
-------------	------	-----

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

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
State Wildlife Grants

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.634
Agency contact name and phone number	Eric Hyatt, (801) 538-4850

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 986,225
Number of FTEs	10.8
Recipients/Clients Served	Threatened Species
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Statewide Sensitive Species, Management Plans

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	(\$49,311)	(\$246,556)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$49,311)	(\$246,556)

FTEs	-5	-2.5
-------------	----	------

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

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 and public access acquisition and development, inventories and research, management of wildlife species of concern, as well as operation and maintenance of their respective habitats.
25 %	Individual projects under this program can provide coordination, habitat and public access acquisition and development, inventories and research, management of wildlife species of concern, 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 threatened species.

25 %	A reduction in funds would cause a reduction in the number of opportunities to preserve threatened 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
Wildlife Restoration

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,559,413
Number of FTEs	65
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$277,971)	(\$1,389,853)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Wildlife Resources Restricted Account - 1170	(92,656)	(463,280)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$370,627)	(\$1,853,133)

FTEs	-3.25	-16.25
-------------	-------	--------

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

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
Assessment and Accountability

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.369
Agency contact name and phone number	John Jesse, (801) 538-7811

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 4,112,980
Number of FTEs	9.4
Recipients/Clients Served	Children in Public Schools
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Administer all required student federal and state assessments and create all required federal and state accountability reports.

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	(\$205,649)	(\$1,028,245)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$205,649)	(\$1,028,245)

FTEs	-0.5	-2.35
-------------	------	-------

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.
25 %	Significantly slow down assessment and testing development.

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.

25 %	Reduced ability to ensuring that the State's schools and local education agencies are held accountable for results.
------	---

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
Career and Technology Education

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.002, 84.048, 84.287
Agency contact name and phone number	Mary Shumway, (801) 538-7852

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 22,815,105
Number of FTEs	13
Recipients/Clients Served	168,697
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 2012:

(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	(\$1,140,755)	(\$5,703,776)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,140,755)	(\$5,703,776)

FTEs	-0.65	-3.25
-------------	-------	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Adult Education has a match requirement of 25% while the vocational program is a 50% match on administration: both have a Maintenance of Effort of prior year expenditures.
--	---

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 cuts will affect locals primarily in having to reduce projects, equipment, and resources that support existing CTE programs. State Leadership projects for curriculum development, professional development, and academic/technical integration will be more limited.
25 %	At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and state funding efforts.

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 resources would be available for career and technical education.
25 %	At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and state funding efforts.

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
Child Nutrition Programs

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.553, 10.555, 10.558, 10.559, 10.560, 10.582
Agency contact name and phone number	Luann Elliott, (801) 538-7513

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 157,654,193
Number of FTEs	22.0
Recipients/Clients Served	There are 8 Family Day Care sponsors, serving about 16,300 children a day year round. There are 157 Child and Adult Care Food Program sponsors, serving about 21,700 children a day year round. There are 110 sponsors of School Nutrition Programs, serving about 575,000 children a day during the school year. There are 38 Summer Food Service Program sponsors, serving about 50,700 children a day during the summer months.
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	School Districts and Charter Schools (School Children), Child care centers and Organizations that oversee multiple child care centers, and various community based organizations that provide food assistance.

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.)

Note: Education funding at district level will be impacted as transfers are required from Maintenance and Operation Fund to or from school lunch program fund; 98 percent of these funds flow to other organizations.

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$7,882,710)	(\$39,413,548)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$7,882,710)	(\$39,413,548)

FTEs	-1.0	-4.0
-------------	------	------

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	Federal match of state funds is provided by collections from liquor tax provided to Child Nutrition programs. State is required to maintain one person on state funds to administer the \$18,000,000 of in-kind food receipts from federal government, including shipping to schools, receiving and storage in appropriate refrigerated or frozen conditions.
--	---

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 %	Reimbursements would be reduced to schools and child care centers. Currently these programs from the US Department of Agriculture are exempted from sequestration in January of 2013.

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 %	Reimbursements would be reduced to schools and child care centers. Currently these programs from the US Department of Agriculture are exempted from sequestration in January of 2013.
-----	---

25 %	Same as 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 %	Reimbursements would be reduced to schools and child care centers. Currently these programs from the US Department of Agriculture are exempted from sequestration in January of 2013.
-----	---

25 %	Same as above.
------	----------------

Board of Education
Office of Rehabilitation, Disability Determination Services

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	96.001
Agency contact name and phone number	Paul Clingo, (801) 321-6500

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 12,103,388
Number of FTEs	83
Recipients/Clients Served	22,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Citizens of Utah who have a physical or mental disability and are receiving assistance from social security.

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	(\$605,169)	(\$3,025,847)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$605,169)	(\$3,025,847)

Funds are used to determine eligibility for Social Security funds.

FTEs	-4	-21
-------------	----	-----

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	Less than \$3,000 is spent annually from state funds for Disability Determination Services.
---	---

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 wouldn't be able to process claims for clients. The backlog of claims would be greater and the ability for people to use Social Security and Determinate 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 claims would be greater and the ability for people to use Social Security and Determinate services would be less.

25 %	The backlog of claims would be greater and the ability for people to use Social Security and Determinate 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, No
-----	--------

25 %	No, No
------	--------

Board of Education
Office of Rehabilitation, Vocational Rehabilitation

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.126
Agency contact name and phone number	Don Uchida, (801) 538-7540

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 42,663,323
Number of FTEs	330.7
Recipients/Clients Served	30,848
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Disabled citizens of Utah; funds primarily for counselors and client services to return individuals to productive work.

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	(\$6,290,174)	(\$31,450,870)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$6,290,174)	(\$31,450,870)

FTEs	-17	-83
-------------	------------	------------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The matching amount 21.3% and the terms of the MOE are an amount of state matching funds equivalent to or above the amount from 2 years prior, for example for federal 2012, we must meet the amount of state funds equivalent to or above what were expended on the Vocational Rehabilitation grant in 2010.
---	---

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 %	Assistance in operating comprehensive, coordinated, effective, efficient and accountable programs of vocational rehabilitation; to assess, plan, develop, and provide vocational rehabilitation services for individuals with disabilities, consistent with their strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, capabilities, and informed choice so they may prepare for and engage in competitive employment would be reduced.
25 %	At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and state funding efforts.

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 case services for individuals with disabilities.

25 %	At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and state funding efforts.
-------------	--

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
Special Education IDEA**

**Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012**

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.027, 84.173
Agency contact name and phone number	Glenna Gallo, (801) 538-7587

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 125,803,478
Number of FTEs	23.3
Recipients/Clients Served	71,271
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	School Districts and Charter Schools (School Children)

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.)

Note: Education funding at district level will be impacted, 96 percent of these funds flow to other organizations.

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$6,290,174)	(\$31,450,870)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$6,290,174)	(\$31,450,870)

FTEs	-1.1	-5.8
-------------	-------------	-------------

<p>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>	<p>IDEA has a Maintenance of Effort requirement at both the State and LEA level.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</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% 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, personnel preparation grants

	provided to Utah IHEs, 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 slightly reduced by 3-4%.
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, personnel preparation grants provided to Utah IHEs, 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 18-24%.

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.
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.

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 71% 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 71% 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 2012

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.365, 84.366, 84.367
Agency contact name and phone number	Sydnee Dickson, (801) 538-7739

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 23,887,644
Number of FTEs	2.5
Recipients/Clients Served	The Educator Effectiveness program serves all students (approx. 600,000), teachers (approx. 30,000), and educational leaders (approx. 1,400) in the state and also supports the work of ten teacher and educational leadership preparation programs in the state.
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Public Schools (School Children) Level 1 teachers, higher ed

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.)

Note: Funds are primarily sent to schools (95%).

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,194,382)	(\$5,971,911)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,194,382)	(\$5,971,911)

FTEs	-0.5	-1.5
-------------	------	------

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	None, cannot supplant state funds with 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 %	To ensure that high quality instruction is available to every Utah student, the <i>Utah Effectiveness Project for High Quality Education</i> was instituted in 2010 by the Utah State Board of Education (R277-530) to guide the development of quality teaching and quality leadership efforts statewide. The project began with the <i>Utah Effective Teaching Standards</i> and the <i>Utah Educational Leadership Standards</i> . These two sets of standards provide a basis for a coherent system for all state and local educators as they develop a vision of an effective statewide system of educator effectiveness. The Educator Effectiveness program serves all students (approx. 600,000), teachers (approx. 30,000), and educational leaders (approx. 1,400) in the state and also supports the work of ten teacher and educational leadership preparation programs in the state.
------------	--

	<p>Statutory Provisions: Title 53A Chapter 6 Educator Licensing and Professional Practices Act; 53A-8a. (formerly known as SB64) 53A-6-102. Legislative findings on teacher quality; 53A-6-104. Board licensure; 53A-6-107. Program approval; 53A-6-108. Prohibition on use of degrees or credit from unapproved institutions; 53A-6-110. Administrative/supervisory letters of authorization; 53A-6-204. Contracts for acceptance of educational personnel; 53A-6-402. Evaluation information on current or prospective school employees – Notice to employee – Exemption from liability; R277-502. Educator Licensing and Data Retention; R277-503. Licensing Routes; R277-505. Administrative License Area of Concentration and Programs; R277-530. Utah Effective Teaching and Educational Leadership Standards; R277-531. Public Educator Evaluation Requirements (PEER).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement of LEAs to implement evaluation systems that meet the parameters of R277-531 • Requirement of LEAs to use student growth measures for all educators as a component of educator evaluation summative ratings • Requirement to measure both tested and non-tested subjects and grades and apply these measurements to educator evaluation ratings • Requirement of LEAs to implement Teaching and Leadership Standards into LEA evaluation systems • Requirement of LEAs to use Professional Performance standards as a component of educator evaluation summative ratings • Requirement of LEAs to use stakeholder satisfaction surveys aligned with Teaching and Leadership Standards as a component of educator evaluation summative ratings • Requirement of Higher Education Institutions recommending licensure for Administrative and Supervisory licensure (Educational Administration) to use the approved Teaching and Leadership Standards in preparation program curriculum • Requirement of Higher Education Institutions to be accredited • Requirement of educational leaders to renew Teacher and Administrator licenses • Requirement of teachers and educational leaders to be mentored during the first three years of licensure <p>State and/or Federal Regulatory Functions Performed by the Section: 53A-8a-403 (5) The evaluation program developed by the joint committee must comply with the requirements of this part and rules adopted by the State Board of Education under 53A-8a-409. 53A-8a-409. Requiring a teacher’s summative evaluation to be based on: (a) student learning growth or achievement, if measures of student learning growth are not available; and (b) standards of instructional quality; and (3) requiring each school district to fully implement an evaluation system for educators in accordance with the framework established by the State Board of Education no later than 2014-2015 school year.</p>
25 %	Same as above

<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?</p>	
5 %	<p>Implications if the Section were not to provide the above noted functions or programs: If the above services, activities, and leadership were not provided:</p> <p>It would be necessary for LEAs to meet State Board and Utah Code requirements without the expertise of state facilitation, consultation, and professional development. Each district would need to develop, adapt, or adopt evaluation programs. Such an undertaking would require additional staff members in each district, additional professional development for existing and new employees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAs would plan, develop, and implement evaluation systems without statewide standards, observation measurement tools, evaluation model system, or statewide growth measures.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAs would not have the benefit of collaborative groups or the leadership to share planning with like districts as they develop new evaluation systems. • LEAs would be conducting development work individually to meet State Board requirements. The reliability, validity, and comparability of the teaching and leadership standards, evaluation systems, and growth measures would be in question. • The progress toward educator effectiveness in the state of Utah would intermittent, not consistent, and no statewide measurement date would exist to provide assurance of comparability.
25 %	Same as above

<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 %	State and/or Federal Reporting Requirements Performed by the Section: 53A-8a-410. Report of educator ratings.
25 %	Same as above

This page intentionally left blank.

Board of Education

Title I

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.010, 84.011, 84.377
Agency contact name and phone number	Karl Wilson, (801) 538-7509

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 87,568,781
Number of FTEs	9.4
Recipients/Clients Served	Students 124,719
	Districts 40
	Schools 55
	Total Schools 277
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	School Districts and Charter Schools (School Children)

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.)

Note: Education funding at district level will be impacted, 99 percent of these funds flow to other organizations.

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$4,378,439)	(\$21,892,195)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$4,378,439)	(\$21,892,195)

FTEs	-5	-2.35
-------------	----	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	MOE is essentially the prior year expenditure levels.
--	---

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 (LEAs) 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 (LEAs) 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.

<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?</p>	
5 %	<p>Programs and services that help local educational agencies (LEAs) 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.</p>
25 %	<p>Programs and services that help local educational agencies (LEAs) 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.</p>

<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>At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and state funding efforts.</p>
25 %	<p>At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and state funding efforts.</p>

Department of Public Safety
Emergency Management Federal Funds

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	97.008, 97.023, 97.036, 97.040, 97.042, 97.045, 97.046, 97.047, 97.052, 97.067, 97.078, 97.082, 11.555
Agency contact name and phone number	Kris Hamlet, (801) 538-9553

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 33,588,720
Number of FTEs	57
Recipients/Clients Served	120
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	State, local, and tribal governments are primary customers served. Several programs reach to individual citizen level 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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,679,436)	(\$8,397,180)
State:		
General Fund	(57,882)	(289,410)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,737,318)	(\$8,686,590)

FTEs	-3	-12
-------------	----	-----

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% pass thru to local, State, and tribal governments. The division is currently planning for a reduction of federal funding with the termination of the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness Program, which is about \$7 million. A 5% reduction on the other grants would be a \$1.0 million reduction to locals; a 14% reduction in state personnel costs (\$189,300); an 8% reduction in current expenses (\$108,200); and approximately 3% in other (\$40,600). A 5% reduction in federal funding would not significantly impact the function of the division.

25 %	The division's budget profile consists of; 75% pass thru to local, State, and tribal governments. A 25% reduction would mean a \$5.0 million reduction to local governments. The division would suffer a 14% reduction in personnel costs (\$946,500); an 8% current expenses reduction (\$541,000); and approximately 3% other reduction (\$203,000). A 25% reduction in federal funding would significantly impact the function of the division. The division is currently planning for a reduction of federal funding with the termination of the Chemical Stockpile Emergency Preparedness 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 %	Three FTE positions would need to be eliminated with a 5% reduction in federal funds. The division would be likely to 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 12 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 discontinue preparedness outreach programs and critical preparedness systems and capabilities would be discontinued 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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	16.727, 20.600, 20.601, 20.602, 20.609, 20.610, 20.611, 20.612, 20.613, 20.614
Agency contact name and phone number	David A. Beach, (801) 366-6045

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,374,998
Number of FTEs	17
Recipients/Clients Served	150
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Utah state, county and city governmental units, and some non-profit, traffic-safety oriented organizations.

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	(\$268,750)	(\$1,343,750)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$268,750)	(\$1,343,750)

FTEs	0	-4
-------------	---	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	CDFA's 20.601, 20.602, 20.610 and 20.613 require maintenance of effort if any federal funds in those respective areas are received. Refer to 23 U.S.C. Sections 405, 408, 410 and 2011 for details.
--	---

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 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 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 occupant protection, impaired driving, pedestrian and bicycle safety and motorcycle safety.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in severe cutbacks in funding related to occupant protection, impaired driving, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and motorcycle safety.

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 2012
—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 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 435,018,477 (Federal Apportionment amount is \$336.8 million)
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 Highway Program (FLHP), as an adjunct to the Federal Aid Highway Program, provides assistance to the Federal Land Management Agencies (FLMAs) for Federally owned roads. 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 2012:

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

Note: base upon Federal Apportionment amount would be \$16.8 million @ 5% and 84.2 million @ 25%

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$21,750,924)	(\$108,754,619)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$21,750,924)	(\$108,754,619)

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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	20.218, 20.231, 20.237
Agency contact name and phone number	Chad Sheppick, Director of Motor Carriers, (801) 965-4105

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,623,562
Number of FTEs	75
Recipients/Clients Served	4,807,131 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>20.231 – The PRISM program links Federal Motor Carrier Safety Information systems with State commercial vehicle registration and licensing systems and enables a State to (1) determine the safety fitness of a motor carrier or registrant when licensing or registering the applicant of motor carrier while the license or registration is in effect, and (2) deny, suspend, or revoke the commercial motor vehicle registrations of motor carrier or registrant that has been issued an operation out-of-service order by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.</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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$131,178)	(\$655,891)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$131,178)	(\$655,891)

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

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal</i>	In accordance with the provisions of 49 CFR Part 350.301, States must maintain a level of effort to qualify for MCSAP funding, including: (a). The State must maintain the average aggregate expenditure of the State and its
--	---

<p>laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</p>	<p>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>(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. <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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	20.509, 20.513, 20.514, 20.516, 20.521
Agency contact name and phone number	Tim Boschert, Director Public Transit Plans & Programs, (801) 964-4508

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 10,043,914
Number of FTEs	2
Recipients/Clients Served	43 Recipients/ 127,044 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>20.514 – Seeks to deliver solutions that improve public transportation. Funds for research on mobility management, transit operational efficiency, safety and emergency preparedness, transit capacity building, energy independence and environmental protection, infrastructure and equipment protection and innovation, and strategic research program planning.</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>20.521 - Provides additional tools to overcome existing barriers facing Americans with disabilities seeking integration into the work force and full participation in society.</p>

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	(\$502,196)	(\$2,510,979)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$502,196)	(\$2,510,979)

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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	64.015
Agency contact name and phone number	Todd Hansen 801-834-0318

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 8,515,620
Number of FTEs	2
Recipients/Clients Served	310
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Elderly nursing home patients

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	(\$425,781)	(\$2,128,905)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		
_____	0	0
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$425,781)	(\$2,128,905)

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 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 Home has only 4 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 up to 300 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.
------------	---

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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.002
Agency contact name and phone number	Dan Schuring, (801) 526-4306

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,629,606
Number of FTEs	14.50
Recipients/Clients Served	N/A
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The purpose 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) system is being designed and programmed by Utah for the national Bureau of Labor Statistics.

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	(\$131,480)	(\$657,402)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$131,480)	(\$657,402)

FTEs	-73	-3.63
-------------	-----	-------

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 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 (e.g. the centralization of the Current Employment Statistics program and the less than anticipated amount of FY 2013 Occupational Employment Statistics funding) 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. Loss of staff for the National QCEW system rewrite would make it very difficult to meet timelines.
25 %	A 25% BLS budget reduction would significantly compromise the state's ability to meet our Bureau of Labor Statistics program deliverables. Even with a commensurate reduction in deliverable requirements and workload, it is very likely that the FTE losses experienced by a 25% budget reduction would lead to a considerable

	deterioration of the quality of BLS estimates and the widely-used economic indicators that are derived from those estimates. Loss of staff for the National QCEW system rewrite would make it impossible to meet timelines and grant deliverables.
--	--

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 delays as remaining resources would be more heavily focused on immediate deliverables. 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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions

Based on Fiscal Year 2012

—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.575, 93.596
Agency contact name and phone number	Dan Schuring, (801) 526-4306

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 53,641,152
Number of FTEs	58.32
Recipients/Clients Served	11,715 children per month avg.
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Children of low income working parents.

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	(\$2,682,058)	(\$13,410,288)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$2,682,058)	(\$13,410,288)

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.)	CCDF requires a MOE of \$4,474,923. Code of Federal Regulations 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 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 %	Child Care is broken up into 3 funding lines by Congress. The Mandatory grant is unlikely to be subject to cuts, the Matching grant is a likely target but as the State does not fund Child Care Matching funds a 25% cut here or even 25% of the total 2011 CCDF expenditure would not have an impact as we do not access these funds at this time. If the cut affected the Discretionary grant the impact would be significant. First would be scaling back quality activities as much as allowable under Federal regulations, which require 4% of spending. 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 then there might be a reduction in FTE's but this is uncertain.

<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?</p>	
5 %	<p>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.</p>
25 %	<p>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 and have their children in safe quality facilities. Without the subsidy parents could lose jobs or place children in unsafe child care environments.</p>

<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>No</p>
25 %	<p>No</p>

Department of Workforce Services
Community Development Block Grant (HUD)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	14.228
Agency contact name and phone number	Gordon D. Walker, 801/526-9554 Kimberley Brown Schmeling, 801/526-9504

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 4,897,467
Number of FTEs	3
Recipients/Clients Served	251 residential households and 27,159 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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$244,873)	(\$1,224,367)
State:	(6,335)	(31,675)
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$251,208)	(\$1,256,042)

FTEs	- .2	- 1
-------------	------	-----

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 \$11,359 less in admin funding and \$246,184 less in program funding for local projects. Approximately .20 of 1 FTE would be redeployed to another program. No change in statute would be required.
------------	--

25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$56,796 less in admin funding and \$1.23 million less in program funding for local projects. While the available funding would still cover all but 1 FTE, 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 FTE or more. 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 %	No, there are no mandated services.
------------	-------------------------------------

25 %	No, there are no mandated services.
-------------	-------------------------------------

Department Workforce Services
Housing & Community Development Division
Community Services Block Grant (HHS)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.569
Agency contact name and phone number	Gordon D. Walker, 801/526-9554 Kimberley Brown Schmeling, 801/526-9504

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,222,281
Number of FTEs	3.2
Recipients/Clients Served	230,951 individuals and 78,629 families
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The 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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$161,114)	(\$805,570)
State:		
General Fund	(2,090)	(10,450)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: _____		
Other Fund: _____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$163,204)	(\$816,020)

FTEs	-0.25	-1
-------------	-------	----

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 is no match requirement in CSBG.
---	--

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 \$10,146 less in admin funding and \$150,968 less in program funding for local projects. Approximately .25 of 1 FTE would be redeployed to another program. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$50,728 less in admin funding and \$765,292 less in program funding for local projects. While the available funding would still cover all but 1 FTE, it is likely that the 25% fewer program dollars would not create the demand necessary for 3.2 FTEs and the program would be reduced by more than 1 FTE. 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 counties all across the state, the 5% decrease will not likely have significant impact on any one project or region.
25 %	Because CSBG funds are used to leverage local funds and are spread across counties all across the state, a 25% could seriously affect local deliver 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 %	No, there are no mandated services.
25 %	No, there are no mandated services.

Department of Workforce Services
Housing & Community Development Division
HOME

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	14.239
Agency contact name and phone number	Gordon D. Walker, 801/526-9554 Kimberley Brown Schmeling, 801/526-9504

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 6,527,563
Number of FTEs	10.6
Recipients/Clients Served	238 single-family and multi-family housing units were created
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The mission of the Olene Walker Housing Loan Program is to support quality affordable housing options that meet the needs of Utah's individuals and families. Utahns served by the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund (OWHLF), of which HOME funding is one finance source, includes those with low-incomes, first-time home buyers, residents with special needs such as the elderly, developmentally disabled, physically disabled, victims of abuse, homeless, and Native Americans.

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	(\$326,378)	(\$1,631,891)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$326,378)	(\$1,631,891)

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

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	A 20% match is required for program funding. This requirement is satisfied with the General Fund Appropriation to the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund.
---	---

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 \$16,919 less in admin funding and \$321,463 less in program funding for local projects. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$84,595 less in admin funding and \$1,607,316 less in program funding for local projects. 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 HOME funds are used in concert with other available local/developer financing, the 5% decrease will not likely have significant impact on any one project or region but may result in one-two less projects being financed.
25 %	Because HOME funds are used in concert with other available local/developer financing, a cut of this size would mean there would be 3-5 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 %	No, there are no mandated services.
25 %	No, there are no mandated services.

Department of Workforce Services
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012

—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.568
Agency contact name and phone number	Gordon D. Walker, 801/526-9554 Kimberley Brown Schmeling, 801/526-9504

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 20,372,394
Number of FTEs	6.15
Recipients/Clients Served	41,849
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program provides winter home heating assistance and year-round energy crisis intervention for eligible low-income households throughout Utah. It also provides funds to the State Weatherization Program to help weatherize homes and to provide emergency repair or replacement of defunct furnaces or 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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,018,620)	(\$5,093,099)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,018,620)	(\$5,093,099)

FTEs	-0.25	-1.5
-------------	-------	------

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 \$1.02 million less in program funding for benefit payments or weatherization improvements to approximately 2,756 individuals/families. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$5.09 million less in program funding for benefit payments to 13,784 individuals/families, or the utility benefit payment to each household would be reduced. No change in statute would be required.

<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?</p>	
5 %	<p>Local agencies hire seasonal workers to process LIHEAP applications across the state and complete weatherization measures in low-income homes. Approximately 4 fewer LIHEAP workers and 1 less weatherization worker may be hired. Individuals and families slated to receive benefits would no longer receive the utility payment benefits, creating a tremendous burden on these low-income clients.</p>
25 %	<p>Local agencies hire seasonal workers to process LIHEAP applications across the state and complete weatherization measures in low-income homes. Approximately 20 fewer LIHEAP workers and 4 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, creating a tremendous burden on these low-income clients.</p>

<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>No, there are no mandated services.</p>
25 %	<p>No, there are no mandated services.</p>

Department of Workforce Services
Neighborhood Stabilization Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	14.264
Agency contact name and phone number	Gordon D. Walker, 801/526-9554 Kimberley Brown Schmeling, 801/526-9504

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,753,578
Number of FTEs	.4
Recipients/Clients Served	20 single-family homes purchased and re-sold, benefitting 40 families and 20 neighborhoods
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Neighborhood Stabilization Program provides emergency assistance to state and local governments to acquire and redevelop foreclosed properties that might otherwise become sources of abandonment and blight within their communities. Funding is made available by the federal government.

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	(\$87,679)	(\$438,395)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$87,679)	(\$438,395)

FTEs	0	-4
-------------	---	----

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	No maintenance of effort is 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 %	All available funding was approved by Congress in 2009 and 2011. No new funding is planned to be received, so proposed federal cuts would not affect this program.
25 %	All available funding was approved by Congress in 2009 and 2011. No new funding is planned to be received, so proposed federal cuts would not affect this 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 %	No effects anticipated.

25 %	No effects anticipated.
------	-------------------------

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 Workforce Services
Refugee Cash and Medical Assistance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	CFDA 93.566 — Cash and Medical Assistance only
Agency contact name and phone number	Dan Schuring (801) 526-4306

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,628,706
Number of FTEs	7.35
Recipients/Clients Served	1147
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Refugees

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	(\$281,435)	(\$1,407,177)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$281,435)	(\$1,407,177)

FTEs	-2.5	-7.35
-------------	------	-------

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 are mandated activities by federal statute and regulation. Services that must be maintained are Refugee Cash Assistance, Refugee Medical Assistance, Health Screening, and Underage Refugee Minor. These benefits cannot be eliminated without statute and regulation changes to Immigration and Naturalization Act. Administrative costs can be reduced at state level by reducing FTEs.
25 %	Refugee Cash and Medical are mandated activities by federal statute and regulation. Services that must be maintained are Refugee Cash Assistance, Refugee Medical Assistance, Health Screening, and Underage Refugee Minor. These benefits cannot be eliminated without statute and regulation changes to Immigration and Naturalization Act. Administrative costs can be reduced at state level by reducing FTEs.

<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?</p>	
5 %	A reduction of 2.5 FTEs would seriously impact services to customers.
25 %	A reduction of 25% would eliminate all FTEs assigned to work on these activities and would critically impact services to customers as well as other partners serving these customers.

<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 %	Refugee Cash and Medical are mandated activities by federal statute and regulation. Services that must be maintained are Refugee Cash Assistance, Refugee Medical Assistance, Health Screening, and Underage Refugee Minor. These benefits cannot be eliminated without statute and regulation changes to Immigration and Naturalization Act.
25 %	Refugee Cash and Medical are mandated activities by federal statute and regulation. Services that must be maintained are Refugee Cash Assistance, Refugee Medical Assistance, Health Screening, and Underage Refugee Minor. These benefits cannot be eliminated without statute and regulation changes to Immigration and Naturalization Act.

Department of Workforce Services
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.551, 10.561
Agency contact name and phone number	Dan Schuring, (801) 526-4306

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 431,893,320
Number of FTEs	409.78
Recipients/Clients Served	277,454 avg. persons per month
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$21,594,666)	(\$107,973,330)
State:		
General Fund	(1,152,959)	(5,764,795)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$22,747,625)	(\$113,738,125)

FTEs	-24.31	-121.54
-------------	--------	---------

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	Most non-benefit costs are at a 50/50 match rate for SNAP. In 2012 the State portion of the SNAP costs were: \$23,059,179.68
---	--

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 whoever 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 whoever 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 the cuts were to the benefits then 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. One hundred million dollars 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 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.558
Agency contact name and phone number	Dan Schuring (801) 526-4306

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 59,583,429
Number of FTEs	316.75
Recipients/Clients Served	6,202
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Unemployed and underemployed families with dependent children.

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	(\$2,979,171)	(\$14,895,857)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$2,979,171)	(\$14,895,857)

FTEs	-2.0	-45 to -50
-------------	------	------------

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 maintenance of effort of \$20,414,000. That amount would likely not change.
--	--

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 in this scenario are ones that are not employment-related. Specifically, after school care to vulnerable children and two-parent family formation and maintenance activities would be cut. No change in statute would be necessary.
25 %	If cuts are left to the discretion of the department, then the activities listed in the 5% scenario would be eliminated first, followed by other non-employment activities such as homelessness prevention, home baby visits, and other discretionary contracts. Also likely to be cut would employment-related but non-mandatory programs such as mental health counseling and training to non-FEP customers. In order to reach the 25% target, the department would also have to reduce the amount of TANF that pays for Child Care by about \$4 million. This option, if the Child Care grant were also forced to make cuts, would seriously impact that program. With the reduction of the above-mentioned services, an accompanying reduction of staff by about 10% would also be likely. Another option is to cut or reduce the amount of TANF transferred to the SSBG grant. Currently, 10% of the base TANF grant is scheduled to be transferred to SSBG, which is managed by the Department of Human Services (DHS). Since the amount of the transfer is determined by the legislature, approval by that body would be necessary.

<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?</p>	
5 %	<p>The elimination of the after school programs would affect at-risk youths throughout the state, who, through the programs, develop critical life skills and are encouraged to avoid out-of-wedlock pregnancies. Similarly, if the Marriage Commission, which provides two-parent family formation activities, were eliminated, young people considering marriage would have less information available to them regarding the development and maintenance of successful marriages.</p>
25 %	<p>In addition to the impact described in the 5% scenario, many other individuals and families throughout the state would be affected if the 25% 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.</p>

<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>No mandatory services will be affected.</p>
25 %	<p>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, then the department will likely reduce the grant amount given to each client. No other funding resources are available to meet these needs. It should also be noted that, beginning in FY 12, supplemental TANF federal funding, about \$8.7 million, has already been eliminated from the TANF money available to the state.</p>

Department of Workforce Services
Trade Adjustment Assistance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.245
Agency contact name and phone number	Dan Schuring, (801) 526-4306

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,037,051
Number of FTEs	10.35
Recipients/Clients Served	555
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$151,853)	(\$759,263)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$151,853)	(\$759,263)

FTEs	0	-1.3
-------------	---	------

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 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. This level of cut 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. This level of cut 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 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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.225 — Unemployment Insurance Administration only
Agency contact name and phone number	Dan Schuring (801) 526-4306

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 32,247,218
Number of FTEs	258
Recipients/Clients Served	Not available
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Unemployment Insurance claimants, employers

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	(\$1,612,361)	(\$8,061,805)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,612,361)	(\$8,061,805)

FTEs	-13	-65
-------------	-----	-----

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 %	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, 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, 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, however the state is given substantial lee-way in determining how much resources are allocated to each activity.
------------	---

25 %	The UI “Special Administrative Fund” (SAF) could potentially be used (after FY 2012) to help augment the UI administrative grant fund reduction, however this would negatively impact the current training and re-employment programs it currently funds.
-------------	---

Department of Workforce Services

Wagner-Peyser/Veterans

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions

Based on Fiscal Year 2012

—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	Wagner-Peyser: 17.207 — Employment Services only Veterans: 17.801, 17.804, 17.807
Agency contact name and phone number	Dan Schuring (801) 526-4306

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	Wagner-Peyser: \$6,554,795 Veterans: \$981,509
Number of FTEs	Wagner-Peyser: 112.40 Veterans: 15.30
Recipients/Clients Served	129,043
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 2012:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$376,815)	(\$1,884,076)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$376,815)	(\$1,884,076)

FTEs	-5.7	-28.5
-------------	------	-------

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 %	Both Wagner-Peyser and Veterans are almost completely FTE driven; thus, a 5% reduction in funding would result in a reduction of staffing of approximately 6 FTE's. No change in statute would be necessary.
25 %	A 25% reduction in funding would result in a corresponding reduction of staffing, or approximately 28 FTE's. 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 6 FTE's would not seriously impact services rendered to recipients.
25 %	A reduction of 28 FTE's would limit the availability of services to clients coming into employment centers, and employers seeking for assistance in recruiting.

<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 %	No mandatory services will be affected.
25 %	Mandatory services will still be provided, but the speed, efficiency and quality of providing those services may be affected.

Department of Workforce Services
Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2012
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.258, 17.259, 17.260, 17.277, 17.278
Agency contact name and phone number	Dan Schuring, (801) 526-4306

Fiscal Year 2012 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 15,022,960
Number of FTEs	62.04
Recipients/Clients Served	347,506
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	WIA clients are economically disadvantaged Adults and Youth and 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 the customers served also are served under the Wagner-Peyser funding as all adults 18 and older receiving DWS services are counted for both populations.

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	(\$751,148)	(\$3,755,740)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$751,148)	(\$3,755,740)

FTEs	-6	-4
-------------	----	----

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 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. In the current declining economy, DWS would serve far fewer clients than it currently serves at a time when dislocated workers and economically disadvantaged adults and youth need training services more than ever.

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.

This page intentionally left blank.