

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Reporting
To the Executive Appropriations Committee
For State Fiscal Year 2011

Prepared by: Department of Administrative Services, Division of Finance

December 1, 2011



Table of Contents

Introduction.....	v
Explanation of Data	v
Summary of Federal Receipts:	
State Agencies.....	1
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	11
Meat and Poultry Inspection	13
Mormon Cricket and Grasshopper Suppression Program and other Insect programs.....	15
Board of Regents and Student Assistance Programs	
Student Loan Purchase Program.....	17
Student Loan Guarantee Program.....	19
Community and Culture	
Division of Arts & Museums.....	21
Division of State History	23
Community Development Block Grant (HUD).....	25
Americorp (Corporation for National Service).....	27
Community Services Block Grant (HHS).....	29
HOME.....	31
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program	33
Utah State Library General Operations.....	35
Weatherization Assistance Program	37
Corrections	
Divisions of Institutional Operations	39
Environmental Quality	
Clean School Bus/Diesel Retrofit	41
Underground Storage Tanks	43
LUST.....	45
Water Protection Counter-Terrorism Grants	47
Superfund Sites	49
Brownfield State Response	51
Performance Partnership Grant.....	53
WRT Infrastructure 3% Setaside and Network/Exchange Databases.....	55
Drinking Water Federal State Revolving Funds (FSRF).....	57

Continues

Monitoring of Closed DOE Sites: Green River, UT and Vitro Tailings Clive, UT	61
Nonpoint Source Project Grants	63
Water Quality SRF Loans	65
WQ Management	67
Air Quality Monitoring	69

Health

ADAP Shortfall Relief-Ryan White Part B Supplemental	71
Metabolic and Birth Defects Surveillance	73
Centers for Birth Defects Research and Prevention	75
Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Tracking Survey and Integration (EHDI)	77
Adult Viral Hepatitis	79
Utah Public Health Approaches to Arthritis	81
Demonstrating the Capacity of Comprehensive Cancer to Implement Policy	83
Colorectal Screening	85
Diabetes Control and Prevention	87
Epidemiology & Lab Capacity for Infectious Disease	89
Chronic Disease, Health Promotion, Surveillance: Healthy Communities	91
Heart Disease and Stroke Prevention	93
National Cancer Prevention and Control	95
Utah Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity	97
Public Health Tracking	99
Core Capacity Tobacco Collaborative Chronic Disease	101
Utah WISEWOMAN Program	103
Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System	105
Federal Survey and Certification Title 18	107
Federal Survey and Certification Title 19	109
Hospital Preparedness Program	111
Ryan White/HIV	113
AIDS Prevention	115
Maternal and Child Health Block Grant	117
Public Health Preparedness and Response for Bioterrorism	119
Women, Infant and Children (WIC) Program	121
Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities	123
Vaccine Distributions	125
Immunization and Vaccines for Children	127
CHIP	129
Medicaid	131

Continues

Human Services

IVD Child Support Collections / Incentives	133
Child Welfare Title IV-B Subpart 1.....	135
Foster Care Title IV-E	137
Family Violence Prevention and Services	139
Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse	141
Title V Senior Community Service Employment (SCSEP)	143
Title III Grants for State & Community Programs on Aging and Nutritional Services Incentive Program (NSIP).....	145
MH & SA Projects of Regional and National Significance.....	147
IV-B Subpart 2, Promoting Safe and Stable Families	149
Adoption Assistance Title IV-E.....	151
Social Services Block Grant, Discretionary & TANF Transfers	153
Block Grants for Community Mental Health Services	155

Insurance

Grants to States for Health Insurance Premium Review-Cycle I	157
Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan – Federal-HIPUtah	159
Grants to State for Operation of Qualified High Risk Pools	161

Labor Commission

UOSH (Utah OSHA) Compliance	163
-----------------------------------	-----

National Guard

Military Operations and Maintenance	165
Law Enforcement Assistance.....	167

Natural Resources

Division of Forestry, Fire, & State Lands.....	169
Coal Program	171
Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program.....	173
State Wildlife Grants.....	175
Sportfish Restoration	177
Section 6/Endangered Species	179
Cooperative Agreements.....	181
Wildlife Restoration.....	183

Public Education

Office of Rehabilitation, Vocational Rehabilitation	185
Assessment and Accountability	187
Child Nutrition Programs.....	189
Career and Technology Education.....	191
Special Education IDEA	193
Teaching and Learning	195
Title I.....	197

Continues

Public Safety

Emergency Management Federal Funds.....	199
Forensic/DNA.....	201
Commercial Driver License/REAL ID.....	203
Highway Safety Program.....	205
Hazardous Materials and Training.....	207
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area.....	209
Equitable Federal Sharing.....	211

Tax Commission

Oil & Gas Royalty Management.....	213
-----------------------------------	-----

Transportation

Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program.....	215
Public Transit Program.....	217
Highway Planning & Construction Program.....	219

Veterans' Affairs

Veterans Nursing Homes.....	221
-----------------------------	-----

Workforce Services

Child Care.....	223
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.....	225
Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).....	227
Refugee Cash and Medical.....	229
Temporary Assistance For Needy Families (TANF).....	231
Trade Adjustment Assistance.....	233
Unemployment Insurance.....	235
Wagner-Peyser/Veterans.....	237
Workforce Investment Act (WIA).....	239

Introduction

House Bill 138, “Federal Receipts Reporting Requirements,” sponsored by Representative Ken Ivory of the 2011 General Session 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. HB 138 also requires the Government Operations and Political Subdivisions Interim Committee to study whether to apply federal receipts reporting requirements to certain other governmental entities.

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 will be some ARRA money spent in subsequent fiscal years, the amount compared to normal federal receipts will be insignificant; therefore, the fiscal year 2011 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 2011 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 report is prepared by the Division of Finance 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 a 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 2011. In addition to these funding types, the institutions also receive federal student financial aid. For the purpose of this report, we have chosen to list student financial aid 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. 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, 2011, 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

HB 138 requires a total budget to be presented. Since the federal funds receipts being presented are the actual for the fiscal year, the budget presented is a "final" total budget from the year's operations so as to present a consistent comparison.

The *Final Agency Total Budget* for State agencies is from the fiscal year 2011 State of Utah Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), Budgetary Comparison Schedules.

The *Budgeted Expenditures* for Utah State Higher Education (USHE) are the expenditures as reported in the fiscal year 2011 State of Utah CAFR in the Statement of Activities for Component Units. Total expenditures are reported for USHE institutions because complete final total budgets were not available at the time of this report.

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 and appropriating federal funds have changed in recent years. Some of the situations in fiscal year 2011 for receipts exceeding appropriations may include:

- Several federal programs are exempted by statute (UCA 63J-5-103). Also exempted are pass through federal funds.
- Some federal appropriations, 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. The passage of Senate Bill 160 (2011 General Session) clarified that federal receipts must be appropriated in the fiscal year in which they will be received.
- Intent language in appropriation bills provides latitude in operating federal programs.

5% and 25% Plan of Potential Reductions

HB 138 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 as they are ending for the most part in fiscal year 2011. 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.

This page intentionally left blank.

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — State Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

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	\$ 28,720	\$ 113,000	\$ 84,280			\$ 1,436	\$ 7,180
ARRA funding	147,000	—	(147,000)				
	<u>\$ 175,720</u>	<u>\$ 113,000</u>	<u>\$ (62,720)</u>	\$ 50,959,000	0.3%		
Agriculture and Food							
Federal grants	\$ 5,480,466	\$ 5,604,600	\$ 124,134			\$ 274,023	\$ 1,370,117
ARRA funding	1,267	—	(1,267)				
	<u>\$ 5,481,733</u>	<u>\$ 5,604,600</u>	<u>\$ 122,867</u>	\$ 29,152,000	18.8%		
Board of Regents							
Federal grants	\$ 1,988,395	\$ 303,100	\$ (1,685,295)			\$ 99,420	\$ 497,099
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 1,988,395</u>	<u>\$ 303,100</u>	<u>\$ (1,685,295)</u>	\$ 29,421,000	6.8%		
Commerce							
Federal grants	\$ 260,400	\$ 644,800	\$ 384,400			\$ 13,020	\$ 65,100
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 260,400</u>	<u>\$ 644,800</u>	<u>\$ 384,400</u>	\$ 29,315,000	0.9%		
Community and Culture							
Federal grants	\$ 49,808,170	\$ 81,433,600	\$ 31,625,430			\$ 2,490,409	\$ 12,452,043
ARRA funding	20,436,627	26,136,200	5,699,573				
	<u>\$ 70,244,797</u>	<u>\$ 107,569,800</u>	<u>\$ 37,325,003</u>	\$ 155,999,000	45.0%		
Corrections							
Federal grants	\$ 894,035	\$ 1,021,100	\$ 127,065			\$ 44,702	\$ 223,509
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 894,035</u>	<u>\$ 1,021,100</u>	<u>\$ 127,065</u>	\$ 253,827,000	0.4%		
Environmental Quality							
Federal grants	\$ 17,402,709	\$ 20,561,800	\$ 3,159,091			\$ 870,135	\$ 4,350,677
ARRA funding	2,307,941	—	(2,307,941)				
	<u>\$ 19,710,650</u>	<u>\$ 20,561,800</u>	<u>\$ 851,150</u>	\$ 51,573,000	38.2%		
Governor's Office of Economic Development							
Federal grants	\$ 272,764	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 777,236			\$ 13,638	\$ 68,191
ARRA funding	—	200,000	200,000				
	<u>\$ 272,764</u>	<u>\$ 1,250,000</u>	<u>\$ 977,236</u>	\$ 36,601,000	0.7%		
Health							
Federal grants	\$ 1,535,155,218	\$ 1,536,770,100	\$ 1,614,882			\$ 76,757,761	\$ 383,788,805
ARRA funding	133,046,105	108,986,300	(24,059,805)				
	<u>\$ 1,668,201,323</u>	<u>\$ 1,645,756,400</u>	<u>\$ (22,444,923)</u>	\$ 2,286,514,000	73.0%		
Human Services							
Federal grants	\$ 110,696,079	\$ 127,290,300	\$ 16,594,221			\$ 5,534,804	\$ 27,674,020
ARRA funding	7,767,960	25,314,900	17,546,940				
	<u>\$ 118,464,039</u>	<u>\$ 152,605,200</u>	<u>\$ 34,141,161</u>	\$ 667,484,000	17.7%		
Insurance							
Federal grants	\$ 5,634,390	\$ 11,306,900	\$ 5,672,510			\$ 281,720	\$ 1,408,598
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 5,634,390</u>	<u>\$ 11,306,900</u>	<u>\$ 5,672,510</u>	\$ 17,783,000	31.7%		
Labor Commission							
Federal grants	\$ 2,373,937	\$ 2,862,500	\$ 488,563			\$ 118,697	\$ 593,484
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 2,373,937</u>	<u>\$ 2,862,500</u>	<u>\$ 488,563</u>	\$ 11,992,000	19.8%		

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — State Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Continued

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	\$ 29,791,789	\$ 30,835,400	\$ 1,043,611			\$ 1,489,589	\$ 7,447,947
ARRA funding	732,333	—	(732,333)				
	<u>\$ 30,524,122</u>	<u>\$ 30,835,400</u>	<u>\$ 311,278</u>	\$ 36,155,000	84.4%		
Natural Resources							
Federal grants	\$ 38,200,034	\$ 34,956,300	\$ (3,243,734)			\$ 1,910,002	\$ 9,550,009
ARRA funding	24,304,831	36,000,000	11,695,169				
	<u>\$ 62,504,865</u>	<u>\$ 70,956,300</u>	<u>\$ 8,451,435</u>	\$ 210,943,000	29.6%		
Public Education *							
Federal grants	\$ 465,649,730	\$ 493,930,500	\$ 28,280,770			\$ 23,282,487	\$ 116,412,433
ARRA funding	88,023,161	194,300	(87,828,861)				
	<u>\$ 553,672,891</u>	<u>\$ 494,124,800</u>	<u>\$ (59,548,091)</u>	\$ 3,108,423,000	17.8%		
Public Safety							
Federal grants	\$ 35,669,990	\$ 46,648,100	\$ 10,978,110			\$ 1,783,500	\$ 8,917,498
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 35,669,990</u>	<u>\$ 46,648,100</u>	<u>\$ 10,978,110</u>	\$ 202,235,000	17.6%		
Public Service Commission							
Federal grants	\$ —	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500			\$ —	\$ —
ARRA funding	1,021,851	871,700	(150,151)				
	<u>\$ 1,021,851</u>	<u>\$ 873,200</u>	<u>\$ (148,651)</u>	\$ 5,315,000	19.2%		
Tax Commission							
Federal grants	\$ 520,904	\$ 587,200	\$ 66,296			\$ 26,045	\$ 130,226
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 520,904</u>	<u>\$ 587,200</u>	<u>\$ 66,296</u>	\$ 87,679,000	0.6%		
Technology Services							
Federal grants	\$ 15,000	\$ 865,200	\$ 850,200			\$ 750	\$ 3,750
ARRA funding	—	—	—				
	<u>\$ 15,000</u>	<u>\$ 865,200</u>	<u>\$ 850,200</u>	\$ 4,218,000	0.4%		
Transportation							
Federal grants	\$ 258,650,925	\$ 201,598,100	\$ (57,052,825)			\$ 12,932,546	\$ 64,662,731
ARRA funding	34,367,809	—	(34,367,809)				
	<u>\$ 293,018,734</u>	<u>\$ 201,598,100</u>	<u>\$ (91,420,634)</u>	\$ 2,000,984,000	14.6%		
Veterans' Affairs							
Federal grants	\$ 7,190,096	\$ 180,100	\$ (7,009,996)			\$ 359,505	\$ 1,797,524
ARRA funding	72,027	—	(72,027)				
	<u>\$ 7,262,123</u>	<u>\$ 180,100</u>	<u>\$ (7,082,023)</u>	\$ 239,727,000	3.0%		
Workforce Services							
Federal grants	\$ 613,489,384	\$ 549,330,700	\$ (64,158,684)			\$ 30,674,469	\$ 153,372,346
ARRA funding	18,747,364	465,336,900	446,589,536				
	<u>\$ 632,236,748</u>	<u>\$ 1,014,667,600</u>	<u>\$ 382,430,852</u>	\$ 725,359,000	87.2%		
TOTALS							
Federal grants	\$ 3,179,173,135	\$ 3,147,894,900	\$ (31,278,235)			\$ 158,958,658	\$ 794,793,287
ARRA funding	\$ 330,976,276	\$ 663,040,300	\$ 332,064,024				
	<u>\$ 3,510,149,411</u>	<u>\$ 3,810,935,200</u>	<u>\$ 300,785,789</u>	<u>\$ 10,241,658,000</u>	34.3%		

* 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 — State Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Continued

Designated HB 138 Agencies with no Federal Receipts:

- Alcoholic Beverage Control
- Financial Institutions
- Human Resource Management

Enterprise Funds

Enterprise funds are used to account for loan programs with non-state individuals/entities and are required to account for the State's unemployment compensation benefits. The employers' unemployment premiums are required to be reported in the Single Audit. These enterprise funds, other than Student Assistance Programs, also have federal funds for administration 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	\$ 335,045,175	\$ 306,974,454	\$ 15,348,723	\$ 76,743,614
Water Loan Programs – Environmental Quality		\$ 19,626,713	\$ 981,336	\$ 4,906,678
Water Loan Programs ARRA – Environmental Quality		\$ 17,731,190		
Housing Loan Programs – Community and Culture		\$ 2,227,238	\$ 111,362	\$ 556,810
Student Assistance Programs – Board of Regents		\$ 34,189,711	\$ 1,709,486	\$ 8,547,428

Sources:

- Federal Funds Receipts — Fiscal Year 2011 Single Audit expenditures with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) listed separately.
- Federal Funds Appropriated — Appropriated federal funds.
- Final Agency Total Budget — Fiscal Year 2011 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, 2011

Colleges and Universities	Federal Funds Receipts *	Budgeted Expenditures	Federal Receipts % of Total Budget	State Appropriated ARRA Federal Funds **
University of Utah ***				
Institution	\$ 46,314,059			\$ 16,361,700
ARRA	37,907,823			6,824,700
Research and Development	224,746,400			—
Student Financial Aid	35,132,806			—
	<u>\$ 344,101,088</u>	\$ 2,782,291,000	12.4%	<u>\$ 23,186,400</u>
Utah State University				
Institution	\$ 22,877,947			\$ —
ARRA	9,983,962			22,296,100
Research and Development	98,733,674			3,902,300
Student Financial Aid	41,933,702			—
	<u>\$ 173,529,285</u>	\$ 548,350,000	31.6%	<u>\$ 26,198,400</u>
Weber State University				
Institution	\$ 3,055,775			\$ —
ARRA	16,077			1,885,500
Research and Development	206,365			—
Student Financial Aid	30,860,925			—
	<u>\$ 34,139,142</u>	\$ 207,079,000	16.5%	<u>\$ 1,885,500</u>
Southern Utah University				
Institution	\$ 5,643,707			\$ —
ARRA	416,790			859,500
Student Financial Aid	15,420,418			—
	<u>\$ 21,480,915</u>	\$ 107,826,000	19.9%	<u>\$ 859,500</u>
Utah Valley University				
Institution	\$ 8,072,313			\$ —
ARRA	—			2,043,600
Research and Development	91,827			—
Student Financial Aid	60,098,935			—
	<u>\$ 68,263,075</u>	\$ 256,062,000	26.7%	<u>\$ 2,043,600</u>
Salt Lake Community College				
Institution	\$ 3,352,179			\$ —
ARRA	1,463,618			1,817,700
Student Financial Aid	43,494,547			—
	<u>\$ 48,310,344</u>	\$ 203,636,000	23.7%	<u>\$ 1,817,700</u>
Dixie State College of Utah				
Institution	\$ 2,020,287			\$ —
ARRA	—			516,900
Research and Development	56,676			—
Student Financial Aid	20,222,769			—
	<u>\$ 22,299,732</u>	\$ 77,348,000	28.8%	<u>\$ 516,900</u>
Snow College				
Institution	\$ 1,437,313			\$ —
ARRA	—			416,400
Student Financial Aid	6,013,226			—
	<u>\$ 7,450,539</u>	\$ 43,021,000	17.3%	<u>\$ 416,400</u>
Total — Colleges and Universities	<u>\$ 719,574,120</u>	<u>\$ 4,225,613,000</u>	17.0%	<u>\$ 56,924,400</u>

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Institutions of Higher Education
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

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 ARRA Federal Funds **</u>
Bridgerland				
ARRA	\$ —			\$ 221,100
Student Financial Aid	1,099,050			—
	<u>\$ 1,099,050</u>	\$ 15,136,000	7.3%	<u>\$ 221,100</u>
Davis				
Institution	\$ 543,784			\$ —
ARRA	—			275,700
Student Financial Aid	1,637,643			—
	<u>\$ 2,181,427</u>	\$ 19,632,000	11.1%	<u>\$ 275,700</u>
Dixie				
Institution	\$ 499,730			\$ —
ARRA	—			48,900
Student Financial Aid	492,795			—
	<u>\$ 992,525</u>	\$ 3,467,000	28.6%	<u>\$ 48,900</u>
Mountainland				
ARRA	\$ —			\$ 94,800
Student Financial Aid	613,083			—
	<u>\$ 613,083</u>	\$ 12,069,000	5.1%	<u>\$ 94,800</u>
Ogden-Weber				
Institution	\$ 513,644			\$ —
ARRA	—			230,100
Student Financial Aid	1,687,504			—
	<u>\$ 2,201,148</u>	\$ 19,615,000	11.2%	<u>\$ 230,100</u>
Southwest				
ARRA	\$ —			\$ 42,300
Student Financial Aid	396,414			—
	<u>\$ 396,414</u>	\$ 3,657,000	10.8%	<u>\$ 42,300</u>
Tooele				
	<u>\$ —</u>	\$ 1,462,000	0.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
Uintah Basin				
ARRA	\$ —			\$ 123,600
Student Financial Aid	238,307			—
	<u>\$ 238,307</u>	\$ 9,752,000	2.4%	<u>\$ 123,600</u>
Administration				
ARRA	\$ —			\$ 28,200
	<u>\$ —</u>	\$ 4,774,000	0.0%	<u>\$ 28,200</u>
Total — Utah College of Applied Technology	<u>\$ 7,721,954</u>	<u>\$ 89,564,000</u>	8.6%	<u>\$ 1,064,700</u>

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Institutions of Higher Education
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

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 ARRA Federal Funds **</u>
TOTALS				
Institution	\$ 94,330,738			\$ 16,361,700
ARRA	49,788,270			37,725,100
Research and Development	323,834,942			3,902,300
Student Financial Aid	259,342,124			—
Total — All Institutions of Higher Education	<u>\$ 727,296,074</u>	<u>\$4,315,177,000</u>	16.9%	<u>\$ 57,989,100</u>

* Federal receipts acquired by the institutions and does not include the ARRA State Fiscal Stabilization Funds reported in the single audit under the Governor's Office.

** ARRA State Fiscal Stabilization Funds reported in the single audit under the Governor's Office, except for \$20,264,000 for Utah Education Network and USU programs.

*** Includes University of Utah's hospital and clinics and the Utah Education Network.

Sources:

Federal Funds Receipts — FY 11 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.

Budgeted Expenditures — Expenditures as reported in the FY 11 State of Utah Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) in the Statement of Activities for Component Units.

State Appropriated ARRA Federal Funds — Appropriated federal funds—ARRA, plus college and university appropriations for the Utah Education Network of \$16,361,700 and \$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, 2011

<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	\$ 53,843,384	\$ 507,698,619	10.6%
Beaver	1,571,880	20,171,564	7.8%
Box Elder	9,553,447	106,496,233	9.0%
Cache	14,660,160	132,507,980	11.1%
Canyons	25,882,586	288,196,099	9.0%
Carbon	3,632,604	40,351,394	9.0%
Daggett	372,574	4,310,137	8.6%
Davis	62,260,326	578,397,199	10.8%
Duchesne	5,285,430	52,183,000	10.1%
Emery	2,243,600	25,833,331	8.7%
Garfield	1,585,199	12,630,280	12.6%
Grand	2,097,435	23,979,483	8.7%
Granite	77,910,991	597,946,559	13.0%
Iron	9,659,120	78,671,917	12.3%
Jordan	42,147,924	404,642,154	10.4%
Juab	1,966,084	18,994,000	10.4%
Kane	1,093,789	15,867,196	6.9%
Logan	7,529,604	53,364,785	14.1%
Millard	3,507,839	28,652,822	12.2%
Morgan	1,248,435	26,606,431	4.7%
Murray	5,010,024	59,193,557	8.5%
Nebo	22,608,882	263,139,265	8.6%
No. Sanpete	2,614,544	20,176,001	13.0%
No. Summit	625,081	11,409,276	5.5%
Ogden	25,561,306	181,262,509	14.1%
Park City	2,468,974	63,011,711	3.9%
Piute	752,713	9,231,290	8.2%
Provo	18,491,842	125,326,164	14.8%
Rich	567,377	6,876,683	8.3%
Salt Lake	44,467,463	298,718,674	14.9%
San Juan	15,201,292	51,782,071	29.4%
Sevier	6,636,216	48,917,602	13.6%
So. Sanpete	3,534,661	40,551,386	8.7%
So. Summit	1,095,834	16,624,215	6.6%
Tintic	392,231	3,574,008	11.0%
Tooele	11,846,290	124,541,930	9.5%
Uintah	7,360,098	102,933,355	7.2%
Wasatch	3,700,227	52,162,230	7.1%
Washington	26,878,722	244,848,557	11.0%
Wayne	697,842	5,835,512	12.0%
Weber	25,878,258	247,399,355	10.5%
Total School Districts	<u>\$ 554,442,288</u>	<u>\$4,995,016,534</u>	11.1%

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Local Education Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Continued

Charter Schools	Federal Revenues from All Sources *	Budgeted Expenditures	Percent of Budgeted Expenditures From Federal Revenues
American Leadership Academy	\$ 804,191	\$ 10,096,553	8.0%
American Preparatory Academy	1,361,215	7,197,032	18.9%
AMES	264,478	3,380,295	7.8%
Aspire Online Charter School	153,640	500,000	30.7%
Baer Canyons HS Sports & Medical Science (new school)	—	—	—
Bear River Charter School	221,115	1,136,352	19.5%
Beehive Sci. & Tech. Acad.	55,974	1,511,865	3.7%
C.S. Lewis Academy	295,310	2,116,398	14.0%
Canyon Rim Academy	203,050	2,935,442	6.9%
Channing Hall	390,695	4,420,855	8.8%
City Academy	156,632	1,752,100	8.9%
DaVinci Academy	287,030	10,286,658	2.8%
Dual Immersion Academy	575,478	2,856,622	20.1%
Early Light Academy at Daybreak	376,025	3,919,658	9.6%
East Hollywood High	319,809	2,466,952	13.0%
Edith Bowen	192,486	2,846,778	6.8%
Endeavor Hall (new school)	—	—	—
Entheos Academy	478,170	3,270,275	14.6%
Excelsior Academy	550,603	3,436,515	16.0%
Fast Forward Charter High School	131,013	1,560,274	8.4%
Freedom Academy	477,694	4,239,880	11.3%
Gateway Preparatory Academy	451,382	3,142,145	14.4%
George Washington Academy	288,504	6,874,499	4.2%
Good Foundation Academy	194,451	1,926,530	10.1%
Guadalupe Schools	215,598	1,425,312	15.1%
Hawthorn	446,616	4,213,299	10.6%
Intech Early College High School	88,322	1,223,215	7.2%
Itineris Early College High	49,127	1,658,661	3.0%
John Hancock	74,310	1,131,869	6.6%
Karl G. Maeser	109,814	3,675,165	3.0%
Lakeview Academy	345,845	4,192,096	8.2%
Legacy Preparatory Academy	307,909	4,841,717	6.4%
Liberty Academy	200,133	3,668,619	5.5%
Lincoln Academy	341,853	3,722,769	9.2%
Maria Montessori Academy	344,527	2,593,911	13.3%
Merit College Preparatory Academy	247,211	2,561,373	9.7%
Moab Community School	58,745	455,054	12.9%
Monticello Academy	306,301	4,474,636	6.8%
Mountainville Academy	332,655	4,559,128	7.3%
Navigator Pointe Academy	267,389	6,849,561	3.9%
Noan Webster Academy	420,282	3,223,722	13.0%
North Davis Preparatory Academy	409,691	5,161,409	7.9%
North Star Academy	203,839	2,885,046	7.1%
NUAMES	148,083	2,877,128	5.1%
Odyssey School	272,831	2,757,379	9.9%
Ogden Preparatory Academy	920,475	6,017,564	15.3%
Open Classroom School	238,548	2,459,158	9.7%
Open High School of Utah	221,147	1,538,201	14.4%
Oquirrh Mountain Charter School	316,060	3,354,838	9.4%
Paradigm High School	194,634	3,186,566	6.1%
Pinnacle Canyon Academy	571,917	4,375,100	13.1%
Providence Hall	258,806	3,748,924	6.9%
Quail Run Primary School	491,393	4,001,430	12.3%
Quest Academy	291,347	3,190,282	9.1%

Continues

State of Utah
Federal Receipts Report — Local Education Agencies
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2011

Continued

<u>Charter Schools</u>	<u>Federal Revenues from All Sources *</u>	<u>Budgeted Expenditures</u>	<u>Percent of Budgeted Expenditures From Federal Revenues</u>
Renaissance Academy	266,018	3,843,173	6.9%
Rockwell Charter High School	425,466	3,269,076	13.0%
Ronald Reagan Academy	590,611	4,212,729	14.0%
Salt Lake Arts Academy	52,283	1,777,182	2.9%
Salt Lake Center for Science Education	198,741	2,064,773	9.6%
Salt Lake School for Performing Arts	36,274	961,272	3.8%
Soldier Hollow	198,431	1,302,549	15.2%
Spectrum Academy	165,400	3,269,296	5.1%
Success Academy	98,318	2,121,442	4.6%
Success School	—	567,555	0.0%
Summit Academy	389,327	6,624,348	5.9%
Summit Academy High School	154,020	9,757,372	1.6%
Syracuse Arts Academy	431,725	4,897,368	8.8%
The Ranches Academy Inc	233,019	2,230,514	10.4%
The Ranches Academy Inc	142,367	2,036,006	7.0%
Thomas Edison Charter School North	387,891	6,306,187	6.2%
Timpanogos Academy	202,599	2,540,954	8.0%
Tuacahn Hs For Performing Arts	116,764	2,048,180	5.7%
Uintah River High School	219,890	996,168	22.1%
Utah Connections Academy	** 145,857	—	—
Utah County Academy of Sciences	148,329	2,446,500	6.1%
Utah Virtual Academy	542,040	11,036,825	4.9%
Venture Academy	374,119	2,828,643	13.2%
Vista at Entrada	376,420	4,698,322	8.0%
Wasatch Peak Academy	269,628	2,225,604	12.1%
Weilenmann School of Discovery	333,555	3,598,658	9.3%
Total Charter Schools	<u>\$ 23,423,445</u>	<u>\$ 269,557,506</u>	8.7%
Total All Local Education Agencies	<u>\$ 577,865,733</u>	<u>\$5,264,574,040</u>	11.0%

* 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 with federal charter start-up funding.

Source:

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

This page intentionally left blank.

Department of Agriculture and Food
Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,718,467
Number of FTEs	3
Recipients/Clients Served	40
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Farmers in the Uintah Basin, Manila, and Price San Rafael watershed. Assisted in converting to more efficient irrigation systems.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$85,923)	(\$429,617)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$85,923)	(\$429,617)

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

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	There 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
Meat and Poultry Inspection

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,399,766.37
Number of FTEs	27.5
Recipients/Clients Served	0
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Meat & poultry processing plants

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$69,988)	(\$349,940)
State:		
General Fund	(62,821)	(314,104)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$132,809)	(\$664,044)

FTEs	-2	-27.5
-------------	----	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	In order for the state of Utah to have a Meat and Poultry Inspection program, we need to maintain 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.

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.

Department of Agriculture and Food
**Mormon Cricket and Grasshopper Suppression Program
and other Insect programs**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.025
Agency contact name and phone number	Stephen Ogilvie (801) 538-7110

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$739,058
Number of FTEs	1.5
Recipients/Clients Served	Various farmers statewide
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Agricultural producers that are suffering economics losses due to grasshopper or Mormon cricket infestations.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$36,953)	(\$184,765)
State:		
General Fund	(966)	(4,829)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: _____		
Other Fund: _____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$37,919)	(\$189,594)

FTEs	-1.5	-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>	This grant requires a match in the Gypsy Moth portion of the 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 %	When grant runs out of money, services would cease and production losses could be high.
25 %	When grant runs out of money, services would cease and production losses could be high.

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 %	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.
25 %	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.

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 %	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. Historically, when USDA is unable to assist with suppression programs local political entities actively seek assistance from other sources.
25 %	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. Historically, when USDA is unable to assist with suppression programs local political entities actively seek assistance from other sources.

Utah State Board of Regents
Student Loan Purchase Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	(\$12,431,691)	(28,180,753)+15,348,062+401,000
Number of FTEs	112	
Recipients/Clients Served	142,000	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Program manages the servicing activity for a student loan portfolio of \$1.8 billion pertaining to 142,000 borrowers (as of June 30, 2011).	

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

(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 (\$12,030,691) 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? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?

5 %	N/A
25 %	N/A

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

5 %	N/A
25 %	N/A

Utah Higher Education Assistance Authority
Student Loan Guarantee Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$46,621,402
Number of FTEs	52
Recipients/Clients Served	142,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Program provides guarantee services related to a student loan portfolio of \$1.8 billion pertaining to 142,000 borrowers (as of June 30, 2011).

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$2,331,070)	(\$11,655,351)
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	(\$2,331,070)	(\$11,655,351)

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

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	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 52 to 49.
25 %	A 25% reduction in Federal receipts would cause a corresponding decrease in the number of FTE's from 52 to 39.

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

Department of Community & Culture
Division of Arts & Museums

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	45.025
Agency contact name and phone number	Sandra Andrus (801) 236-7557 or Kim Hale (801) 538-8707

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	694,800
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	1,500,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Individual Artists, Arts Organizations, Schools, Students, Teachers

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$34,740)	(\$173,700)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$34,740)	(\$173,700)

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.)	1:1. The National Endowment for 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 %	Arts Grants to Non-Profit Organizations would be reduced. No change in statute or rules.
25 %	Individual program outreach would be reduced. Arts Programs might be consolidated or cut causing a limited availability of grants and services to Arts Organizations in Utah. 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, programs, productions, etc.
25 %	Fewer opportunities for individual artists, teachers, students, schools, and organizations for training, certification, awards, art exhibits, visiting artists in schools, etc.

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 Community & Culture
Division of State History

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.904. State History is reporting the Historic Preservation Grant only.
Agency contact name and phone number	Londi Rowley (801) 533-3521 or Kim Hale (801) 538-8707

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 748,881	Actual \$838,300, \$748,881 is Historic Preservation only.
Number of FTEs	8.5	
Recipients/Clients Served		
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Federal and State agencies, local governments including cities and towns, developers, historic residential and commercial home owners, and cultural resource management companies and consultants.	

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$37,444)	(\$187,220)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$37,444)	(\$187,220)

FTEs State History does not expect an increase or a decrease in state or federal funds or FTE's	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 Historic Preservation Fund federal grant requires 40% match, however, at least 70% of this match is provided by local governments. State History's matching share (for the \$710,000 federal grant) is \$84,000, which is a General Fund appropriation 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 cultural resource management staffing (private sector) assisting state and federal agencies. This would not require a change in statute or rules.

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

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

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

Department of Community & Culture/Division of Housing & Community Development
Community Development Block Grant (HUD)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	14.228
Agency contact name and phone number	Gordon D. Walker, 801/538-8723 Kimberley Brown Schmeling, 801/538-8727

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 8,036,709
Number of FTEs	3.75
Recipients/Clients Served	0
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$401,835)	(\$2,009,177)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$401,835)	(\$2,009,177)

FTEs	-10	-50
-------------	-----	-----

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 \$8,100 less in admin funding and \$390,000 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 \$40,200 less in admin funding and \$1.97 million less in program funding for local projects. While the available funding would still cover all but .75 FTE, it is likely that the 25% fewer program dollars would not create the demand necessary for 3.75 FTEs and the program would be reduced by 1 FTE or more. 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 %	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.

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

Department of Community & Culture/Division of Housing & Community Development
Americorp (Corporation for National Service)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	94.006
Agency contact name and phone number	Gordon D. Walker, 801/538-8723 Kimberley Brown Schmeling, 801/538-8727

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$2,663,365
Number of FTEs	3.2
Recipients/Clients Served	
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	\$133,188	\$665,940
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	\$133,188	\$665,940

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

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There is a 1:1 match required on the \$250,000 administrative funding provided for the program. This match is met through a General Fund appropriation and in-kind contributions. 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 \$133,200 less in program funding for support of local Americorp members. Fewer members would be available to serve throughout the state. Admin funding is guaranteed at the Small State Minimum of \$250,000. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$666,000 less in program funding for support of local Americorp members. Fewer members would be available to serve throughout the state. Admin funding is guaranteed at the Small State Minimum of \$250,000.No change in statute would be required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	There would simply be fewer Americorp members serving/volunteering throughout the state.
25 %	There would be significantly less Americorp 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 Community & Culture/Division of Housing & Community Development

Community Services Block Grant (HHS)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions

Based on Fiscal Year 2011

—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.569
Agency contact name and phone number	Gordon D. Walker, 801/538-8723 Kimberley Brown Schmeling, 801/538-8727

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,528,507
Number of FTEs	3.5
Recipients/Clients Served	
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 Utahns.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$176,425)	(\$882,127)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$176,425)	(\$882,127)

FTEs	-0.25	-1.0
-------------	-------	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There is no match requirement 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 \$17,600 less in admin funding and \$150,000 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 \$82,200 less in admin funding and \$800,000 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 3.50 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 Community & Culture/Division of Housing & Community Development

HOME

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	14.239
Agency contact name and phone number	Gordon D. Walker, 801/538-8723 Kimberley Brown Schmeling, 801/538-8727

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	2,538,028
Number of FTEs	4.25
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$126,901)	(\$634,507)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$126,901)	(\$634,507)

FTEs	0	-.50
-------------	---	------

<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>A 20% match is required for program funding. This requirement is satisfied with the General Fund Appropriation to the Olene Walker Housing Loan Fund.</p>
--	--

<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.</p>	
5 %	<p>A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$6,300 less in admin funding and \$129,000 less in program funding for local projects. No change in statute would be required.</p>
25 %	<p>A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$31,700 less in admin funding and \$600,000 less in program funding for local projects. 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?	
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.
25 %	Because HOME funds are used in concert with other available local/developer financing, a cut of this size would mean there would be 1-2 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 Community & Culture/Division of Housing & Community Development

Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions

Based on Fiscal Year 2011

—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.568
Agency contact name and phone number	Gordon D. Walker, 801/538-8723 Kimberley Brown Schmeling, 801/538-8727

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$29,267,173
Number of FTEs	5.0
Recipients/Clients Served	38,500 homes
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,463,359)	(\$7,316,793)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,463,359)	(\$7,316,793)

FTEs	0	.0
-------------	---	----

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

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$1.46 million less in program funding for benefit payments or weatherization improvements to approximately 2,750 individuals/families. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$7.32 million less in program funding for benefit payments to 13,900 individuals/families, or the utility benefit payment to each household would be reduced. No change in statute would be required.

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

5 %	Local agencies hire seasonal workers to process LIHEAP applications across the state. Approximately 4 less LIHEAP workers would 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.
25 %	Local agencies hire seasonal workers to process LIHEAP applications across the state. Approximately 20 less LIHEAP workers would 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>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, there are no mandated services.
25 %	No, there are no mandated services.

Department of Community and Culture
Utah State Library General Operations

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,868,593
Number of FTEs	3.0
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$93,430)	(\$467,148)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$93,430)	(\$467,148)

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 \$963,300 and maintenance of effort expenditure of \$2,073,000 per year. Note: All MOE funding is state match. Note: A reduction at about the 5% level is anticipated.
---	---

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 Utahns outside the libraries service area (C) Public Pioneer Program - provides online educational and information resources to residents of Utah (A) Blind Library Program - provides Braille, audio and large print informational and leisure reading materials to Blind, visually and print impaired, and physically disabled populations (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 (A) Blind Library 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 %	(B) Lender Support Program - no significant impact (C) Public Pioneer Program - reduction in purchases of online audio and e-books (A) Blind Library Program - reduction in purchase of large print books (D) Library Development LSTA grants - reduction in support for Utah libraries
25 %	(B) Lender Support Program - reduction of total funds available for this service by 25%; this would reduce incentive for libraries to lend materials to patrons of other Utah libraries (C) Public Pioneer Program - reduction of two online resources - users would have fewer resources available in the areas of business and genealogy (A) Blind Library Program - discontinue purchase of large print books - users would have a limited selection of large print book titles to select from (D) Library Development LSTA grants - discontinuation of support to Utah libraries - limited or no access to library services for underserved and rural citizens
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 (A) Blind Library Program is federally mandated (2 U.S.C. 135a, 135a-1, 135b) - funding for the large print book collection would be reduced; no other resources are available to supplement the collection. However, a level of services is not mandated and this would be the last program cut.
25 %	See 5%. Funding for the (A) Blind Library large print book collection would be discontinued, no other resources are available to supplement the collection

Department of Community & Culture/Division of Housing & Community Development

Weatherization Assistance Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions

Based on Fiscal Year 2011

—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	81.042
Agency contact name and phone number	Gordon D. Walker, 801/538-8723 Kimberley Brown Schmeling, 801/538-8727

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,066,868
Number of FTEs	2.5
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP) helps low-income individuals and families reduce energy costs and increase comfort and safety in their homes. Individuals, families, the elderly and the disabled who are no more than 150 percent of the current federal poverty income level are eligible for help from the Weatherization Assistance Program. However, priority is given to the elderly and disabled, households with high-energy consumption, emergency situations, and homes with preschool-age children.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$53,343)	(\$266,717)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$53,343)	(\$266,717)

FTEs	-10	-.50
-------------	-----	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	No match is required on administration or pass-thru funds.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$2,600 less in admin funding and \$50,000 less in program funding for local projects. Approximately .10 of 1 FTE would be redeployed to another program. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$13,300 less in admin funding and \$250,000 less in program funding for local projects. While the available funding would still cover all but .50 FTE, it is likely that the 25% fewer program dollars would not create the demand necessary for 2.5 FTEs and the program would be reduced by 1 FTE. 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 %	Approximately 10 fewer homes would be weatherized in a given year. There is already a waiting list for these services, so this would only increase the delay before homes are completed and energy costs are reduced.
25 %	Approximately 40 fewer homes would be weatherized in a given year. There is already a waiting list for these services, so this would only increase the delay before homes are completed and energy costs are 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, there are no mandated services.
25 %	No, there are no mandated services.

Department of Corrections
Divisions of Institutional Operations
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 705,924
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	0
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. (16.606)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$35,296)	(\$176,481)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$35,296)	(\$176,481)

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>	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.
--	---

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
Clean School Bus/Diesel Retrofit

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.039 (Nat. Utah Clean School Bus) & 66.040 (State Clean Diesel)
Agency contact name and phone number	Bryce Bird, (801) 536-4064

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 549,521.54
Number of FTEs	.5
Recipients/Clients Served	1352
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The funds were used by the Division of Air Quality to retrofit over 1,200 school buses and purchase 37 new school buses to protect Utah school children and operators from air pollution. The funds were also used to install APUs on 52 long-haul trucks and 32 agricultural trucks, and repower and replace 31 pieces of machinery with less-polluting machinery.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$27,476)	(\$137,380)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$27,476)	(\$137,380)

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 %	This funding was used to retrofit over 1,200 school buses, purchase 37 new school buses for school districts throughout Utah, install APUs on 52 long-haul trucks and 32 agricultural trucks, and repower and replace 31 pieces of machinery with less-polluting machinery. This funding is not necessarily recurring. Most of the funding is used to identify and obtain matching funding from industry and other entities, and is passed through directly to owners/operators of school buses and other identified diesel equipment and machinery. No changes to statute or rules would be required.
25 %	This funding was used to retrofit over 1,200 school buses, purchase 37 new school buses for school districts throughout Utah, install APUs on 52 long-haul trucks and 32 agricultural trucks, and repower and replace 31 pieces of machinery with less-polluting machinery. This funding is not necessarily recurring. Most of the funding is used to identify and obtain matching funding from industry and other entities, and is passed through directly to owners/operators of school buses and other identified diesel equipment and machinery. No changes to 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 %	This project has been completed, and may not be funded further. These funds are generally passed through to owners/operators of school buses and other diesel equipment.
25 %	This project has been completed, and may not be funded further. These funds are generally passed through to owners/operators of school buses and other diesel equipment.

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 Environmental Quality Underground Storage Tanks

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions Based on Fiscal Year 2011 —Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.804
Agency contact name and phone number	Roy Baran, (801) 536-4109

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$568,028
Number of FTEs	3.88
Recipients/Clients Served	0
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The recipient of this grant is the Underground Storage Tank (UST) Compliance Program, whose mission is to prevent human health and environmental impacts by minimizing petroleum spills from USTs. The clients served are UST owners and operators and, by extension, all citizens of the State via protection from petroleum spills and their effects.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$28,400)	(\$142,000)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits	(7,100)	(35,500)
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$35,500)	(\$177,500)

FTEs	-0.19	- 0.97
-------------	-------	--------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The grant requires a 25% match from the State.
--	--

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 5% reduction, some outreach may be reduced and some projects intended to improve efficiency (database enhancement, online payments, etc.) would be delayed or eliminated. No change in statute or rules would be necessary.
25 %	With a 25% reduction, the amount of outreach, number of inspections and follow up (enforcement) would be reduced. No change in statute or rules would be necessary, but we may be in danger of losing program primacy if core requirements are not met.

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 trickle-down effect of reduced funding may require that State funding provided to Local Health Agencies to assist in some UST Program work be reduced to offset reduced grant money. The State owns the largest number of UST facilities regulated by the program and would see a reduction in the amount of outreach assistance to maintain compliance at fueling facilities.
25 %	This trickle-down effect of reduced funding would require that State funding provided to Local Health Agencies to assist in some UST Program work be reduced or eliminated to offset reduced grant money. Outreach assistance provided to State operated UST facilities would be reduced significantly. Tank fees may need to be increased to meet program operation needs.

<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 %	The UST program is required by federal mandate and oversight is delegated to the State. No other resources are currently available to meet these requirements. UST fees, which provide the matching funds required, could be increased to meet these needs.
25 %	The UST program is required by federal mandate and oversight is delegated to the State. No other resources are available to meet these requirements. UST fees, which provide the matching funds required, could be increased to meet these needs.

Department of Environmental Quality

LUST

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,324,901
Number of FTEs	8.57
Recipients/Clients Served	0
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$66,245)	(\$331,225)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: PST Trust Fund	(6,625)	(33,122)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$72,870)	(\$364,347)

FTEs	-0.43	-2.14
-------------	-------	-------

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

Water Protection Counter-Terrorism Grants

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.474
Agency contact name and phone number	Craig Silotti, (801) 536-4460

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 66,401
Number of FTEs	0.5
Recipients/Clients Served	+450 Community Systems
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Water systems developing emergency response/counter-terrorism efforts

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$3,320)	(\$16,600)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$3,320)	(\$16,600)

FTEs	0 (no change)	0 (no change)
-------------	---------------	---------------

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 %	Funding in FY12 and FY13 is carryover from previous years, and will be fully spent. No additional funding is expected. No changes in rule necessary.
25 %	Funding in FY12 and FY13 is carryover from previous years, and will be fully spent. No additional funding is expected. No changes in rule 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 %	We expect that services to water systems in developing counter-terrorism plans will be reduced as funding is reduced, and personnel time will be allocated elsewhere.

25 %	We expect that services to water systems in developing counter-terrorism plans will be reduced as funding is reduced, and personnel time will be allocated elsewhere.
------	---

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

5 %	There are no mandated services that would need to be maintained. Training and mock terrorism drills will be reduced or stopped.
-----	---

25 %	There are no mandated services that would need to be maintained. Training and mock terrorism drills will be reduced or stopped.
------	---

Department of Environmental Quality
Superfund Sites

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,697,004
Number of FTEs	10.32
Recipients/Clients Served	0
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$84,850)	(\$424,251)
State:		
General Fund	(1,000)	(5,000)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$85,850)	(\$429,251)

FTEs	-0.52	-2.58
-------------	-------	-------

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

Utah Department of Environmental Quality
Brownfield State Response

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.817
Agency contact name and phone number	Roy Baran, (801) 536-4109

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$477,741
Number of FTEs	3.91
Recipients/Clients Served	N/A
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Recipient: Brown fields program. Clients: Citizens, businesses, and local agencies with property where expansion, redevelopment or reuse is complicated by the presence or potential presence of contamination.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$23,887)	(\$119,435)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$23,887)	(\$119,435)

FTEs	-0.20	-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>	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 division would reduce or eliminate work on the CERCLA GIS database used to store site specific information and make that information available to the public via online services (the Interactive Map). No change in statute or rule would be required.
25 %	In addition to eliminating CERCLA GIS database enhancement and improvement, the division would be unable to fund and perform Targeted Brownfields Assessments to local governments, used to assist them in property development decisions. 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 %	Would slow the development and enhancement to the CERCLA database resulting in the slowing down of provided information to the public via online services (the Interactive Map).

25 %	Discontinuing the development of the CERCLA GIS database, used in part to populate the Interactive Map with site specific information, would impact both the public and private sectors relying on this service for information sought/used in the due diligence process for property transactions. Eliminating TBA's could result in impediments to local economic development efforts in communities that rely on the Targeted Brownfields Assessments provided by the division with this funding stream.
-------------	---

<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 federal mandates required. Any available State general funds could be used.
25 %	No federal mandates required. Any available State general funds could be used.

Department of Environmental Quality Performance Partnership Grant

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions Based on Fiscal Year 2011 —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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$7,186,770
Number of FTEs	69
Recipients/Clients Served	varies
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	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. All citizens and the state's environment are benefited and affected.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$359,338)	(\$1,796,692)
State:		
General Fund	(41,857)	(209,285)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Environmental Quality Restricted Account	(11,620)	(58,101)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$412,815)	(\$2,064,078)

FTEs	-3.45	-17.25
-------------	-------	--------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	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
WRT Infrastructure 3% Setaside and Network/Exchange Databases

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.202, 66.608
Agency contact name and phone number	Walter Baker, 801-536-4312,

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 204,109
Number of FTEs	.6
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	These programs fund part of an FTE, and allocates money to water systems to assist with correcting system problem, and includes onetime data base development funds

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$10,205)	(\$51,027)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$10,205)	(\$51,027)

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

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There are no match 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 %	N/A – no new grants were authorized and 2011 and unlikely any will be authorized in 2012. Funds expended in 2011 were carryover funds and one time project grants.
25 %	N/A – no new grants were authorized and 2011 and unlikely any will be authorized in 2012. Funds expended in 2011 were carryover funds and one time project grants.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	N/A – no new grants were authorized and 2011 and unlikely any will be authorized in 2012. Funds expended in 2011 were carryover funds and one time project grants..
25 %	N/A – no new grants were authorized and 2011 and unlikely any will be authorized in 2012. Funds expended in 2011 were carryover funds and one time project grants..

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 – no new grants were authorized and 2011 and unlikely any will be authorized in 2012. Funds expended in 2011 were carryover funds and one time project grants..
25 %	N/A – no new grants were authorized and 2011 and unlikely any will be authorized in 2012. Funds expended in 2011 were carryover funds and one time project grants.

Department of Environmental Quality

Drinking Water Federal State Revolving Funds (FSRF)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions

Based on Fiscal Year 2011

—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$12,944,915
Number of FTEs	21
Recipients/Clients Served	1000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Water system loan/grant recipients, monies described here are pass-through to water systems for construction projects and administration of loan program, state program management, technical assistance, Capacity Development program implementation, and source water protection.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$647,246)	(\$3,236,229)
State:		
General Fund	(29,405)	(147,024)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Drinking Water Development Security Fund (5235)	(103,667)	(518,335)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$780,318)	(\$3,901,588)

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. 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 that 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 set-aside can be used for the following state programs: Program augmentation, Capacity Development, Source Water and Operator Certification. A 1:1 match is required for this part of the set-aside.</p>
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	<p>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%. 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 there was a \$400 million need 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%. 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 there was a \$400 million need 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. With ongoing reductions in our set-aside balance, along with the potential cuts described in this package, the overall deficit that would need to be replaced approaches \$3,000,000 per year</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
U.S. Department of Energy
Monitoring of Closed DOE Sites: Green River, UT and Vitro Tailings Clive, UT

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	Not Applicable
Agency contact name and phone number	Rusty Lundberg, (801) 536-4257

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,921
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	1
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	DEQ for purposes of observing annual groundwater monitoring of closed DOE sites. DEQ for reviewing plans or reports for closed DOE sites within the State of Utah. DEQ attend annual inspections of closed DOE sites.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$96)	(\$480)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$96)	(\$480)
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>	10% State match provided by the Division of Facilities and Construction Management.
---	---

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 %	Division of Radiation Control (DRC) staff observes the DOE conduct the required annual on-site inspections of the two closed DOE sites (Green River Disposal Site and Vitro Tailings Cell at the EnergySolutions Clive facility). A 5% percent reduction would likely not impact the ability of staff to rely on the funding resources to conduct site inspections or observe annual groundwater sampling at the Green River Disposal Site. DRC Staff also reviews plans and reports for the closed DOE sites within the State of Utah. A minor reduction would likely not impact DRC review of the plans and reports. No change in rule or statute would be required.
25 %	Division of Radiation Control (DRC) staff observes the DOE conduct the required annual on-site inspections of the two closed DOE sites (Green River Disposal Site and Vitro Tailings Cell at the EnergySolutions Clive facility). If a significant cut was made to the DOE grant, DRC staff may not have the resources to conduct site inspections or observe annual groundwater sampling at the Green River Disposal Site. DRC Staff also reviews plans and reports for the closed DOE sites within the State of Utah, if a significant cut was made to the DOE grant, it is

	possible review of the plans and reports could be delayed. No change in rule or 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 %	Division of Radiation Control (DRC) staff observes the DOE conduct the required annual on-site inspections of the two closed DOE sites (Green River Disposal Site and Vitro Tailings Cell at the EnergySolutions Clive facility). A 5% percent reduction would likely not impact the ability of staff to rely on the funding resources to conduct site inspections or observe annual groundwater sampling at the Green River Disposal Site. DRC Staff also reviews plans and reports for the closed DOE sites within the State of Utah. A minor reduction would likely not impact DRC review of the plans and reports.
25 %	Division of Radiation Control (DRC) staff observes the DOE conduct the required annual on-site inspections of the two closed DOE sites (Green River Disposal Site and Vitro Tailings Cell at the EnergySolutions Clive facility). If a significant cut was made to the DOE grant, DRC staff may not have the resources to conduct site inspections or observe annual groundwater sampling at the Green River Disposal Site. DRC Staff also reviews plans and reports for the closed DOE sites within the State of Utah, if a significant cut was made to the DOE grant, it is possible review of the plans and reports could be delayed.

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

5 %	No.
25 %	No.

Department of Environmental Quality Nonpoint Source Project Grants

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions Based on Fiscal Year 2011 —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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,300,038
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	22
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Local Land owners

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$65,002)	(\$325,010)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____ In-Kind	(26,001)	(130,004)
TOTAL	(\$91,003)	(\$455,014)

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 a current contract with the Dept. of Agriculture to support 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
Water Quality SRF Loans

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$9,554,755
Number of FTEs	3
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$477,738)	(\$2,388,689)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Wastewater Loan Program	(95,548)	(597,172)
Other Fund: _____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: <u> In-Kind </u>		
TOTAL	(\$573,285)	(\$2,985,861)

FTEs	-20	-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 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, one FTE would be lost and project management performance would be impacted.

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

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

Department of Environmental Quality
WQ Management

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.454
Agency contact name and phone number	Walter Baker, 801-536-4312

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	19,462
Number of FTEs	.10
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$973)	(\$4,866)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$973)	(\$4,866)

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

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	No match 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 %	This grant funds one FTE to complete the federally required, biennial, Integrated Report to Congress documenting the water quality of Utah's lakes and rivers and listing impaired waters. The IR is a requirement of the Clean Water Act (CWA) that must be completed to maintain state primacy of the program. A 5% reduction would not require a change in statute or rules.
25 %	This grant funds one FTE to complete the federally required, biennial, Integrated Report to Congress documenting the water quality of Utah's lakes and rivers and listing impaired waters. The Integrated Report is a requirement of the Clean Water Act that must be completed to maintain state primacy of the program. While not requiring any sort of statute or rule change, the 25% cut would severely impact program performance of DWQ's mandated Clean Water Act (CWA) responsibilities, possibly resulting in forfeiture of the state delegation of this 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>	
5 %	A 5% reduction to the Division's CWA programs would result in a minor reduction in the Division's ability to monitor surface water quality and in some delay in the turnaround for processing surface water discharge permits.
25 %	A 25% reduction to the Division's CWA programs would result in a significant reduction in the Division's ability to monitor surface water quality and in a very significant delay in the turnaround for processing surface water discharge permits. This level of reduction would impair the Division's ability to be responsive to new industry coming into Utah, inhibiting economic development due to delayed permitting times.

<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 %	The CWA requirement to complete the Integrated Report will have to be maintained if a federal budget reduction became a reality. There are no other resources available to support these programmatic responsibilities.
25 %	All of the delegated CWA programmatic responsibilities would have to be maintained if a federal budget reduction became a reality. There are no other resources available to support these programmatic responsibilities.

Department of Environmental Quality
Air Quality Monitoring

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	66.034 (Monitoring (AT & 103) & 2BM11 (BLM Utah Air Monitoring 15.236)
Agency contact name and phone number	Bryce Bird, (801) 536-4064

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 494,298
Number of FTEs	3.6
Recipients/Clients Served	0
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The funds are used by the Division of Air Quality to establish an air monitoring network that serves all of Utah, with a concentrated effort along the Wasatch Front. Utah has also secured \$112,483 to complete a monitoring study in the Uintah Basin

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$24,714)	(\$123,575)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$24,714)	(\$123,575)

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 bulk of this funding (\$344K) is used to operate the federally required ambient monitors for airborne particulate matter in Utah. \$112K comes from BLM to begin a monitoring study in the Uintah Basin to try to explain why high concentrations of ozone are found there. Some (\$38K) is used to operate the Air Toxics Monitor at the Hawthorne Middle School in Salt Lake. No changes to statute or rules would be required.
25 %	The bulk of this funding (\$344K) is used to operate the federally required ambient monitors for airborne particulate matter in Utah. \$112K comes from BLM to begin a monitoring study in the Uintah Basin to try to explain why high concentrations of ozone are found there. Some (\$38K) is used to operate the Air Toxics Monitor at the Hawthorne Middle School in Salt Lake. No changes to 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 %	A significant amount of our monitoring equipment is operating beyond its useful life. With this reduction, we would have to delay replacing worn out equipment and defer maintenance. This could result in a lower % data capture, which could invalidate all of our data. We would need to reduce the number of filters we would have analyzed, resulting in less ground-based information on which to base our projections. The monitoring study in the Uintah Basin may be delayed, cut back, or eliminated. We will close non-regulatory monitoring sites, resulting in less data available for developing State Implementation Plans. The public relies on this monitoring data to know when to take special measures to protect the health/welfare of children, seniors, and the most sensitive portion of the population.
25 %	A significant amount of our monitoring equipment is operating beyond its useful life. With this reduction, we would have to delay replacing worn out equipment and defer maintenance. This could result in a lower % data capture, which could invalidate all of our data. We would need to reduce the number of filters we would have analyzed, resulting in less ground-based information on which to base our projections. The monitoring study in the Uintah Basin may be delayed, cut back, or eliminated. We will close non-regulatory monitoring sites, resulting in less data available for developing State Implementation Plans. The public relies on this monitoring data to know when to take special measures to protect the health/welfare of children, seniors, and the most sensitive portion of the population.

<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 %	The maintenance of the ambient air monitoring network, as well as the collection, analysis, and dissemination of air monitoring data is required in the clean air act.
25 %	The maintenance of the ambient air monitoring network, as well as the collection, analysis, and dissemination of air monitoring data is required in the clean air act.

Department of Health
ADAP Shortfall Relief-Ryan White Part B Supplemental

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$656,318
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	74
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	74 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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$32,816)	(\$164,080)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$32,816)	(\$164,080)

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 19 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 are no other states or local programs that assist with HIV drugs.

25 %	The change would be that the nineteen 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 are no other states 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
Metabolic and Birth Defects Surveillance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Amy Nance 801-883-4661

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$150,030	GRANT ENDS 9/30/2011 – No cost extension through 5/31/2012
Number of FTEs	0	
Recipients/Clients Served	0	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The no cost extension is needed to complete the pilot project on integrating metabolic conditions into birth defect surveillance. It will provide the support and time to complete the assessment of the variables, data analysis, and report writing.	

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$7,502)	(\$37,508)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$7,502)	(\$37,508)

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>	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 %	No change to the statute or rules necessary
25 %	No change to the statute or rules 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 %	Grant ends 9/30/2011 we have made a request for \$14,000 in carryover which we are waiting on to hear back from CDC on.

25 %	Grant ends 9/30/2011 we have made a request for \$14,000 in carryover which we are waiting on to hear back from CDC on.
------	---

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 Health
Centers for Birth Defects Research and Prevention

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Amy Nance 801-883-4661

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$986,408
Number of FTEs	3.18
Recipients/Clients Served	4103 interviews completed in Utah
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The study has been ongoing since 1997, with seven of the Centers collecting data for the past thirteen years. The Utah Center for Birth Defects Research and Prevention (UCBDRP) is one of the newest Centers beginning in September 2002. The primary goal of this study is to advance our understanding of the roles of genes, our environment, and interactions between the two with respect to the causes of birth defects. It is anticipated that information obtained from this study will ultimately be useful in the prevention of birth defects. Over the length of the study, we anticipate that NBDPS interview staff will conduct computer assisted telephone interviews (CATI), with at least 30,000 women, involving 20,000 mothers of infants with birth defects and 10,000 mothers of infants without birth defects. In addition to the interview, NBDPS will collect cheek cell samples (buccal brushes) on all case-infants, control-infants and their parents.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$49,320)	(\$246,602)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$49,320)	(\$246,602)

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>	There would be no matching required by the state. A reduction in funds would have to be absorbed through the grant 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 %	Reductions would impact subcontracts.
------------	---------------------------------------

25 %	Reductions would impact subcontracts first and then state-provided services second. The result is a decline in the number of interviews performed.
-------------	--

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 %	We have received word from CDC that our 4th year budget will be decreased to \$900,000. We are making adjustments to our sub-contracts to cover the loss of funds.
25 %	We have received word from CDC that our 4th year budget will be decreased to \$900,000. We are making adjustments to our sub-contracts to cover the loss of funds.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	There are no federal mandated services that the state would have to support if funds were cut. Any cuts would result in the grant activities being modified.
25 %	There are no federal mandated services that the state would have to support if funds were cut. Any cuts would result in the grant activities being modified.

Department of Health
**Early Hearing Detection and Intervention
Tracking Survey and Integration (EHDI)**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Richard Harward 801-584-8529

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$167,236
Number of FTEs	.65
Recipients/Clients Served	52,612
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Newborns and infants

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$8,362)	(\$41,809)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$8,362)	(\$41,809)

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>	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 %	Reduce contracts with data system development and maintenance. This would not require a change in state statute.
25 %	Reduce contracts with data system development and maintenance. This would not require a change in state statute.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Impact would include reductions in development of data systems feeding into the statewide CHIE

25 %	Impact would include major reductions in development of data systems feeding into the statewide cHIE
------	--

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 %	Reporting of newborn screening information to the CDC.
-----	--

25 %	Reporting of newborn screening information to the CDC.
------	--

Department of Health
Adult Viral Hepatitis

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Lynn Meinor, (801) 538-6198

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$57,641
Number of FTEs	1
Recipients/Clients Served	1,500
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Adults statewide

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$2,882)	(\$14,410)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$2,882)	(\$14,410)

FTEs	-01	-25
-------------	-----	-----

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

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	The Adult Viral Hepatitis grant's activities include prevention education, testing, material distribution and community involvement. The numbers of educational activities and materials distributed would be reduced. Funding was reduced 10% for fiscal year 2012, for a reduction of \$8,173.00.
25 %	FTE and activities would be reduced and scaled back significantly. 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 %	Minor changes would be felt by agencies receiving Hepatitis information and resources.
25 %	Some agencies would have limited access to Hepatitis information and resources would also be severely restricted.

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 Adult Viral Hepatitis Grant is mandated for every state. There is a coordinator in every state and area.
25 %	Cuts would have to be made to FTE and supplies, but position would be maintained.

Department of Health
Utah Public Health Approaches to Arthritis

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Peterson, (801) 538-9291

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 469,522
Number of FTEs	3.33
Recipients/Clients Served	10
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Contracted agencies to deliver programs, including Local Health Departments, Area Agencies on Aging, healthcare and community-based organizations.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$23,476)	(\$117,381)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$23,476)	(\$117,381)

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>	No state matching is required for this CDC Arthritis 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 %	There would be a slight reduction in offerings of the Arthritis Foundation Exercise Program, EnhanceFitness, and Chronic Disease Self-Management Program. No change in statute or rules.
25 %	There would be a large reduction in offerings of the Arthritis Foundation Exercise Program, EnhanceFitness, and Chronic Disease Self-Management Program. This would impact many communities around the state and those living with arthritis. 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 %	We would reduce training (for partners and staff), and reduce contracts by 5% across the board.

25 %	We would reduce training (for partners and staff), travel and reduce contracts by 25% across the board. It's possible we would eliminate a contract or two as well. Furthermore, we would likely have to implement a Reduction in Force action by one FTE.
------	--

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

5 %	No, there are not.
-----	--------------------

25 %	No, there are not.
------	--------------------

Department of Health
**Demonstrating the Capacity of Comprehensive Cancer to
Implement Policy**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 67,138
Number of FTEs	.25
Recipients/Clients Served	State of Utah
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Residents of Utah affected by policy change activities.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$3,357)	(\$16,785)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$3,357)	(\$16,785)

FTEs	NA	NA
-------------	----	----

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 %	Reduce contracts with Local Health Departments to provide education regarding policies related to cancer prevention and control.
25 %	Reduce contracts with Local Health Departments to provide education regarding policies related to cancer prevention and 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 %	Local Health Departments and the public would see a decrease in the activities related to the education of youth and the dangers of flavored tobacco products.

25 %	Local Health Departments and the public would see a decrease in the activities related to the education of youth and the dangers of flavored tobacco products.
------	--

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
Colorectal Screening

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,102,665
Number of FTEs	4.0
Recipients/Clients Served	300
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Utah residents age 50 to 70 at 250% of poverty level

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$55,133)	(\$275,666)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$55,133)	(\$275,666)

FTEs	NA	NA
-------------	----	----

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 %	Fifty five low income uninsured individuals in need of a screening colonoscopy would not be able to receive colonoscopy.
25 %	Elimination of the colon cancer screening program. Three hundred low income uninsured individuals in need of a screening colonoscopy would not be able to receive colonoscopy.

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 %	Individuals in need of a screening colonoscopy would not be able to receive a colonoscopy.
25 %	Individuals in need of a screening colonoscopy would not be able to receive a colonoscopy.

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
Diabetes Control and Prevention

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Peterson, (801) 538-9291

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 754,385
Number of FTEs	6.20
Recipients/Clients Served	Statewide
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Local Health Departments, Community-based Organizations, Health Plans, Community Health Centers, American Indian Partnership, Intermountain Healthcare, Media

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$37,719)	(\$188,596)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$37,719)	(\$188,596)

FTEs	-0.20	-2.0
-------------	-------	------

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	No state matching required, just from our program partners, which is taken care of.
---	---

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 %	There would be fewer professional education programs for diabetes providers and fewer media campaigns to disseminate information on diabetes prevention and control. Further, diabetes public health interventions in general would be reduced, thus adversely impacting Utahns with diabetes. No change in statute or rules.
25 %	There would be fewer professional education programs for diabetes providers and fewer media campaigns to disseminate information on diabetes prevention and control. Further, diabetes public health interventions in general would be significantly reduced, thus adversely impacting Utahns with diabetes. 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 %	We would reduce training (for partners and staff), and reduce contracts by 5% across the board, thus affecting state and local agencies.

25 %	We would reduce training (for partners and staff), and reduce contracts by 5% across the board, thus affecting state and local agencies. It's possible we would eliminate several contracts as well. Furthermore, we would likely have to implement a Reduction in Force action by one or two FTE. This would, of course, adversely impact the diabetes services we provide around the state.
-------------	---

<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, there are not.
25 %	No, there are not.

Department of Health
Epidemiology & Lab Capacity for Infectious Disease

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$879,946
Number of FTEs	8.3
Recipients/Clients Served	3
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/Tri Sano surveillance system.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$43,997)	(\$219,987)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$43,997)	(\$219,987)

FTEs	0	-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>	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; however, 2 to 3 FTEs would have to be eliminated at this level. This 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 %	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.
25 %	At the 25% level, all contractual funds would be eliminated as described above. In addition, personnel would be eliminated (presumably within Epidemiology and the Public Health Laboratory), resulting in increased workload for existing staff which would result in problems with productivity, customer service, and morale.
<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 – 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.

Department of Health
**Chronic Disease, Health Promotion, Surveillance:
Healthy Communities**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Heather Borski, (801) 538-9998

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$37,007
Number of FTEs	.5
Recipients/Clients Served	500
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	This grant supports technical assistance, training, and consultation provided to Utah's 12 Local Health Districts, local coalitions, and local municipalities in implementing "Healthy Communities" efforts designed to promote healthy eating and physical activity, and prevent tobacco use.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,850)	(\$9,252)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,850)	(\$9,252)
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.)	1:4 Match 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 %	Training materials and resources for Local Health Districts, local coalitions, and local municipalities would be reduced.
25 %	Training materials and resources for Local Health Districts, local coalitions, and local municipalities would be eliminated. Financial incentives provided to municipalities participating in the A Healthier You Legacy Community Awards Program would be 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 %	Public health professionals, coalition leaders and members, and municipal leaders would not receive the most current guidelines to assure implementation of optimal Healthy Communities Programs.

25 %	Public health professionals, coalition leaders and members, and municipal leaders would not receive the most current guidelines to assure implementation of optimal Healthy Communities Programs. Financial incentives that help municipalities implement Healthy Communities Programs would be lost.
-------------	---

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
Heart Disease and Stroke Prevention

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Nicole Bissonette (801) 538-6228

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 940,398
Number of FTEs	7
Recipients/Clients Served	2,847,897
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The HDSPP serves the entire State of Utah with coordinated heart disease and stroke prevention efforts including risk factor reduction.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Federal	(\$47,020)	(\$235,100)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$47,020)	(\$235,100)

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>	The HDSPP is required to have a state match of 1:5.
---	---

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 lowest priority activities would be eliminated. This would include our blood pressure awareness media campaign.
25 %	A \$235,100 cut would significantly impact our program efforts. We would be forced to eliminate many of our contracts with, community based organizations (CBO), medical quality improvement organizations (QIO), BP media campaign and staff positions.

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 %	Cardiovascular disease causes 1 in 3 deaths reported each year. Uncontrolled high blood pressure is a major risk factor for cardiovascular disease. 1 in 3 adults has hypertension. Many people do not understand the link between high blood pressure and cardiovascular disease. If our media campaign is eliminated it will leave many Utah citizens unaware of the seriousness of high blood pressure.

25 %	The loss of our contracts with CBOs, QIO's, our media campaign, and staff would mean a reduction in prevention, awareness, quality blood pressure control for the people of the state of Utah. A loss of HDSPP staff would mean less effort to follow up on statewide efforts with our partners.
------	--

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
National Cancer Prevention and Control

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,414,783
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$170,739)	(\$853,698)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$170,739)	(\$853,698)
FTEs	0	0

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	There 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
Utah Nutrition, Physical Activity, and Obesity

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Lynda Blades, (801) 538-6229

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 460,079
Number of FTEs	4.05
Recipients/Clients Served	12
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Contracted agencies to deliver programs (Local Health Departments)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$23,004)	(\$115,020)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$23,004)	(\$115,020)
FTEs	-55	-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>	Grant requires a 1:5 Match. Match requirement is met by contributions (in-kind resources) from partners external to the UDOH. Grant provisions require at a minimum, a Program Grant Coordinator who serves as principal investigator to assure compliance with cooperative agreement requirements and a Program Epidemiologist/Evaluator.
---	---

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 %	One of our currently-funded staff members' hours would be reduced. This would impact any of the following staff members: the Program's Physical Activity Coordinator, Nutrition Coordinator or Secretary.
25 %	Up to two staff positions would have to be 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 %	There would be a slight reduction in the dedicated staff to offer expertise on nutrition and physical activity to partners in implementing strategies in the 10-year state plan for obesity prevention.

25 %	Momentum for obesity prevention would decrease. Partners' activities and communication and reporting on statewide obesity prevention initiatives would decrease. There would be a lack of coordination of activities statewide and lack of resources to monitor and evaluate effectiveness of statewide initiatives to increase physical activity and healthy eating in schools, worksites, communities and in the medical community.
------	---

<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 %	The state would still be required to provide state-level infrastructure, management and support of obesity prevention initiatives, including subject matter expertise on physical activity, to local health departments, the public and other partners.
25 %	Minimal program management/infrastructure (maximum 2 FTEs) would be maintained at the state-level. There are no other resources available to maintain current level of productivity.

Department of Health
Public Health Tracking

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Sam LeFevre, (801) 538-6188

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$687,646
Number of FTEs	6.5
Recipients/Clients Served	Statewide
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Public and health care professionals statewide

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$34,382)	(\$171,912)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$34,382)	(\$171,912)

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 (yet)
---	------------

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 %	Approximately 50% of these funds are in contract. Certain contracts – specifically those for development of IBIS-PH and bio-monitoring would be reduced. The work would continue but over a longer period.
25 %	We would have to significantly reduce contracted work and eliminate one position (the data analyst position).

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 %	Upgrades to the IBIS-PH system would take longer to accomplish and there would be fewer updates to data and measures.
25 %	Upgrading IBIS-PH would stop. Bio-monitoring activities would be eliminated. We would stop analyzing the data and focus just on making data available to external partners.

<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>Yes: Nationally consistent data and measures must be transmitted to CDC on a regular basis, participation on certain workgroups is required, and there are a number of community outreach activities and risk communication activities that are required.</p>
<p>25 %</p>	<p>Yes: Nationally consistent data and measures must be transmitted to CDC on a regular basis, participation on certain workgroups is required, and there are a number of community outreach activities and risk communication activities that are required.</p>

Department of Health
**Core Capacity Tobacco
Collaborative Chronic Disease**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283
Agency contact name and phone number	Amy Sands, (801) 538-9374

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,271,638
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$63,582)	(\$317,910)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$63,582)	(\$317,910)

FTEs		
-------------	--	--

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	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 and local health department community interventions. No change in statute required.
25 %	Reductions to Utah Tobacco Quit Line cessation interventions and local health department community interventions. 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
Utah WISEWOMAN Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 899,091
Number of FTEs	2.53
Recipients/Clients Served	2,960
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Funding provides cardiovascular and diabetes testing (cholesterol, glucose and blood pressure) and lifestyle counseling to uninsured or underinsured Utah women aged 50-64 who live at or below 250% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL).

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$44,955)	(\$224,773)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$44,955)	(\$224,773)

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 %	Eliminate proposed evaluation activities designed to demonstrate the success of the program and would reduce the ability of the program to provide education and support materials to client to help them reach their physical activity, nutrition and weight loss goals. Additionally the program would be able to provide the services including lifestyle coaching to 148 fewer women (screening would be reduced from 2,960 to 2,812)
25 %	Eliminate proposed evaluation activities designed to demonstrate the success of the program and would eliminate the ability of the program to provide education and support materials to client to help them reach their physical activity, nutrition and weight loss goals. Additionally the program would be able to provide the services including lifestyle coaching to 741 fewer women (screening would be reduced from 2,960 to 2,219)

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

5 %	Reduce the amount of funding by \$25,625.00 that the UDOH would give to Local Health Departments to provide the services (cholesterol, glucose, blood pressure testing and lifestyle counseling for nutrition, physical activity, and healthy weight) to Utah women aged 50-64 who live at or below 250% FPL. Program would offer services to fewer women and be required to evaluate the impact of the program with limited resources.
25 %	Reduce the amount of funding by \$128,120.00 that the UDOH would give to Local Health Departments to provide the services (cholesterol, glucose, blood pressure testing and lifestyle counseling for nutrition, physical activity, and healthy weight) to Utah women aged 50-64 who live at or below 250% FPL. Program would offer services to fewer women and be required to evaluate the impact of the program with extremely limited resources.

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

Department of Health
Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.283, 92.988
Agency contact name and phone number	Jennifer Wrathall, 801-538-9259

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 505,594
Number of FTEs	7.79
Recipients/Clients Served	2,847,897
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Data from the BRFSS serves the entire population by providing accurate and timely information used by state and local health departments and organizations to make decisions about health services and resources provided in Utah'

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$25,280)	(\$126,399)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$25,280)	(\$126,399)

FTEs	-0.39	-1.89
-------------	-------	-------

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 %	With a 5% reduction, the BRFSS Program would reduce the number of landline surveys to approximately 9,000 completes. This would not require a change in statute.
25 %	With a 25% reduction, the BRFSS Program would reduce the number of landline surveys to approximately 7,500 completed surveys.

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 of this reduction in the number of completes would be a reduction in the strength and timeliness of the estimates produced from the data. Some estimates, particularly small area estimates, may not be possible with just one year of data.

25 %	The impact of this reduction in the number of completes would be a reduction in the strength and timeliness of the estimates produced from the data. Some estimates, including small area and Local Health District, among others, may not be possible with just one year of data. Data users would need to wait for another year of data in order to make reliable estimates for some groups of the population.
------	--

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
Federal Survey and Certification Title 18

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,896,886
Number of FTEs	19.76
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$94,844)	(\$474,222)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$94,844)	(\$474,222)

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 %	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.

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

5 %	If this reduction was implemented, our office would not be able to meet the Federal survey requirements to ensure that health providers are in compliance with Medicare requirements. Certification of these health providers to obtain Medicare funding may be in jeopardy.
25 %	If this reduction was implemented, our office would not be able to meet the Federal survey requirements to ensure compliance with Medicare requirements. Certification of these health providers to obtain Medicare funding may be in jeopardy. 25% would create a larger problem.

<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 %	There is no state money to support this function. Certification for Medicare is solely based on the Federal requirement for facilities that receive Medicare funding.
25 %	There is no state money to support this function. Certification for Medicare is solely based on the Federal requirement for facilities that receive Medicare funding.

Department of Health
Federal Survey and Certification Title 19

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$764,991
Number of FTEs	13.05
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$38,250)	(\$191,248)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$38,250)	(\$191,248)

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 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.

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

	to obtain Medicaid funding may be in jeopardy.
25 %	If this reduction was implemented, our office would not be able to meet the Federal survey requirements to ensure that nursing home providers are in compliance with Medicaid requirements. Certification of these health providers to obtain Medicaid funding would be in jeopardy.

<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 %	There is no extra state money to support this function of certification inspections. Certification for Medicaid is based on the State and Federal requirements for facilities that receive Medicaid funding.
25 %	There is no extra state money to support this function of certification inspections. Certification for Medicaid is based on the State and Federal requirements for facilities that receive Medicaid funding.

Department of Health
Hospital Preparedness Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$3,899,547
Number of FTEs	5.4
Recipients/Clients Served	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 EMS.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$194,977)	(\$974,887)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _Parent Fee		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$194,977)	(\$974,887)

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

Will have to reduce Admin costs by \$60,093 under 25% reduction scenario, to stay under 15% admin cap per ASPR HPP grant.

<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). 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>
---	---

	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'.
--	--

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 almost \$975,000 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
Ryan White/HIV

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$3,404,156
Number of FTEs	4
Recipients/Clients Served	400
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	HIV positive clients who receive HIV medications. The clients either have no insurance or are underinsured.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$170,208)	(\$851,039)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$170,208)	(\$851,039)

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.)	There is not matching or maintenance of effort requirements. However there is a grant requirement that administrative costs cannot exceed 10% of the total grant so if the funding was reduced by 25%, one FTE would need to be eliminated to stay under the 10%.
--	---

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 19 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 95 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 19 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 are no other states or local programs that assist with HIV drugs.

25 %	The change would be that the 95 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 are no other states 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 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,101,411
Number of FTEs	12
Recipients/Clients Served	21,916
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	6,688 clients were tested for HIV in 2010. In addition, 15,228 clients were reached through various interventions in the state.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$55,071)	(\$275,353)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$55,071)	(\$275,353)

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. Less 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
Maternal and Child Health Block Grant

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,349,013
Number of FTEs	42.76
Recipients/Clients Served	0
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$267,450)	(\$1,337,253)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: Collections/Clinical	(16,750)	(83,700)
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$284,200)	(\$1,420,953)

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.)	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%, 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
Public Health Preparedness and Response for Bioterrorism

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$7,030,531
Number of FTEs	19.74
Recipients/Clients Served	Population of the State of Utah
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Public Health Preparedness efforts benefit the population of Utah. 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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$351,527)	(\$1,757,633)
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	(\$351,527)	(\$1,757,633)

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 used as an indicator of nonfederal support for public health security before the infusion of federal funds. These expenditures are calculated by the awardee</p>
---	--

	<p>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
Women, Infant and Children (WIC) Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 47,802,399
Number of FTEs	15.85
Recipients/Clients Served	Approx 71,844/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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$2,390,120)	(\$11,950,600)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$2,390,120)	(\$11,950,600)

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 %	Cuts to WIC could encompass every pot accounted for above 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 pot accounted for above 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 FY12. 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 "healthiest caseload" with strict oversight from our funding agency, USDA. It 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, but looks bad from a political standpoint.

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 %	Not 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 Health
Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,865,378
Number of FTEs	5.38
Recipients/Clients Served	4,406
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$293,269)	(\$1,466,345)
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	(\$307,069)	(\$1,535,345)

FTEs		
-------------	--	--

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 and training 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 providers contracts by 5%. Limit local health departments and service providers 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
Vaccine Distributions

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 25,435,309	Note: \$23,802,864.19 is Vaccine for Children Program which is an entitlement program that purchases VFC vaccines. The Section 317 Vaccine funding (\$1,632,445) provides program funding and is subject to reduction.
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$81,622)	(\$408,111)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$81,622)	(\$408,111)

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
Immunization and Vaccines for Children

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,724,042
Number of FTEs	19
Recipients/Clients Served	2,800,089
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	By vaccination we serve the entire population of the state.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$136,202)	(\$681,011)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$136,202)	(\$681,011)

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
CHIP

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 54,785,437
Number of FTEs	13
Recipients/Clients Served	38,498
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$2,739,272)	(\$13,696,359)
State:		
General Fund	(113,668)	(653,422)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Tobacco Settlement	(571,999)	(2,774,914)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits	(106,083)	(530,415)
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$3,531,022)	(\$17,655,110)

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 1,925 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 36,500.
25 %	The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 7,700 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 28,800. This could be accomplished by capping CHIP family eligibility incomes at less than or equal to 150% FLP

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 1,925 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 36,500. 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.
25 %	The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 7,700 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 28,800. 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.

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 %	This cut would make 1,925 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.
25 %	This cut would make 7,700 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.

Department of Health
Medicaid
(LGAA, LHAA, LJAA & LKAA)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,346,070,911
Number of FTEs	N/A
Recipients/Clients Served	432,754
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$67,303,546)	(\$336,517,728)
State:		
General Fund	(12,305,685)	(53,665,419)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		
University of Utah Seed	(12,626,714)	(17,897,779)
Dedicated Credits		(57,158,759)
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$92,235,945)	(\$465,239,685)

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, Breast & Cervical Cancer.</p> <p>Eligibility Changes: Eliminate 1931 Vehicle Exclusion, Reduce Spenddown for Aged, Blind, and Disabled to 85% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL).</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: Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH), Graduate Medical Education (GME), University of Utah Medical Group (UUMG) Physician Enhanced Payments.</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.
25 %	All the same from the 5% group except, restore the Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) and: Eliminate Coverage for Medically Needy Individuals Eliminate the Nursing Home Assessment Eliminate the Hospital Assessment Considerable reduction in administrative staff and 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 %	4,212 individuals will lose coverage. 21,338 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 qualifying for Disproportionate Share Payments (DSH) will take reductions. The loss of administrative funds will result in the loss of services where program staff are reduced. The oversight of programs would also be lost which could result in disallowances.
25 %	All the same from the 5% scenario plus: 20,388 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. Hospitals will still be forced to treat these patients and would have DSH to partially offset these unfunded costs. It is unlikely that federal DSH payments would increase during this period of shortfall which will limit the ability of DSH to cover those costs. The University of Utah Hospital will take another large cut due to the elimination of the Inpatient UPL.

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

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

Department of Human Services
Division(s): ORS

IVD Child Support Collections / Incentives

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts *	\$ 22,911,022
Number of FTEs	270
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	286,185
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Mothers, Fathers, and Children

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,145,551)	(\$5,727,756)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$1,145,551)	(\$5,727,756)

FTEs	-13	-67
-------------	-----	-----

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.

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

5 %	All services provided by ORS are mandated and would be required to be maintained. As a result, the cuts would be absorbed through additional staff reductions. This would increase case load sizes for remaining staff and reduce the time and quality of services that could be provided. Currently there are over 350,000 Child Support and Medicaid cases.
25 %	A 25% cut would magnify the problem described above.

Department of Human Services
Division(s): DCFS, EDO
Child Welfare Title IV-B Subpart 1

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts *	\$3,390,000
Number of FTEs	51.79
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	18,535
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.

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

(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	-2.45	-12.25
-------------	-------	--------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	State match is 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. No other community resources provide child protective services or foster care functions. Limited community resources provide in-home services and adoptive supports, but many of these are already being accessed to support Division clients.
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. No other community resources provide child protective services or foster care functions. Limited community resources provide in-home services and adoptive supports, but many of these are already being accessed to support Division clients. Community resources would not have the capacity to fill in the gap in resources for a cut this severe.

Department of Human Services
Division(s): DCFS, JJS, EDO
Foster Care Title IV-E

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts *	\$ 21,848,723
Number of FTEs	135.22
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	3,355
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Clients are children in foster care that qualify for Title IV-E. These children are legal wards of the State.

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,092,436)	(\$5,462,180)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,092,436)	(\$5,462,180)

FTEs	-6.82	-35.08
-------------	-------	--------

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 11 – 65% 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 care, which is a statutory responsibility (62A-4a-105).
------------	---

	<p>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 care (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>DCFS would see some reduced ability to provide basic care and supervision and clients' personal needs. Also impacted would be administrative and accountability functions, recruitment and retention of foster parents, and possibly some local agencies going out of business. JJS would experience a reduction 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>
25 %	<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. 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>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>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> <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>
25 %	<p>See above.</p>

Department of Human Services
Division(s): DCFS

Family Violence Prevention and Services

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011

—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts *	\$ 1,127,207
Number of FTEs	.61
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	2,855
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Adults and children who are victims of domestic violence receiving services through domestic violence shelters

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$56,360)	(\$281,802)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$56,360)	(\$281,802)

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

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Domestic violence shelters could see some decreased ability to serve adults and children seeking safety and services. Request for replacement State funds is an option.

25 %	Domestic violence shelters would have a significant decreased capacity. A decision would likely have to be made to either close some shelters or seriously underfund them all. Request for replacement State funds is an option.
-------------	--

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

5 %	The State would be obligated to continue to meet Federal grant requirements for remaining funds, in accordance with Federal law and rules. Federal services would not be mandated beyond funding capacity.
------------	--

25 %	See above.
-------------	------------

Department of Human Services
Division(s): EDO, DSAMH

Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011

—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts *	\$ 17,099,643
Number of FTEs	11.40
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	1,013,195*
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. The Public Health Service Act (PHSA) Section 1930.

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$854,982)	(\$4,274,911)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$854,982)	(\$4,274,911)

FTEs	-0.50	-2.50
-------------	-------	-------

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 current MOE requirement is approximately \$16,782,000.
---	--

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 %	Local Substance Abuse Authorities would see staff reductions resulting in fewer services and clients served. Request for replacement State funds is an option.
25 %	Local Substance Abuse Authorities would see significant staff reductions resulting in fewer services and clients served. Request for replacement State funds is an option.

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

Department of Human Services

Division(s): DAAS

Title V Senior Community Service Employment (SCSEP)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions

Based on Fiscal Year 2011

—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.235
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen 538-3956; Don Moss 538-4142

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts *	\$ 1,012,618
Number of FTEs	.35
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	Approx. 400
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The SCSEP program helps seniors learn job skills and places them in temporary jobs that help the community

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$50,631)	(\$253,155)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$50,631)	(\$253,155)

FTEs	0	-.05
-------------	---	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	None (10% in-kind match is provided by AAAs)
--	--

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 %	Senior employment.
25 %	Senior employment.

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 seniors would receive services, or fewer services would be provided. Request for replacement State funds is an option.

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 %	The Older Americans Act requires these programs to be run. Less funding would impact extent of services.
25 %	See above.

Department of Human Services

Division(s): 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 2011

—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts *	\$ 7,577,708
Number of FTEs	7
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	Approx. 70,100
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Vulnerable adults receiving home delivered meals, congregate meals, personal care, supportive services, transportation, nutrition counseling, etc...

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$378,885)	(\$1,894,427)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$378,885)	(\$1,894,427)

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.)	The division must certify yearly that Maintenance of Effort requirements have been met. MOE includes: 25% State match for State Admin, State Ombudsman, & Legal Services programs; 1/3 of 25% match for AAA Admin; 5% match for IIIB, C1, C2, & AAA Ombudsman programs; and 25% for IIID program. None required for the NSIP grant. 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.

<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 %	The Older Americans Act requires these programs to be run. Less funding would impact extent of services.
25 %	See above.

Department of Human Services
Division(s): DSAMH, EDO

MH & SA Projects of Regional and National Significance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts *	\$ 4,010,007
Number of FTEs	2.00
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	815
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Substance Abuse prevention services to adults from 25 – 55 years of age including physician and pharmacy training, prescription drug take-back events, website creation and maintenance, and two media campaigns. Those impacted by these activities are projected to be 4,368,735 (duplicated). Services were also provided to mentally ill youth to assist them to successfully transition to adulthood.

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$200,500)	(\$1,002,502)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$200,500)	(\$1,002,502)

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 %	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 %	Less funding to local authorities and providers would impact extent of 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 %	No.
25 %	No.

Department of Human Services
Division(s): DCFS

IV-B Subpart 2, Promoting Safe and Stable Families

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts *	\$1,895,699
Number of FTEs	8.36
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	9,243
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.

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$94,785)	(\$473,925)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$94,785)	(\$473,925)

FTEs	-0.42	-2.09
-------------	-------	-------

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. 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.

<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 %	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.

<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 %	The State would be obligated to continue to meet Federal grant requirements for remaining funds, in accordance with Federal law and rules. There are some community programs that provide services in the family support area, but less so in the other mandated categories. These programs would probably not be able to pick up the gap, and in some cases are the programs funded by this grant.
25 %	The State would be obligated to continue to meet Federal grant requirements for remaining funds, in accordance with Federal law and rules. There are some community programs that provide services in the family support area, but less so in the other mandated categories. These programs would not be able to pick up the gap, and in some cases are the programs funded by this grant.

Department of Human Services
Division(s): DCFS, EDO
Adoption Assistance Title IV-E

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts *	\$ 7,342,764
Number of FTEs	12.41
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	3,104
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.

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$367,138)	(\$1,835,690)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$367,138)	(\$1,835,690)

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.

Department of Human Services
Division(s): EDO, DSAMH, DSPD, DCFS, DAAS, JJS
Social Services Block Grant, Discretionary & TANF Transfers

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts *	\$15,815,050
Number of FTEs	123.77
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	131,487
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.

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$790,753)	(\$3,953,763)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$790,753)	(\$3,953,763)

FTEs	-4.39	-22.94
-------------	-------	--------

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.</p> <p>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.</p>
------------	---

	<p>DAAS: All SSBG is pass-through to AAAs. 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, fewer services provided to fewer people could increase homelessness or increased institutionalization. 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

<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.

Department of Human Services
Division(s): DSAMH

Block Grants for Community Mental Health Services

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts *	\$ 2,388,631
Number of FTEs	1.90
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	45,085
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Adults with Serious and Persistent Mental Illness (SPMI) and Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) children.

*See next to last block (additional information)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$119,432)	(\$597,158)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$119,432)	(\$597,158)

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 current MOE requirement is approximately \$26,800,000. 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 some staff reductions. Request for replacement State funds is an option.
25 %	Local Mental Health Authorities would see staff reductions and a significant reduction of services and clients served. Request for replacement State funds is an option.

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

Department of Insurance
Grants to States for Health Insurance Premium Review-Cycle I

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 166,121
Number of FTEs	2
Recipients/Clients Served	NA
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$8,306)	(\$41,530)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$8,306)	(\$41,530)

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>	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 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. All grant funded FTE's are temporary employees. If funding were to be cut the department may eliminate FTE's or limit the 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 the transparency database may not be as consumer friendly.

25 %	If a 25% reduction were necessary, the transparency database may not be as consumer friendly 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. If the state does not perform the duties made possible by the grant funds, the federal government would assume control.
------------	---

25 %	No. If the state does not perform the duties made possible by the grant funds, the federal government would assume control.
-------------	---

Department of Insurance
Pre-Existing Condition Insurance Plan – Federal-HIPUtah
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.529 2010 UTHRPC
Agency contact name and phone number	Tomi Ossana, (801) 485-2830

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$3,669,009
Number of FTEs	None – all Staff is contracted
Recipients/Clients Served	652
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$183,450)	(\$917,252)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$183,450)	(\$917,252)
FTEs	0	0

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

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

5 %	<p>Since 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 \$40 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 below.</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 but may not be able to afford it. 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 available to the uninsured. In the end cost of those services comes back to the taxpayers of the State of Utah 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. An example of these costs are as follows: For FY2011 an average of 267 members paid \$670,335 in premiums and incurred \$4,287,073 in claims and was made whole by a \$3,669,009 federal draw down. For FY 2012 there is an average of 878 members projected to be covered under this program. Federal-HIPUtah currently covers approximately 600 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.</p>
25 %	Same as above

Department of Insurance
Grants to State for Operation of Qualified High Risk Pools
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,793,548
Number of FTEs	None – all Staff is contracted
Recipients/Clients Served	An average of 1,110 members out of an average 4,061 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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$89,677)	(\$448,387)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: _____		
Other Fund: _____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$89,677)	(\$448,387)

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 support a Premium Assistance Subsidy Program for potential and current HIPUtah applicants. The PAS Program
------------	---

	<p>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 3,900 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 1210 in November 2010 to 906 as of August 2011. 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 Utah Labor Commission
UOSH (Utah OSHA) Compliance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,237,319	
Number of FTEs	30	
Recipients/Clients Served	1,521	Employer interventions
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	UOSH now exercises jurisdiction over 1,146,110 employees and 82,603 employers in Utah	

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$61,866)	(\$309,330)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$61,866)	(\$309,330)

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

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The agreement with federal OSHA requires 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 %	Yes, there are mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain. At a 5% reduction, the State could maintain the level of service required by Utah statute and the existing agreement with federal OSHA
25 %	Yes, there are mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain. At a 25% reduction, federal OSHA would need to determine whether the baseline requirement for compliance efforts would remain in effect as resulting staffing reductions would likely bring the Division under the staffing levels required under our federal agreement.

Utah National Guard
Military Operations and Maintenance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$24,062,873
Number of FTEs	133
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(1,203,144)	(6,015,718)
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	(1,277,534)	(6,387,668)

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 expenditures and eliminate non-essential mission function. The programs affected 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.

<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 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.</p>
25 %	<p>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 \$30 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.</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 %	No
25 %	No

**Utah National Guard
Law Enforcement Assistance**

**Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$4,969,895
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 2011:

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	\$ (248,495)	\$ (1,242,474)
State:	\$ -	\$ -
General Fund	\$ -	\$ -
Education Fund	\$ -	\$ -
Transportation Fund	\$ -	\$ -
Transportation Investment Fund	\$ -	\$ -
Restricted Fund/Account Name:	\$ -	\$ -
Other Fund:	\$ -	\$ -
Dedicated Credits	\$ -	\$ -
Other: _____	\$ -	\$ -
Other: _____	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL	\$ (248,495)	\$ (1,242,474)

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

FTEs	-3	-15
-------------	----	-----

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	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 program's funding is to provide staffing for the Counterdrug Enforcement Program. As a result of the 5% 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 program's funding is to provide staffing for the Counterdrug Enforcement Program. The National Guard would have to reduce the program staffing by 15 positions. The staffing reduction would adversely affect the intelligence 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 intelligence gathering capabilities for the Counter Drug Programs. The reduction would reduce law enforcement capabilities in stopping drug trafficking.
------------	--

25 %	The staffing reduced would adversely affect the intelligence gathering capabilities for the Counter Drug Programs. It would reduce 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.
-------------	---

Department of Natural Resources
Division of Forestry, Fire, & State Lands
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.664, 10.675, 10.676, 10.677, 15.228, 15.239, 15.242
Agency contact name and phone number	Roger Lewis, (801) 537-3206

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,478,328
Number of FTEs	24
Recipients/Clients Served	
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$273,916)	(\$1,369,582)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$273,916)	(\$1,369,582)

FTEs	-1	-6
-------------	----	----

Maintenance of Effort <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	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
COAL PROGRAM

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,834,180
Number of FTEs	18
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$91,709)	(\$458,545)
State:		
General Fund	(12,506)	(62,529)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$104,215)	(\$521,074)

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.)	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 %	The program would lose approximately 1 FTE. The permitting and inspecting process for coal mines would have to be done by remaining staff, thus causing a slower response time to the coal mines. No change in statute or rules.
25 %	The program would lose approximately 4 FTE's. The permitting and inspecting process for coal mines would have to be done by remaining staff, thus causing a much slower response time to the coal mines and not as many inspections will be performed. 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.

<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>We would still have to provide the services delegated to us by the cooperative agreement with the Secretary of the Interior.</p>
<p>25 %</p>	<p>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.</p>

Department of Natural Resources
ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION PROGRAM

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.252
Agency contact name and phone number	JILL MARRIOTT, (801) 538-5381 OR PAULA DUPIN-ZAHN (801) 538-5309

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,552,027
Number of FTEs	10
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$177,601)	(\$888,007)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$177,601)	(\$888,007)

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.)	No state match. If we participate with another federal agency we need to match with state funds as we can't match federal dollars with federal dollars, but this only happens a few times a 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 %	No change in statute or rules. We would have to cut back on engineering or construction work for the abandoned mines that remain open.
25 %	No change in statute or rules. We would have to greatly reduce cost for engineering or construction work for the abandoned mines that remain open.

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 area's where these abandoned mines are currently being considered for closure will not be done as fast. The health and safety of the local residents will be at risk. In some areas the increased OHV use makes these areas dangerous.

25 %	The local area's where these abandoned mines are currently being looked at for closure will not be done as fast. The health and safety of the local residents will be at risk. In some areas the increased OHV use makes these areas dangerous.
------	---

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 we are unable to do these services, the federal agency may need to take back the primacy.
-----	--

25 %	If we are unable to do these services, the federal agency may need to take back the primacy.
------	--

Department of Natural Resources
State Wildlife Grants

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,496,629
Number of FTEs	22.54
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$74,831)	(\$374,157)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$74,831)	(\$374,157)

FTEs	-1.13	-5.63
-------------	-------	-------

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
Sportfish Restoration

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,712,232
Number of FTEs	76.43
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$285,612)	(\$1,428,058)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Wildlife Resources Restricted Account - 1170	(71,403)	(357,015)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$357,015)	(\$1,785,073)

FTEs	-3.8	-19
-------------	------	-----

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
Section 6/Endangered Species

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
 Based on Fiscal Year 2011
 —Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.615
Agency contact name and phone number	Eric Hyatt, (801) 538-4850

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,350,370
Number of FTEs	.48
Recipients/Clients Served	Endangered Species
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	State Endangered Species Programs (specific projects)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$67,519)	(\$337,593)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$67,519)	(\$337,593)

FTEs	-03	-12
-------------	-----	-----

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

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 competitively based program in which funds are spent on land preserving endangered species or on habitat plans to manage endangered species.
25 %	This is a competitively based program in which funds are spent on land preserving endangered species or on habitat plans to manage endangered species.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	A reduction in funds would cause a reduction in the number of opportunities to preserve endangered species.

25 %	A reduction in funds would cause a reduction in the number of opportunities to preserve endangered species.
-------------	---

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

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

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

Department of Natural Resources
Cooperative Agreements

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
 Based on Fiscal Year 2011
 —Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,187,305
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	Pubic
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Co-Operative Projects, Watershed

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$159,365)	(\$796,826)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$159,365)	(\$796,826)

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

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

Wildlife Restoration

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions

Based on Fiscal Year 2011

—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 6,311,515
Number of FTEs	64.86
Recipients/Clients Served	Public
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	xAll Big Game Species, Habitat Management, Hunter Education, Administration of Fed Funds

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$315,576)	(\$1,577,879)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Wildlife Resources Restricted Account - 1170	(78,894)	(394,470)
Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$394,470)	(\$1,972,348)

FTEs	-3.25	-16.22
------	-------	--------

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
Office of Rehabilitation, Vocational Rehabilitation

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 40,791,608
Number of FTEs	190.3
Recipients/Clients Served	28,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Citizens of Utah

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$2,039,580)	(\$10,197,902)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$2,039,580)	(\$10,197,902)

Funds are primarily used for counselors and client services.

FTEs	-10.0	-48.0
-------------	-------	-------

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 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 2011, we must meet the amount of state funds equivalent to or above what were expended on the VR grant in 2009.
--	--

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
Assessment and Accountability**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.369, 84.372 (FY 12 is last year)
Agency contact name and phone number	Sydnee Dickson, (801) 538-7739

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 8,105,066
Number of FTEs	6.0
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Public Schools (School Children)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$405,253)	(\$2,026,267)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$405,253)	(\$2,026,267)

FTEs	-0.05	-2.0
-------------	-------	------

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 %	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
Child Nutrition Programs

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 151,921,817
Number of FTEs	20.0
Recipients/Clients Served	x
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$7,596,091)	(\$37,980,454)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$7,596,091)	(\$37,980,454)

Education funding at district level will be impacted as transfers are required from M&O to or from school lunch program fund, 98 percent of these funds flow to other organizations.

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

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	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.
25 %	At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and reimbursement rates.

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 Administration allocation has not historically been fully used, so reductions would be implemented in this allocation.
25 %	At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and reimbursement rates.

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 reimbursement rates.
25 %	At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and reimbursement rates.

Board of Education
Career and Technology Education

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 23,873,454
Number of FTEs	12.5
Recipients/Clients Served	x
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,193,673)	(\$5,968,364)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,193,673)	(\$5,968,364)

Education funding at district level will be impacted 64 percent of these funds flow to other organizations.

FTEs	-0.625	-3.125
-------------	--------	--------

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 an MOE 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
Special Education IDEA

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.027, 84.173
Agency contact name and phone number	Glenna Gallo, (801) 538-7898

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 108,690,291
Number of FTEs	22.55
Recipients/Clients Served	x
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	School Districts and Charter Schools (School Children)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$5,434,515)	(\$27,172,573)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$5,434,515)	(\$27,172,573)

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

FTEs	-1.0	-6.0
-------------	------	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The SEA has an MOE of prior year fiscal support. The LEA has an MOE of prior year expenditure level.
--	--

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 %	Special education and related services to all children with disabilities cannot be reduced if under IEP.
25 %	Special education and related services to all children with disabilities cannot be reduced if under IEP.

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 %	Special education and related services to all children with disabilities cannot be reduced if under IEP.

25 %	Special education and related services to all children with disabilities cannot be reduced if under IEP.
------	--

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 %	IEP services would continue regardless of federal support.
-----	--

25 %	IEP services would continue regardless of federal support.
------	--

Board of Education
Teaching and Learning

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.318, 84.357 (FY 12 is last year), 84.365, 84.366, 84.367
Agency contact name and phone number	Sydnee Dickson, (801) 538-7739

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 30,507,598
Number of FTEs	2.9
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Public Schools (School Children)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,525,380)	(\$7,626,900)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,525,380)	(\$7,626,900)

Funds are primarily sent to schools (95%).

FTEs	0.0	-1.0
-------------	-----	------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Teacher Quality and English Language Acquisition have MOE requirements at 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 %	Distribution amounts will be revised downward for professional development in math and science as well as reductions in funding for technology in the classroom.
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 professional development offerings in math and science as well as reductions in funding for technology in the classroom and English language services to students.

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

Title I

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 79,913,069
Number of FTEs	9.4
Recipients/Clients Served	x
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	School Districts and Charter Schools (School Children)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$3,995,653)	(\$19,978,267)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$3,995,653)	(\$19,978,267)

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

FTEs	-0.5	-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.
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.

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

25 %	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.
-------------	---

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

Department of PUBLIC SAFETY
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT FEDERAL FUNDS

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	97.008, 97.023, 97.036, 97.040, 97.042, 97.045, 97.047, 97.052, 97.055, 97.067, 97.078, 97.082, 11.555
Agency contact name and phone number	Russell Fillmore, (801) 538-3754

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 27,228,171
Number of FTEs	52
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,398,938)	(\$6,994,690)
State:		
General Fund	(47,250)	(236,250)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,446,188)	(\$7,230,940)

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 (\$1,049,203 reduction); 14% personnel costs (\$195,852 reduction); 8% current expenses (\$111,915 reduction); and approximately 3% other (\$41,968 reduction). A 5% reduction in federal funding would not 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.
25 %	The division's budget profile consists of; 75% pass thru to local, State, and tribal governments (\$5,246,017 reduction); 14% personnel costs (\$979,257 reduction); 8% current expenses (\$559,575 reduction); and approximately 3% other (\$209,841 reduction). 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 able 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
Forensic/DNA

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	87.16.748, 87.16.741, 87.16.742
Agency contact name and phone number	Joseph Brown, (801) 965-4476

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,061,312
Number of FTEs	1
Recipients/Clients Served	Varies
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Law enforcement both state and local

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$53,066)	(\$265,328)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$53,066)	(\$265,328)

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 %	Test less convicted offender DNA samples to be entered into the CODIS database increasing the backlog of samples.
25 %	Test even less convicted offender DNA samples to be entered into the CODIS database increasing substantially the backlog of samples. Also impact the lab's ability to test samples from rapes, homicides and assaults.

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 and state agencies would have to find another source to test samples
25 %	Local and state agencies would have to find another source to test samples

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 Public Safety
Commercial Driver License/REAL ID

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	87.20.232, 87.97.089, 97.094
Agency contact name and phone number	Joseph Brown, (801) 965-4476

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$850,148
Number of FTEs	3
Recipients/Clients Served	0
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Trucking companies, all citizens of Utah having a driver license

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$42,507)	(\$212,537)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$42,507)	(\$212,537)

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 %	Reduce non-personnel expenditures that these funds are currently being used for like the purchase of equipment or mailings
25 %	These funds are being used in lieu of state funds to put into place laws passed by the Utah legislature. The legislature passed laws to increase security on Driver License but then cut the funding due to budget shortfalls. Fortunately, these federal funds were accessed to offset the cuts made by the legislature and we can continue to implement laws put in place by the Utah legislature. If these funds are reduced, then state funds (restricted funds) will used to offset the reductions.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	None

25 %	None
------	------

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 Public Safety
Highway Safety Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$5,170,006
Number of FTEs	17
Recipients/Clients Served	State-wide Population
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$258,500)	(\$1,292,502)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$258,500)	(\$1,292,502)

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, 20.609, and 20.613 require maintenance of effort if any federal in those respective areas is 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 Public Safety
Hazardous Materials and Training

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	87.20.703
Agency contact name and phone number	Joseph Brown, (801) 965-4476

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$249,767
Number of FTEs	1
Recipients/Clients Served	0
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Trucking companies, all citizens of Utah having a driver license

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$12,488)	(\$62,442)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$12,488)	(\$62,442)

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 %	Reduce pass-through to local governments for hazardous materials training
25 %	Reduce in half, pass-through to local governments for hazardous materials training

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 funds for training on the local level
25 %	Less funds for training on the local 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 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Public Safety
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	87.95.001
Agency contact name and phone number	Joseph Brown, (801) 965-4476

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$610,586
Number of FTEs	5
Recipients/Clients Served	0
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	These funds are used to find and prosecute individuals transporting illegal drugs in Utah

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$30,529)	(\$152,647)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$30,529)	(\$152,647)

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 %	Reduce interdiction overtime shifts, training, and travel
25 %	This grant is split between Public Safety and the AGs office with each receiving approximately half the amount. The amount to the AGs office would be reduced by approx. \$76,000 most likely resulting in a full-time attorney working strictly these high intensity drug trafficking cases being let go. Public Safety would curtail interdiction overtime shifts, training, and travel.

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 %	Roads would be less save for all citizens of Utah
------------	---

25 %	Roads would be less save for all citizens of 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 %	No
------------	----

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

Department of Public Safety
Equitable Federal Sharing

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	Various
Agency contact name and phone number	Joseph Brown, (801) 965-4476

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$500,000
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	0
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Trucking companies, all citizens of Utah having a driver license

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$25,000)	(\$125,000)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$25,000)	(\$125,000)

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 %	These funds can only be used for purchasing of equipment so this would result in less equipment being purchased to replace old equipment
25 %	These funds can only be used for purchasing of equipment so this would result in less equipment being purchased to replace old equipment

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

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

Tax Commission
Federal Oil & Gas Royalty Management
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	NA
Agency contact name and phone number	Julie Alsop, (801) 297-3815

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 506,108
Number of FTEs	N/A – see footnote.*
Recipients/Clients Served	Ongoing Audit Service Contract .
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Federal/state audits and related investigations of oil, gas, coal and solid minerals or geo-thermal steam leases, administered by the Dept of Interior, located in the State of Utah

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	N/A - see footnote	N/A - see footnote
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	N/A	N/A

FTEs	N/A – see footnote.*	N/A – see footnote.*
-------------	----------------------	----------------------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Dedicated funds - not subject to federal shutdown.
--	--

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 %	N/A – see footnote.*
25 %	N/A – see footnote.*

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

25 %	N/A – see footnote.*
-------------	----------------------

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 – see footnote.*
------------	----------------------

25 %	N/A – see footnote.*
-------------	----------------------

Department of Transportation
Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,709,992
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	<p>20.218 - The MCSAP is a Federal grant program that provides financial assistance to States to reduce the number and severity of accidents and hazardous materials incidents involving commercial motor vehicles (CMV). The goal of the MCSAP is to reduce CMV-involved accidents, fatalities, and injuries through consistent, uniform, and effective CMV safety programs. Investing grant monies in appropriate safety programs will increase the likelihood that safety defects, driver deficiencies, and unsafe motor carrier practices will be detected and corrected before they become contributing factors to accidents.</p> <p>20.237 - The CVISN grant program provides financial assistance to eligible States to (1) improve the safety and productivity of commercial vehicles and drivers; and (2) reduce costs associated with commercial vehicle operation and federal and State commercial vehicle regulatory requirements. The program shall advance the technological capability and promote the deployment of intelligent transportation system applications for commercial vehicle operations, including commercial vehicle, commercial driver, and carrier-specific information systems and networks.</p>

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$135,499)	(\$677,498)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$135,499)	(\$677,498)

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>In accordance with the provisions of 49 CFR Part 350.301, States must maintain a level of effort to qualify for MCSAP funding, including:</p> <p>(a). The State must maintain the average aggregate expenditure of the State and its political subdivisions, exclusive of Federal funds and State matching funds, for CMV safety programs eligible for funding under this part at a level at least equal to the average level of expenditure for the 3 full fiscal years beginning after October 1 of the year 5 years prior to the beginning of each Government fiscal year.</p> <p>(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
---	--

	<p>programs.</p> <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 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,714,229
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	48 Recipients/ 176,821 clients served
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	<p>20.509 - Support public transportation for the general public in non-urbanized areas: Cache County, Park City, Ute Indian Tribe, Navajo Nation Indian Tribe, Uintah Basin and Cedar City areas. Also, assists in the development and support of Intercity Bus transportation.</p> <p>20.513 - Assist the transportation needs of the elderly and persons with disabilities when the transportation service provided is unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate.</p> <p>20.516 - JARC addresses the unique transportation challenges faced by welfare recipients and low-income persons seeking to obtain and maintain employment.</p> <p>20.521 - 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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$135,711)	(\$678,557)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$135,711)	(\$678,557)

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>No state funds are used for match. All matching funds are provided by either the local sales tax revenue or by local agencies.</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 %	All program aspects would 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 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 %	Programs would be cut to match available funds for services locally.
25 %	Programs would be cut to match available funds for services locally.

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. 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. There are no other resources available to meet these needs.

Department of Transportation
Highway Planning & Construction Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 251,307,773	Note: Federal Apportionment amount is \$288.6 million.
Number of FTEs	0	
Recipients/Clients Served	State and Local Governments, and MPOs	
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 2011:

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

Note: based upon Federal Apportionment amount would be \$14.4 million @ 5% and \$72.2 million @ 25%.

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$12,565,388)	(\$62,826,943)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$12,565,388)	(\$62,826,943)

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, "Take Care of What We Have". 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, "Take Care of What We Have".

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 Veterans Affairs
Veterans Nursing Homes

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 7,002,615
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	325
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Elderly nursing home patients

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$350,130)	(\$1,750,654)
State:	0	0
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		
_____	0	0
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$350,130)	(\$1,750,654)

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

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

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	The federal VA pays approximately 50% of the nursing home costs, and the resident/family has to pay the remainder. A 5% decrease would result in an increased financial burden on the families of the veterans in the nursing homes and/or a reduction in services provided to the residents.
25 %	A 25% reduction would place a very heavy burden on the families of the veterans and require substantial decreases in services and could result in the closure of the facility – denying benefits to all veterans.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	The residents would not have the full range of nursing home services that they now enjoy, or the financial burden to veterans and their families would be proportionally greater.

25 %	The financial burden to the residents/families would be so great as to impact their ability to stay in the nursing home. Loss of enough residents could cause the facility to close, thus denying nursing home benefits to all. Such a reduction in services would essentially end the program services. Many residents of limited income would be forced to leave the nursing home and seek alternative placement in facilities with Medicaid beds (the State Veterans 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

Child Care

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 45,054,413
Number of FTEs	58.32
Recipients/Clients Served	11,436 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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$2,252,721)	(\$11,263,603)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$2,252,721)	(\$11,263,603)

FTEs	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, 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.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Depending upon the services reduced there could be fewer after-school programs or greater turn-over at child care facilities if the career ladder programs were cut back.
25 %	Cutting back quality activities would have a long lasting impact including reductions in the skill level and training of child care providers and reductions in available child care. Reducing the population served and reducing the amount of the subsidy would have similar effects. The Child Care subsidy allows low income working parents to work and have their children in safe quality facilities. Without the subsidy parents could lose jobs or place children in unsafe child care environments.

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

Department of Workforce Services
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 416,380,339
Number of FTEs	499.18
Recipients/Clients Served	268,856 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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$20,819,017)	(\$104,095,085)
State:		
General Fund	(1,270,360)	(6,351,799)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$22,089,377)	(\$110,446,884)

FTEs	-29.61	-148.06
-------------	--------	---------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Most non-benefit costs are at a 50/50 match rate for SNAP. In 2011 the State portion of the SNAP costs were: \$25,407,197.01
--	---

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.
<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 eligible persons must be served.
25 %	All eligible persons must be served.

Department of Workforce Services
Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,322,972
Number of FTEs	14.15
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$116,149)	(\$580,743)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$116,149)	(\$580,743)

FTEs	-0.70	-3.53
-------------	-------	-------

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 2012 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
Refugee Cash and Medical

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	Refugee CMA (CFDA 93.566)
Agency contact name and phone number	Dan Schuring (801) 526-4306

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$5,831,968
Number of FTEs	11.42
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Refugees

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$291,598)	(\$1,457,992)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$291,598)	(\$1,457,992)

FTEs	-4.9	-11.42
-------------	------	--------

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.

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 4.9 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.
-------------	---

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

5 %	Refugee Cash and Medical 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
Temporary Assistance For Needy Families (TANF)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—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 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 83,141,866
Number of FTEs	516.04
Recipients/Clients Served	6,860
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Unemployed and underemployed families with dependent children.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$4,157,093)	(\$20,785,467)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$4,157,093)	(\$20,785,467)

FTEs	-2.0	-55
-------------	------	-----

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 a 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 be 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 funding, about \$8.7 million, has already been eliminated from the TANF money available to the state. That cut, coupled with a 25% cut, would result in an effective 33% cut to the state from FY 11 levels.</p>

Department of Workforce Services
Trade Adjustment Assistance

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.225, 17.245
Agency contact name and phone number	Dan Schuring, (801) 526-4306

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 6,383,948
Number of FTEs	12.15
Recipients/Clients Served	1,144
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$319,197)	(\$1,595,987)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$319,197)	(\$1,595,987)

FTEs	0	-1.53
-------------	---	-------

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. The amount expended during SFY 2011 only represents 48% of the available funds. 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 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$26,118,075
Number of FTEs	336
Recipients/Clients Served	
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Unemployment Insurance claimants, employers

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,305,904)	(\$6,529,519)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$1,305,904)	(\$6,529,519)

FTEs	-18.3	-91.5
-------------	-------	-------

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 %	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 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

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

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$10,081,957	Wagner-Peyser: \$9,085,062 (this amount will not be available in full after 2011) Veterans: \$996,895
Number of FTEs	Wagner-Peyser: 110.31 Veterans: 15.78	
Recipients/Clients Served	140,069	
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$504,098)	(\$2,520,489)
State:		
General Fund	0	0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$504,098)	(\$2,520,489)

FTEs	-6.3	-31.5
-------------	------	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	None. It should be noted that the FY 11 federal receipts for Wagner-Peyser include expenditures from prior year funding; the percentage of cuts are based solely on the FY 12 funding 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 %	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 31 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 31 FTE's would limit the availability of services to clients coming into employment centers, and employers seeking for assistance in recruiting.
-------------	---

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

5 %	No mandatory services will be affected.
------------	---

25 %	Mandatory services will still be provided, but the speed, efficiency and quality of providing those services may be affected.
-------------	---

Department of Workforce Services
Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions
Based on Fiscal Year 2011
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.258, 17.259, 17.260, 17.276, 17.277, 17.278
Agency contact name and phone number	Dan Schuring, (801) 526-4306

Fiscal Year 2011 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 11,592,998
Number of FTEs	58.49
Recipients/Clients Served	392,250
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 2011:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$579,650)	(\$2,898,250)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		

Other Fund:		

Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$579,650)	(\$2,898,250)

FTEs	-0.58	-3.92
-------------	-------	-------

Maintenance of Effort (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There are no Maintenance of Effort 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.