

# State of Utah

## Federal Receipts Reporting

Fiscal Year 2016



UTAH DEPARTMENT OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

Division of Finance Accounting Standards and  
Financial Reporting Section

## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	v
Explanation of Information .....	v
Federal Receipts Report:	
Designated State Agencies .....	1
Institutions of Higher Education .....	4
Local Education Agencies .....	7
State Agency Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions:	
<b>Agriculture and Food</b>	
Meat and Poultry Inspection .....	11
<b>Board of Regents and Student Assistance Programs</b>	
Student Loan Guarantee Program .....	13
Student Loan Purchase Program .....	15
<b>Environmental Quality</b>	
Drinking Water Federal State Revolving Funds (FSRF) .....	17
Nonpoint Source Project Grants .....	21
Performance Partnership Grants .....	23
Superfund Sites .....	25
Water Quality State Revolving Fund Loans .....	27
<b>Health</b>	
Affordable Care Act – Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program .....	29
Asthma .....	31
Children’s Health Insurance Program – CHIP/CHIPACAID .....	33
Collaborating to Develop and Enhance Biomonitoring Capability to Assess Human Exposure .....	35
Environmental Health Tracking .....	37
EPICC Diabetes, Nutrition, Physical Activity, Obesity, School Health..	39
Epidemiology and Lab Capacity for Infectious Disease .....	41
Grant to States to Support Health Insurance Rate Reviews .....	43
Hospital Preparedness Program .....	45
Immunization and Vaccines for Children .....	49
Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities .....	51
Maternal and Child Health Block Grant .....	53
Medicaid – Federal Survey and Certification Title 19 .....	55
Medicaid – Medical Assistance Program .....	57
Medicaid – Federal Survey and Certification Title 18 .....	59
National Cancer Prevention and Control .....	61

**Health (continued)**

Prescription Drug Overdose, Abuse, Misuse Prevention; Sexual Violence; Violent Death Reporting; Core Violence & Injury Prevention .....	63
Preventive Health Services Block .....	65
Public Health Emergency Preparedness & PEHP Ebola .....	67
Ryan White Part B (Ryan White Care Act Title II, Ryan White Part B Supplemental and ADAP Shortfall Relief .....	69
Tobacco Control Program .....	71
Utah WISEWOMAN Program .....	73
Vaccine Distributions .....	75
Women, Infant and Children (WIC) Program .....	77
Women, Infant and Children (WIC) Technology .....	79

**Heritage and Arts**

Division of Arts and Museums .....	81
AmeriCorps (Corporation for National and Community Service) .....	83
Division of State History .....	85
Utah State Library General Operations .....	87

**Human Services**

Adoption Assistance Title IV-E .....	89
Block Grants for Community Mental Health Services .....	91
Child Welfare Title IV-B Subpart 1 .....	93
Family Violence Prevention and Services .....	95
Foster Care Title IV-E .....	97
IV-B Subpart 2, Promoting Safe and Stable Families .....	99
IV-D Child Support Collections / Incentives .....	101
Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse .....	103
Projects of Regional and National Significance .....	105
Social Services Block Grant, Discretionary & TANF Transfers .....	107
Title III Grants for State & Community Programs on Aging and Nutritional Services Incentive Program (NSIP) .....	109

**Labor Commission**

UOSHA (Utah OSHA) Compliance .....	111
------------------------------------	-----

**National Guard**

Law Enforcement Assistance .....	113
Military Construction Cooperative Agreement .....	115
Military Operations and Maintenance .....	117

**Natural Resources**

Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program .....	121
Boating Safety Coast Guard .....	123
Coal Program .....	125
Cooperative Agreements .....	127

Continues

<b>Natural Resources (continued)</b>	
Fish, Wildlife, and Plant Conservation Resource Management .....	129
Forestry, Fire, and State Lands .....	131
Recreational Trails Program .....	133
Sportfish Restoration .....	135
Wildlife Restoration .....	137
<b>Public Education</b>	
ASPIRE .....	139
Assessment and Accountability .....	141
Career and Technology Education .....	143
Child Nutrition Programs .....	145
Elementary Secondary Education Act .....	149
Office of Rehabilitation, Disability Determination Services .....	151
Office of Rehabilitation, Vocational Rehabilitation .....	153
Special Education IDEA .....	155
Teaching and Learning .....	157
<b>Public Safety</b>	
Emergency Management Federal Funds .....	159
Highway Safety Program .....	161
<b>Transportation</b>	
Highway Planning and Construction Program .....	163
Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program .....	165
Public Transit Program .....	169
<b>Veterans' Affairs</b>	
Veterans Nursing Homes .....	171
<b>Workforce Services</b>	
Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) .....	173
Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) .....	175
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) .....	177
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) .....	179
Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program .....	181
Employment Service (EC) Cluster .....	183
Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) .....	185
Refugee and Entrant Assistance .....	187
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) .....	189
Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) .....	191
Trade Adjustment Assistance .....	193
Unemployment Insurance (UI) .....	195
Weatherization Assistance for Low-Income Persons .....	197
Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Cluster .....	199

This page intentionally left blank.

## Introduction

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

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

## Explanation of Information

Federal receipts can vary significantly from year to year for certain federal programs while receipts for other federal programs are fairly constant. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) provided one-time federal money mostly in state fiscal years 2010 and 2011. There was a small amount of ARRA money spent in fiscal year 2016 which is presented separately and is not included in the agency plans of potential 5 percent and 25 percent reductions.

### Federal Receipts

The basis for reporting federal receipts is from the State's fiscal year 2016 Single Audit Report for state agencies and state colleges and universities (USHE). The Single Audit Report is published by the Office of the Utah State Auditor at the conclusion of their audit of federal programs. The financial information included in the Single Audit Report and this Report is prepared by the Division of Finance from the State's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) using information from the State's central accounting system and from information submitted by state agencies.

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

Local education districts and charter schools (LEAs) are not included in the State's Single Audit Report or CAFR. The information presented is from the LEA's Annual Financial Report; this is unaudited information that was submitted to the Utah State Board of Education. Audited financial statements are due by November 30, 2016, and will be reconciled to their annual financial reports. Also, the LEA federal revenues are titled as *Federal Revenues from All Sources* to note that they include both ARRA and non-ARRA grants that come from state agencies as well as direct federal assistance to the LEAs.

### Budget

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

The *Final Agency Total Budget* for designated state agencies is from the fiscal year 2016 State of Utah CAFR, Detail Budgetary Comparison Schedules.

The *Budgeted Expenditures* for USHE are the expenditures as reported in the fiscal year 2016 State of Utah CAFR in the Statement of Activities for Component Units.

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

### Comparisons

The Federal Receipts Report — Designated 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. Some of the situations in fiscal year 2016 for receipts exceeding appropriations may include:

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

### 5% and 25% Plan of Potential Reductions

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

*(Remainder of page is blank.)*

*(This page intentionally left blank.)*

**State of Utah**  
**Federal Receipts Report — Designated State Agencies**  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

Designated State Agency	Federal Funds Receipts <i>(1)</i>	Federal Funds Appropriated <i>(2)</i>	Appropriated Over/(Under) Receipts <i>(2) - (1)</i>	Final Agency Total Budget <i>(3)</i>	Federal Receipts % of Total Budget <i>(1)/(3)</i>	5% of Non ARRA Fed. Receipts <i>(1) x 5%</i>	25% of Non ARRA Fed. Receipts <i>(1) x 25%</i>
<b>Administrative Services</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 28,376	\$ 41,400	\$ 13,024	\$ 49,337,000	0.1%	\$ 1,419	\$ 7,094
<b>Agriculture and Food</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 9,815,712	\$ 12,313,400	\$ 2,497,688	\$ 41,020,000	23.9%	\$ 490,786	\$ 2,453,928
<b>Board of Regents</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 1,163,480	\$ 303,100	\$ (860,380)	\$ 47,250,000	2.5%	\$ 58,174	\$ 290,870
<b>Commerce</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 384,359	\$ 308,200	\$ (76,159)	\$ 37,605,000	1.0%	\$ 19,218	\$ 96,090
<b>Corrections</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 327,139	\$ 394,700	\$ 67,561	\$ 298,709,000	0.1%	\$ 16,357	\$ 81,785
<b>Environmental Quality</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 16,919,688	\$ 32,482,600	\$ 15,562,912	\$ 54,521,000	31.0%	\$ 845,984	\$ 4,229,922
<b>Governor's Office of Economic Development</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 959,611	\$ 1,013,300	\$ 53,689	\$ 94,619,000	1.0%	\$ 47,981	\$ 239,903
<b>Health</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 1,906,075,985	\$ 1,990,213,200	\$ 84,137,215			\$ 95,303,799	\$ 476,518,996
ARRA funding	2,946,886	11,975,000	9,028,114				
	<u>\$ 1,909,022,871</u>	<u>\$ 2,002,188,200</u>	<u>\$ 93,165,329</u>	\$ 2,953,306,000	64.6%		
<b>Heritage and Arts</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 7,209,195	\$ 7,804,700	\$ 595,505	\$ 31,392,000	23.0%	\$ 360,460	\$ 1,802,299
<b>Human Services</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 123,020,928	\$ 136,353,200	\$ 13,332,272	\$ 777,588,000	15.8%	\$ 6,151,046	\$ 30,755,232
<b>Insurance</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 576,355	\$ 1,234,600	\$ 658,245	\$ 15,307,000	3.8%	\$ 28,818	\$ 144,089
<b>Labor Commission</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 2,857,647	\$ 3,076,500	\$ 218,853	\$ 13,937,000	20.5%	\$ 142,882	\$ 714,412

Continues

**State of Utah**  
**Federal Receipts Report — Designated State Agencies**  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

Continued

Designated State Agency	Federal Funds Receipts <i>(1)</i>	Federal Funds Appropriated <i>(2)</i>	Appropriated Over/(Under) Receipts <i>(2) - (1)</i>	Final Agency Total Budget <i>(3)</i>	Federal Receipts % of Total Budget <i>(1)/(3)</i>	5% of Non ARRA Fed. Receipts <i>(1) x 5%</i>	25% of Non ARRA Fed. Receipts <i>(1) x 25%</i>
<b>National Guard</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 40,765,068	\$ 46,750,800	\$ 5,985,732	\$ 47,714,000	85.4%	\$ 2,038,253	\$ 10,191,267
<b>Natural Resources</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 39,324,747	\$ 61,613,100	\$ 22,288,353	\$ 249,768,000	15.7%	\$ 1,966,237	\$ 9,831,187
<b>Public Education *</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 471,565,931	\$ 545,796,500	\$ 74,230,569	\$ 3,636,623,000	13.0%	\$ 23,578,297	\$ 117,891,483
<b>Public Safety</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 20,825,620	\$ 38,648,500	\$ 17,822,880	\$ 217,722,000	9.6%	\$ 1,041,281	\$ 5,206,405
<b>Tax Commission</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 535,663	\$ 590,600	\$ 54,937	\$ 94,295,000	0.6%	\$ 26,783	\$ 133,916
<b>Technology Services</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 10,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 290,000	\$ 3,067,000	0.3%	\$ 500	\$ 2,500
<b>Transportation</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 307,354,326	\$ 182,726,300	\$(124,628,026)	\$ 1,264,963,000	24.3%	\$ 15,367,716	\$ 76,838,582
<b>Veterans' Affairs **</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 21,269,687	\$ 622,800	\$ (20,646,887)	\$ 4,526,000	469.9%	\$ 1,063,484	\$ 5,317,422
<b>Workforce Services</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 632,643,547	\$ 739,483,200	\$ 106,839,653	\$ 727,080,000	87.0%	\$ 31,632,177	\$ 158,160,887
<b>TOTALS</b>							
Federal grants	\$ 3,603,633,064	\$ 3,802,070,700	\$ 198,437,636			\$ 180,181,652	\$ 900,908,269
ARRA funding	2,946,886	11,975,000	9,028,114				
	<u>\$ 3,606,579,950</u>	<u>\$ 3,814,045,700</u>	<u>\$ 207,465,750</u>	<u>\$10,660,349,000</u>	33.8%		

\* 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. The Utah State Office of Rehabilitation moves to Workforces Services in fiscal year 2017.

\*\* Veterans' Affairs received \$20.708 million in Federal funds that are not subject to appropriation.

Continues

**State of Utah**  
**Federal Receipts Report — Designated State Agencies**  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

Continued

**Designated State Agencies with no Federal Receipts:**

Alcoholic Beverage Control  
Financial Institutions  
Human Resource Management  
Public Service Commission

**Enterprise Funds**

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

	Employers' Premiums	Federal Funds Receipts	5% of Non ARRA Fed. Receipts	25% of Non ARRA Fed. Receipts
Unemployment Compensation Fund				
– Workforce Services	\$ 182,884,758	\$ 73,584	\$ 3,679	\$ 18,396
Unemployment Compensation Fund ARRA				
– Workforce Services		\$ 2,011,068	\$ 100,553	\$ 502,767
Water Loan Programs – Environmental Quality		\$ 10,381,000	\$ 519,050	\$ 2,595,250
Housing Loan Programs – Workforce Services		\$ 3,348,653	\$ 167,433	\$ 837,163
Water Resources Engineering and Planning				
– Natural Resources		\$ 653,168	\$ 32,658	\$ 163,292
Student Assistance Programs – Board of Regents ***		\$ (29,412,834)	\$ (1,470,642)	\$ (7,353,209)

\*\*\* The Student Assistance Programs had FY 2016 Federal revenues of \$34.2 million less student loan special allowance payments of \$63.6 million resulting in a negative balance of \$29.4 million. The student loan interest and special allowance rates, set by Federal statute, have traditionally been intended to adjust student loan yields upward to market, resulting in additional positive income. However, in the current low interest rate environment, the Federally mandated formula has placed the student loan yield above market, requiring the difference to be refunded to the Federal government.

Sources:

Federal Funds Receipts — Fiscal Year 2016 Single Audit expenditures with American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) listed separately.

Does not include federal loan program activity and balances reported as Single Audit expenditures beginning fiscal year 2016.

Federal Funds Appropriated — Appropriated federal funds from line items in appropriation acts.

Final Agency Total Budget — Fiscal Year 2016 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, 2016

<u>Colleges and Universities</u>	<u>Federal Funds Receipts *</u>	<u>Budgeted Expenditures</u>	<u>Federal Receipts % of Total Budget</u>	<u>State Appropriated Federal Funds</u>
<b>University of Utah **</b>				
Institution	\$ 20,459,777			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	31,416,994			—
Research and Development	258,999,226			—
ARRA	55,842			—
	<u>\$ 310,931,839</u>	\$ 4,006,287,000	7.8%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Utah State University</b>				
Institution	\$ 17,737,531			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	39,209,801			—
Research and Development	124,082,471			3,902,300
ARRA	58,938			—
	<u>\$ 181,088,741</u>	\$ 660,891,000	27.4%	<u>\$ 3,902,300</u>
<b>Dixie State University</b>				
Institution	\$ 1,172,482			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	14,544,606			—
Research and Development	28,606			—
	<u>\$ 15,745,694</u>	\$ 99,819,000	15.8%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Salt Lake Community College</b>				
Institution	\$ 3,141,131			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	29,816,602			—
Research and Development	266,296			—
	<u>\$ 33,224,029</u>	\$ 211,802,000	15.7%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Snow College</b>				
Institution	\$ 726,467			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	6,390,317			—
	<u>\$ 7,116,784</u>	\$ 50,077,000	14.2%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Southern Utah University</b>				
Institution	\$ 6,800,307			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	12,505,706			—
Research and Development	130,177			—
	<u>\$ 19,436,190</u>	\$ 149,628,000	13.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Utah Valley University</b>				
Institution	\$ 6,414,416			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	46,534,949			—
Research and Development	734,011			—
	<u>\$ 53,683,376</u>	\$ 307,368,000	17.5%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Weber State University</b>				
Institution	\$ 2,449,110			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	27,549,098			—
Research and Development	116,941			—
	<u>\$ 30,115,149</u>	<u>\$ 228,589,000</u>	13.2%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Total — Colleges and Universities</b>	<u>\$ 651,341,802</u>	<u>\$ 5,714,461,000</u>	11.4%	<u>\$ 3,902,300</u>

Continues

**State of Utah**  
**Federal Receipts Report — Institutions of Higher Education**  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

Continued

<u>Utah College of Applied Technology</u>	<u>Federal Funds Receipts *</u>	<u>Budgeted Expenditures</u>	<u>Federal Receipts % of Total Budget</u>	<u>State Appropriated Federal Funds</u>
<b>Bridgerland</b>				
Student Financial Aid	\$ 895,397			\$ —
	<u>\$ 895,397</u>	\$ 16,864,000	5.3%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Davis</b>				
Student Financial Aid	\$ 1,129,159			\$ —
	<u>\$ 1,129,159</u>	\$ 21,837,000	5.2%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Dixie</b>				
Student Financial Aid	\$ 429,997			\$ —
	<u>\$ 429,997</u>	\$ 6,034,000	7.1%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Mountainland</b>				
Student Financial Aid	\$ 715,535			\$ —
	<u>\$ 715,535</u>	\$ 13,409,000	5.3%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Ogden-Weber</b>				
Institution	\$ 522,352			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	1,481,648			—
	<u>\$ 2,004,000</u>	\$ 21,865,000	9.2%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Southwest</b>				
Student Financial Aid	\$ 183,967			\$ —
	<u>\$ 183,967</u>	\$ 4,897,000	3.8%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Tooele</b>				
	<u>\$ —</u>	\$ 3,925,000	0.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Uintah Basin</b>				
Student Financial Aid	\$ 120,629			\$ —
	<u>\$ 120,629</u>	\$ 9,689,000	1.2%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>UCAT Administration</b>				
	<u>\$ —</u>	<u>\$ 2,172,000</u>	0.0%	<u>\$ —</u>
<b>Total — Utah College of Applied Technology</b>				
	<u>\$ 5,478,684</u>	<u>\$ 100,692,000</u>	5.4%	<u>\$ —</u>

Continues

**State of Utah**  
**Federal Receipts Report — Institutions of Higher Education**  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

Continued

<u>ALL Institutions of Higher Education</u>	<u>Federal Funds Receipts *</u>	<u>Budgeted Expenditures</u>	<u>Federal Receipts % of Total Budget</u>	<u>State Appropriated Federal Funds</u>
<b>TOTALS</b>				
Institution	\$ 59,423,573			\$ —
Student Financial Aid	212,924,405			—
Research and Development	384,357,728			3,902,300
ARRA	<u>114,780</u>			<u>—</u>
<b>Total — All Institutions of Higher Education</b>	<u>\$ 656,820,486</u>	<u>\$ 5,815,153,000</u>	11.3%	<u>\$ 3,902,300</u>

\* Federal receipts acquired directly by the institutions.

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

Sources:

Federal Funds Receipts — FY 2016 Single Audit expenditures categorized by type of federal assistance: Institution, Student Financial Aid, Research and Development, and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Institution is primarily the core instruction component and operation of the institution of higher education. Does not include federal loan program activity and balances reported as Single Audit expenditures beginning fiscal year 2016.

Budgeted Expenditures — FY 2016 State of Utah Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) college and university expenditures in the Statement of Activities for Component Units.

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

**State of Utah**  
**Federal Receipts Report — Local Education Agencies**  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

School Districts	Federal Revenues from All Sources *	Budgeted Expenditures	Percent of Budgeted Expenditures From Federal Revenues
Alpine District.....	\$ 36,792,764	\$ 710,705,048	5.2%
Beaver District.....	1,795,792	18,465,949	9.7%
Box Elder District.....	7,212,777	111,266,560	6.5%
Cache District.....	9,758,215	252,526,365	3.9%
Canyons District.....	22,028,889	371,578,818	5.9%
Carbon District.....	3,052,108	38,311,150	8.0%
Daggett District.....	172,538	4,335,483	4.0%
Davis District.....	44,389,291	665,250,300	6.7%
Duchesne District.....	3,271,292	71,430,000	4.6%
Emery District.....	1,750,764	27,988,168	6.3%
Garfield District.....	1,141,820	12,139,066	9.4%
Grand District.....	1,648,070	19,450,927	8.5%
Granite District.....	63,327,738	573,487,738	11.0%
Iron District.....	6,793,975	77,005,640	8.8%
Jordan District.....	27,922,150	462,018,882	6.0%
Juab District.....	1,595,856	23,138,000	6.9%
Kane District.....	940,774	22,164,538	4.2%
Logan City District.....	6,864,888	75,041,706	9.1%
Millard District.....	3,204,699	38,858,983	8.2%
Morgan District.....	938,148	23,281,072	4.0%
Murray District.....	4,283,646	62,350,882	6.9%
Nebo District.....	18,041,146	293,024,572	6.2%
North Sanpete District.....	2,568,522	25,419,956	10.1%
North Summit District.....	697,503	13,012,706	5.4%
Ogden City District.....	21,693,121	151,266,360	14.3%
Park City District.....	1,840,213	73,991,485	2.5%
Piute District.....	893,718	5,677,895	15.7%
Provo District.....	14,167,175	170,547,067	8.3%
Rich District.....	399,899	8,449,340	4.7%
Salt Lake District.....	28,979,327	281,261,288	10.3%
San Juan District.....	12,803,572	43,315,584	29.6%
Sevier District.....	5,076,814	59,554,874	8.5%
South Sanpete District.....	3,151,862	39,159,357	8.0%
South Summit District.....	702,429	19,334,180	3.6%
Tintic District.....	207,638	3,895,889	5.3%
Tooele District.....	15,671,413	136,932,338	11.4%
Uintah District.....	6,394,093	89,720,382	7.1%
Wasatch District.....	3,795,821	77,927,332	4.9%
Washington District.....	20,857,742	290,609,232	7.2%
Wayne District.....	668,861	6,309,305	10.6%
Weber District.....	19,835,675	274,628,125	7.2%
<b>Total School Districts.....</b>	<b>\$ 427,332,738</b>	<b>\$ 5,724,832,542</b>	<b>7.5%</b>

Continues

**State of Utah**  
**Federal Receipts Report — Local Education Agencies**  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

Continued

<b>Charter Schools</b>	<b>Federal Revenues from All Sources *</b>	<b>Budgeted Expenditures</b>	<b>Percent of Budgeted Expenditures From Federal Revenues</b>
Academy for Math Engineering & Science (AMES).....	\$ 175,841	\$ 3,807,060	4.6%
American Academy of Innovation **.....	—	—	—
American International School of Utah.....	424,419	10,971,995	3.9%
American Leadership Academy.....	913,683	15,980,913	5.7%
American Preparatory Academy – Lea.....	2,022,496	52,920,385	3.8%
American Preparatory Academy – Salem.....	240,551	3,097,903	7.8%
Aristotle Academy.....	145,543	1,177,185	12.4%
Ascent Academies.....	597,892	33,088,122	1.8%
Athenian eAcademy.....	138,483	3,536,577	3.9%
Athlos Academy **.....	—	—	—
Bear River Charter School.....	48,908	1,284,731	3.8%
Beehive Science & Technology Academy (BSTA).....	87,735	2,157,762	4.1%
Canyon Grove Academy.....	259,752	2,351,388	11.0%
Canyon Rim Academy.....	251,914	3,184,026	7.9%
Channing Hall.....	152,820	4,284,844	3.6%
City Academy.....	100,819	2,208,972	4.6%
CS Lewis Academy.....	212,593	2,012,330	10.6%
Davinci Academy.....	512,239	7,623,522	6.7%
Dixie Montessori Academy.....	57,491	2,273,346	2.5%
Dual Immersion Academy.....	517,192	3,337,093	15.5%
Early Light at Daybreak.....	181,954	7,853,206	2.3%
East Hollywood High.....	98,202	2,398,735	4.1%
Edith Bowen Laboratory School.....	183,374	3,754,936	4.9%
Endeavor Hall.....	412,683	4,463,947	9.2%
Entheos Academy.....	715,084	6,979,611	10.2%
Esperanza School.....	206,313	2,942,873	7.0%
Excelsior Academy.....	258,430	4,344,367	5.9%
Fast Forward High.....	156,824	1,848,938	8.5%
Franklin Discovery Academy **.....	—	—	—
Freedom Preparatory Academy.....	684,791	8,260,693	8.3%
Gateway Preparatory Academy.....	491,895	4,523,418	10.9%
George Washington Academy.....	249,435	5,871,252	4.2%
Good Foundations Academy.....	162,399	2,969,497	5.5%
Greenwood Charter School.....	217,333	2,896,655	7.5%
Guadalupe School.....	437,240	2,610,089	16.8%
Hawthorn Academy.....	362,953	8,637,216	4.2%
Highmark Charter School.....	136,387	4,142,357	3.3%
Intech Collegiate High School.....	83,159	1,743,532	4.8%
Itineris Early College High.....	113,946	3,110,841	3.7%
Jefferson Academy.....	179,699	3,580,479	5.0%
John Hancock Charter School.....	31,109	1,212,264	2.6%
Kairos Academy.....	26,955	739,719	3.6%
Karl G Maeser Preparatory Academy.....	68,154	17,382,869	0.4%
Lakeview Academy.....	274,320	21,726,282	1.3%
Leadership Learning Academy.....	217,448	3,228,930	6.7%
Legacy Preparatory Academy.....	189,922	6,554,810	2.9%

Continues

**State of Utah**  
**Federal Receipts Report — Local Education Agencies**  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

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>
Lincoln Academy.....	283,313	5,589,670	5.1%
Lumen Scholar Institute.....	43,927	2,874,693	1.5%
Mana Academy Charter School.....	154,184	3,022,928	5.1%
Maria Montessori Academy.....	125,010	3,726,610	3.4%
Merit College Preparatory Academy.....	262,828	3,292,688	8.0%
Moab Charter School.....	88,911	1,003,426	8.9%
Monticello Academy.....	261,121	4,649,294	5.6%
Mountain Heights Academy.....	57,786	3,325,582	1.7%
Mountain West Montessori Academy.....	154,335	3,099,434	5.0%
Mountainville Academy.....	112,214	4,612,281	2.4%
Navigator Pointe Academy.....	98,544	3,124,842	3.2%
No. UT Academy For Math Engineering & Science (NUAMES)...	104,332	5,480,700	1.9%
Noah Webster Academy.....	260,817	3,325,202	7.8%
North Davis Preparatory Academy.....	505,463	6,123,432	8.3%
North Star Academy.....	127,418	3,401,580	3.7%
Odyssey Charter School.....	107,118	3,073,642	3.5%
Ogden Preparatory Academy.....	829,040	7,986,177	10.4%
Open Classroom.....	153,364	2,941,631	5.2%
Pacific Heritage Academy.....	159,176	2,379,351	6.7%
Paradigm High School.....	122,431	4,188,404	2.9%
Pinnacle Canyon Academy.....	894,194	5,555,517	16.1%
Pioneer High School for the Performing Arts.....	7,635	1,979,794	0.4%
Promontory School of Expeditionary Learning.....	244,009	2,904,358	8.4%
Providence Hall.....	541,695	13,925,670	3.9%
Quest Academy.....	270,129	6,049,532	4.5%
Ranches Academy.....	83,430	2,128,034	3.9%
Renaissance Academy.....	148,563	4,600,710	3.2%
Rockwell Charter High School.....	174,824	3,662,529	4.8%
Ronald W Reagan Academy.....	360,806	4,550,922	7.9%
Roots Charter High School.....	55,645	1,287,864	4.3%
Salt Lake Arts Academy.....	71,930	2,841,169	2.5%
Salt Lake Center for Science Education.....	162,049	3,152,278	5.1%
Salt Lake School for the Performing Arts.....	36,497	2,223,803	1.6%
Scholar Academy.....	205,673	3,112,385	6.6%
Soldier Hollow Charter School.....	61,664	1,812,950	3.4%
Spectrum Academy.....	968,834	11,091,868	8.7%
St. George Academy **.....	—	—	—
Success Academy.....	108,032	2,933,929	3.7%
Summit Academy.....	410,949	11,916,180	3.4%
Summit Academy High School.....	146,881	4,478,365	3.3%
Syracuse Arts Academy.....	444,561	11,039,540	4.0%
Terra Academy.....	193,805	4,177,832	4.6%
Thomas Edison Charter School.....	144,847	8,003,359	1.8%
Timpanogos Academy.....	122,397	2,742,715	4.5%
Tuacahn High School for the Performing Arts.....	158,358	2,951,596	5.4%
Uintah River High School.....	324,070	1,139,601	28.4%
Utah Career Path High School.....	50,064	1,238,442	4.0%
Utah Connections Academy.....	327,607	5,846,529	5.6%
Utah County Academy of Science (UCAS).....	68,486	2,907,041	2.4%

Continues

**State of Utah**  
**Federal Receipts Report — Local Education Agencies**  
For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2016

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>
Utah International Charter School.....	252,576	1,615,953	15.6%
Utah Military Academy.....	153,259	3,305,228	4.6%
Utah Virtual Academy.....	968,947	14,437,614	6.7%
Valley Academy.....	401,485	2,830,865	14.2%
Vanguard Academy.....	112,396	2,607,285	4.3%
Venture Academy.....	318,072	5,598,678	5.7%
Vista at Entrada School of Performing Arts and Technology.....	358,701	5,740,295	6.2%
Voyage Academy.....	240,547	3,243,877	7.4%
Walden School of Liberal Arts.....	337,054	9,398,916	3.6%
Wallace Stegner Academy **.....	—	—	—
Wasatch Peak Academy.....	132,367	2,609,168	5.1%
Wasatch Waldorf Academy **.....	—	—	—
Weber State University Charter Academy.....	6,220	207,379	3.0%
Weilenmann School of Discovery.....	214,526	4,409,231	4.9%
Winter Sports School ***.....	—	—	—
<b>Total Charter Schools.....</b>	<b><u>\$ 27,295,496</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 552,556,238</u></b>	<b>4.9%</b>
<b>Total All Local Education Agencies.....</b>	<b><u>\$ 454,628,234</u></b>	<b><u>\$ 6,277,388,780</u></b>	<b>7.2%</b>

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

\*\* New charter school opened.

\*\*\* Information not available at time of report.

Source:

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

Note: Amounts may be subject to change on other reports produced by USBE after receiving audited financial reports.

Department of Agriculture and Food  
**Meat and Poultry Inspection**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,371,165
Number of FTEs	25
Recipients/Clients Served	28 Processing and Harvesting plants 39 Custom Exempt Plants 28 Farm Custom Slaughter mobile unit
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Meat and poultry processing, harvesting, Custom Exempt and Farm Custom Slaughter establishments

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$68,558)	(\$342,791)
State:		
General Fund	(\$68,558)	(\$342,791)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$137,116)	(\$685,582)

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

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

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

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

**5 %** If we are forced to take a 5% Federal cut in our budget. We would also lose an additional 5% of matching funds from the state as well so overall there would be the 10% cut in our budget. Therefore we would 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. We would also lose an additional 25% of matching funds from the state as well so overall there would be a 50% cut in our budget. Therefore we would have to reduce our workforce by approximately 9 inspection personnel. This will result in turning over to the federal government 9 slaughter establishments and/or 18 processing establishments.

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

**5 %** No, because the federal government would have to take over the state inspection program, which will result in Utah businesses making a decision to come under federal inspection or closing their business.

**25 %** No, because the federal government would have to take over the state inspection program, which will result in Utah businesses making a decision to come under federal inspection or closing their business.

Utah Higher Education Assistance Authority  
**Student Loan Guarantee Program**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,000,863
Number of FTEs	38
Recipients/Clients Served	71,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Program provides guarantee services related to a student loan portfolio of approximately \$954 million pertaining to 71,000 borrowers (as of September 30, 2016).

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:  
(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$50,043)	(\$250,216)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$50,043)	(\$250,216)

<b>FTEs</b>	-1.9	-9.5
-------------	------	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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.

<b>5 %</b>	A 5% reduction in Federal receipts would cause a corresponding decrease in the number of FTE's from 38 to 36.
<b>25 %</b>	A 25% reduction in Federal receipts would cause a corresponding decrease in the number of FTE's from 38 to 28.

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

<b>5 %</b>	The level of service being provided to student loan borrowers would be diminished but not severely impacted.
------------	--

<b>25 %</b>	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?

<b>5 %</b>	Yes, the mandated services would continue to be met with less employees.
<b>25 %</b>	Yes, the mandated services would continue to be met with less employees.

Utah State Board of Regents  
**Student Loan Purchase Program**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	(\$ 51,842,750)
Number of FTEs	150
Recipients/Clients Served	185,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Program manages the servicing activity for a student loan portfolio of approximately \$2.24 billion pertaining to 185,000 borrowers (as of September 30, 2016).

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:  
(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

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

<b>FTEs</b>	0	0
-------------	---	---

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

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

5 %	The Federal interest receipts and special allowance payments related to the Program totaling (\$51,842,750) are interest payments related to a portfolio of individual student loans. The interest rates are set by statute and would require a change of law to reduce the receipts. As such, these receipts are not subject to administrative budget review and are not applicable for this reporting purpose.
25 %	Same as above.

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

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

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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 10,344,284
Number of FTEs	25
Recipients/Clients Served	1025
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The purpose of the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund Capitalization Grant is to provide grants and low interest loans to Utah communities to replace aging, failing, and inadequate facilities. These projects help water systems achieve or maintain compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act. The conditions of the Grant allow a portion of the grant (up to 31%) to be set aside (simply called set-asides) for specific activities. The Division of Drinking Water uses such set-asides to administer the loan program and to supplement the division's program management. The set-asides are also used for direct technical assistance to the communities. The recipients may therefore be any water system in the State of Utah (total active systems 1,025) and the clients served consists of the entire population in the State of Utah as determined in the 2010 census.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$517,214)	(\$2,586,071)
State:		
General Fund	(40,000)	(200,000)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Drinking Water Development Security Fund (5210)	(103,443)	(517,214)
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$660,657)	(\$3,303,285)

<b>FTEs</b>	-1	-5
-------------	----	----

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

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

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
<b>5 %</b>	A 5% reduction in federal loan amounts would directly reduce the amount of money available for loans and grants to water systems by an estimated \$356,500. This will mean less ability to provide assistance to water systems facing water system infrastructure problems. No rules would be changed. When ARRA monies were made available by Congress, a survey was conducted to determine the funding needs of public water systems. The results showed a need of \$400 million (not including the Lake Powell Pipeline project and the Bear River project).  A 5% reduction in set-asides would also reduce the Division's operating budget and by association would reduce the amount of direct technical assistance we can offer to water systems by \$160,714. This change would not require any rule or statute changes. This could eliminate 1 FTE.
<b>25 %</b>	A 25% reduction in federal loan amounts would directly reduce the amount of money available for loans and grants to water systems by an estimated \$1,782,500, based on utilization in 2016. This will mean a lesser ability to provide assistance to water systems facing water system infrastructure problems. No rules would be changed. When ARRA monies were made available by Congress, a survey was conducted to determine the funding needs of public water systems. The results showed a need of \$400 million (not including the Lake Powell Pipeline project and the Bear River project).  A 25% reduction would also eliminate the backflow prevention program. This program requires systems to have a program in place to prevent backflow into culinary water systems, which can introduce accidental contamination into distribution systems and homes. Additionally, the state provides certification for testers of backflow prevention devices; water systems rely on this certification, which would also be lost if these reductions occur.  The 25% reduction would also mean eliminating review of distribution systems, since (compared with other water system infrastructure) distribution systems represent a lower risk of introducing contaminants and causing adverse health effects. Although reducing review of new distribution systems could pose a risk to water system customers, the Division believes the risk would be greater if cuts were made in other areas. The rest of the plan review process would remain intact. The Division would also eliminate the technical assistance provided to water systems with surface water treatment plants. This involves a single FTE.  Up to seven FTEs could be eliminated in these scenarios, based on an associated reduction of \$803,571 in the Federal set-asides.  Rules affected: R309-500, R309-105-12, R309-305

Continued on next page.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	<p>Overall, less money will be available for water systems and municipalities facing infrastructure, treatment, capacity, and other problems. These monies can be allocated to water systems with more favorable terms when systems are deemed to be disadvantaged, using criteria in R309-705. A reduction in funding for the SRF loan program means that less money will be available to meet these needs among all water systems, including those that have fewer financial resources to correct problems, i.e., disadvantaged communities.</p> <p>It must be noted that many systems have no alternative funding for project construction. Commercial loans would be financially prohibitive or simply unavailable.</p> <p>Water systems benefit from direct technical support that is freely provided to water systems outside of the regulatory process. A reduction in this service means that water systems will have to turn to the private sector for this help, at additional expense to the system, or the system may make costly mistakes and compromise public health.</p>
25 %	<p>The impacts of a 25 % reduction are similar to those for 5% reduction, but of course the scope of the impact is much larger, and even fewer systems would receive meaningful assistance.</p> <p>It must be noted that many systems have no alternative funding for construction projects. Commercial loans would be prohibitively expensive or simply unavailable.</p> <p>Elimination of the backflow prevention program means more risk of otherwise preventable cross-connection/backflow incidents. Such incidents can introduce non-potable water into homes and distribution systems, which endangers the public through exposure to contaminants, including bacteria and potentially hazardous chemicals.</p> <p>Reduction of plan review for distribution systems means that faulty designs may be missed or overlooked, which also carries the risk of introducing untreated water, bacteria, and other contaminants into distribution pipes, homes and businesses, or construction of facilities that are not adequate to meet customer needs.</p> <p>Elimination of the technical assistance to surface water treatment facilities could significantly impact the small water systems with treatment facilities. This may result in treatment objective breakdowns and possible waterborne disease.</p> <p>The Division would consider a reduction of this size to be unsustainable, especially if combined with reductions associated with other Federal grants. The risk of loss of primacy would be very high. The Federal State Revolving Fund (FSRF) program set-asides provided 58% of the Division's operating budget (\$3,214,283) in FY 2016.</p>

*Continued on next page.*

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

Department of Environmental Quality  
**Nonpoint Source Project Grants**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 995,718
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	17
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Local land owners

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$49,786)	(\$248,930)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other: <u>In-Kind Match from land owners</u>	(33,190)	(165,954)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$82,976)</b>	<b>(\$414,884)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	0	0
-------------	---	---

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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.

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

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

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

<b>25 %</b>	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?

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

Department of Environmental Quality  
**Performance Partnership Grant**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 7,660,148
Number of FTEs	55
Recipients/Clients Served	2,763,885
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	All Utah citizens (2010 census) and the state's environment are benefited and affected. This grant provides funding to monitor and regulate federal programs over Utah's air, land, and water. We regulate various industries that release pollutants in the land, air, and water to benefit all Utah citizens.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$383,007)	(\$1,915,037)
State:		
General Fund	(151,645)	(758,225)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Environmental Quality Restricted Account	(12,500)	(62,500)
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$547,152)	(\$2,735,762)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Department of Environmental Quality  
**Superfund Sites**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,464,004
Number of FTEs	12
Recipients/Clients Served	89 Sites
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Recipient: State Superfund program. Client: All citizens of the State affected by contamination of land and water caused by mining and manufacturing activities.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$73,200)	(\$366,001)
State:		
General Fund	(1,955)	(9,773)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$75,155)	(\$375,774)

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

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

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

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

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

5 %	Moderate reductions in the pace of discovery, investigation and cleanup would affect residents, businesses, and State and local agencies. Also reduction in coordination with stakeholders in addressing Superfund sites.
25 %	Significant reduction in the pace of Superfund site cleanup activities would result; also a reduction in the number of sites discovered and evaluated. Significant reduction in State participation in addressing existing sites in Utah, including reduced coordination with stakeholders on site cleanup and other site-specific concerns and issues.

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

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

Department of Environmental Quality  
**Water Quality State Revolving Fund Loans**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$3,563,633
Number of FTEs	5
Recipients/Clients Served	61
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Outstanding Loans issued. Recipients include cities, towns, and districts throughout the State of Utah.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$178,182)	(\$890,908)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Wastewater Loan Program	(35,636)	(178,182)
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other: <u>In-Kind</u>		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$213,818)</b>	<b>(\$1,069,090)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	0	-1
-------------	---	----

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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.

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

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

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

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

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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$5,363,451
Number of FTEs	5
Recipients/Clients Served	Approx. 1,250 families
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Low-income, pregnant women, mothers, and young children in Box Elder, Cache, Rich, Davis, Salt Lake, Weber, Washington, Utah, and Morgan counties.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$268,173)	(\$1,340,863)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$268,173)</b>	<b>(\$1,340,863)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-25	-25
-------------	-----	-----

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5 %	No.
25 %	No.

Department of Health  
**Asthma**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.070
Agency contact name and phone number	Nichole Shepard, (801) 538-6259

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 584,253
Number of FTEs	3.30
Recipients/Clients Served	63,874 Utah Children who currently have asthma, 5-6 clinics per year 10 schools offer self-management 501 elementary schools in Utah reaching 305,200 Students in Utah who can use the recess guidance 150 RNs and RTs are reached through per year
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Currently serving Utah Residents particularly those residing in Salt Lake County and Utah County with a focus on children with uncontrolled asthma and those with asthma and/or sensitive lung conditions through a home visiting program, self-management classes offered in up to 10 schools per year and quality improvement efforts in 5-6 clinics per year which reaches 55 clinical staff, 50 care coordinators. We also offer continuing education credits targeting Registered Nurses (RNs) and Respiratory Therapists (RTs) through webinar's 2- 3 times per year, which reaches 150 RNs and RTs. We house the Utah Recess Guidance that helps schools determine when to keep kids indoors based poor air quality during inversions. There are 1,826 school staff are on the listserv for recess guidance updates that are emailed out when action is needed. There are 501 Elementary schools in Utah giving access to 305,200 students in Utah who can benefit from the Utah Recess Guidance. In addition, the Utah Asthma Program seeks opportunities to influence the health care system for expansion of our home visiting program, reimbursement and developing/disseminating a community health worker training module specific to asthma.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$29,213)	(\$146,063)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$29,213)	(\$146,063)

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

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Zero matching from state funds; BHP Manager offers .10 FTE in-kind support
--	--

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

5 %	We would lose program efforts and reduce reach by cutting small contracts (i.e. - Webinars, Self-Management classes and Community Health worker training) which would also equate in a reduction of a minimum .10 FTE.
25 %	We would not be able to fulfill our grant requirements effectively. Half of our contracts would be cut and termination of staff would be required making it impossible to implement programming (i.e. health system projects, or the in-home visit program, evaluation of efforts and/or surveillance would greatly be reduced, reducing our ability to collaborate with state partners.

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

5 %	Evaluation services would slow down and education opportunities for health system efforts would be reduced.
25 %	It would be difficult to sustain efforts and implement sustainable programming. The project would dwindle to minimal efforts and reduce our competitive advantage for future funding opportunity. Residents of Utah may not get have access to comprehensive asthma care and we could see an increase in the burden of asthma.

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

5 %	No mandated services, but grant project efforts would be reduced. Currently no other resources are available.
25 %	No mandated services, but grant projects would be greatly reduced and unsustainable. Currently no other resources are available.

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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$115,694,255
Number of FTEs	N/A
Recipients/Clients Served	17,058 / month
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	CHIP eligible children with family incomes less than or equal to 200% of the federal poverty level (FPL) (after the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act [ACA] implementation in January enrollment changed to less than or equal to 138% FPL). Recipients/Clients Served listed above is the average number of enrollees post ACA implementation as the other children are now covered by Medicaid.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$5,784,713)	(\$28,923,564)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Tobacco Settlement Restricted Account #1320		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$5,784,713)	(\$28,923,564)

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

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

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

5 %	<p>The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 2,509 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.</p> <p>An alternative option would be to reduce the amount of CHIPicaid expenditures funded by the CHIP grant. CHIPicaid expenditures are Medicaid expenditures for children that were previously eligible for CHIP prior to ACA or would have been eligible for CHIP had the eligibility rules implemented by ACA not occurred. This option would not necessarily cause any children to lose insurance coverage but would increase other costs for the state because the same expenditures would be reimbursed at the lower, Medicaid reimbursement rate, rather than the CHIP enhanced reimbursement rate. This option would have an increased state cost in the Medicaid budget of approximately \$1,721,100.</p>
-----	--

25 %	<p>The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 12,543 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.</p> <p>An alternative option would be to reduce the amount of CHIPicaid expenditures funded by the CHIP grant. CHIPicaid expenditures are Medicaid expenditures for children that were previously eligible for CHIP prior to ACA or would have been eligible for CHIP had the eligibility rules implemented by ACA not occurred. This option would not necessarily cause any children to lose insurance coverage but would increase other costs for the state because the same expenditures would be reimbursed at the lower, Medicaid reimbursement rate, rather than the CHIP enhanced reimbursement rate. This option would have an increased state cost in the Medicaid budget of approximately \$8,605,400.</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>The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 2,509 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. Current law does not allow for reduction in services. CHIP premiums are paid at a capitated rate. Reduction to this rate would likely cause all service providers to sever their contracts.</p> <p>The alternative option of reducing CHIPicaid expenditures funded by the CHIP grant would minimize the impact on recipients but would increase the State's cost in another budget. This is a viable option only if the hypothetical reductions in federal funding are not imposed on all federally-funded programs.</p>
-----	---

25 %	<p>The average monthly enrollment in CHIP would have to be reduced by 12,543 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. Current law does not allow for reduction in services. CHIP premiums are paid at a capitated rate. Reduction to this rate would likely cause all service providers to sever their contracts.</p> <p>The alternative option of reducing CHIPicaid expenditures funded by the CHIP grant would minimize the impact on recipients but would increase the State's cost in another budget. This is a viable option only if the hypothetical reductions in federal funding are not imposed on all federally-funded programs.</p>
------	--

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

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

Department of Health  
**Collaborating to Develop and Enhance Biomonitoring  
Capability to Assess Human Exposure**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.070
Agency contact name and phone number	Sanwat Chaudhuri , (801) 965-3896

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 758,844
Number of FTEs	1.0
Recipients/Clients Served	Total population
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Developing scientific testing to more accurately measure human exposure to hazards.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

<b>Funding Information</b>	<b>5 %</b>	<b>25 %</b>
Federal	(\$37,942)	(\$189,711)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$37,942)</b>	<b>(\$189,711)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	0	0
-------------	---	---

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> <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.

<b>5 %</b>	Fewer sample tests and reduced data analysis. Fewer tests, sample kits, shipping and other processing costs.
<b>25 %</b>	30% reduction in number of tests conducted and delay in developing additional verification testing

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

<b>5 %</b>	Slower development of new testing methodology
<b>25 %</b>	Significant delay in testing and verification of new tests

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

Department of Health  
**Environmental Health Tracking**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.070
Agency contact name and phone number	Sam LeFevre, (801) 538-6188

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 850,170
Number of FTEs	6.5
Recipients/Clients Served	2,943,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	All residents of the State of Utah

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$42,509)	(\$212,543)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
_____		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$42,509)	(\$212,543)
FTEs	0	-2

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	State Epidemiologist 0.05 FTE in kind, Toxicologist 0.10 FTE in kind. Appx \$25,000 in data from external partners provided to EPHTN free of cost.
--	--

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

5 %	Expansion and enhancement projects would be minimized. Some collaboration with other projects (i.e., asthma and biomonitoring) would be minimized.
25 %	The project would go into a minimal sustainment. Outreach, marketing and training activities would be terminated. Approximately 30% of data production activities would be eliminated. Data transaction to CDC would be minimized. All collaboration and support of external partners would be terminated.

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

5 %	Data production and interpretation services would be less frequent and slower in development.
25 %	Initially minimal, however, over time the project would become obsolete. At this level, the project is not sustainable for more than a few years.

Are there mandated 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 %	Blood lead surveillance. Currently no other resources are available for this service.
25 %	Blood lead surveillance. Currently no other resources are available for this service.

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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 5,909,436
Number of FTEs	20.3
Recipients/Clients Served	State of Utah residents
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Utah residents with diabetes, uncontrolled hypertension and those at risk for those conditions and well as Utah residents who are overweight or obese.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:  
(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$295,472)	(\$1,477,359)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$295,472)</b>	<b>(\$1,477,359)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	0	0
-------------	---	---

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

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Reductions to the school's nutrition and physical activity interventions would result in 30,000 less students being served, reductions to quality improvement efforts around high blood pressure and diabetes resulting in 300+ less people being served. Reductions to local health district efforts and partner efforts. No change in rule or statute.
25 %	Reductions to the schools nutrition and physical activity interventions would result in 150,000 less students being served. Reductions to quality improvement efforts around high blood pressure and diabetes would result in 700+ less people being served. Significant reductions to local health district efforts and partner efforts. No change in rule or statute.

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

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

Department of Health  
**Epidemiology and Lab Capacity for Infectious Disease**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,385,937
Number of FTEs	25.32
Recipients/Clients Served	Statewide
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Funds support epidemiologic, laboratory, and informatics capacity related to: enteric diseases and foodborne disease outbreak detection and response; influenza and other respiratory pathogens; health information systems; healthcare associated infections; arboviral diseases, including Zika virus and West Nile virus; projects related to vaccine-preventable and other types of diseases; and the National Electronic Disease Surveillance System (NEDSS) implementation in Utah (TriSano). Funds support personnel that attend to surveillance, investigation, and response to diseases and outbreaks in collaboration with local health partners, and healthcare partners. Funds also support critical laboratory infrastructure and supplies, and critical informatics infrastructure. Contractual funds support courier service for statewide transportation of samples to the Utah Public Health Laboratory (UPHL), implementation of electronic laboratory reporting and refinement of TriSano, and statewide participation in surveillance and infectious disease response efforts with local public health and other key partners.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$69,297)	(\$346,484)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$69,297)	(\$346,484)

FTEs	0	-2.25
------	---	-------

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

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

5 %	At the 5% level, reductions would occur in contracts supporting local health department involvement in response to outbreaks and key infectious diseases, including arboviral, vaccine-preventable, prion, and mycotic diseases. Reduction would also occur in contracts supporting TriSano. At this level, no staff would be eliminated, and programs would only be reduced, not eliminated. This would not require a change in statute or rules.
-----	--

25 %	At the 25% level, all contracts, including those supporting courier service for sample transport to UPHL, local health department investigation support, healthcare associated infection training and related projects, maintenance of TriSano, and implementation of electronic laboratory reporting, would be discontinued. In addition, 2.25 full-time equivalents (FTEs) would have to be eliminated from these programs. This would not require a change in statute or rules.
------	--

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

5 %	At the 5% level, capacity to support local health department response to infectious diseases, including arboviral, vaccine-preventable, prion, mycotic, and healthcare associated, would be reduced, which would impact public health's capacity to detect and promote prevention for these conditions. While State health department staff may be able to absorb some of these efforts, the reduction in support to local health departments would be challenging for public health in Utah, and relationships would be negatively impacted. Capacity to continue implementation of electronic laboratory reporting would be reduced, resulting in delays in bringing additional laboratories onto the system. This would lead to frustration from partner laboratories waiting to participate, and could lead to outbreak identification being missed, or delayed, due to reporting inefficiencies.
-----	---

25 %	At the 25% level, all contracts would be eliminated. Courier capacity for sample transport would be eliminated, and electronic laboratory reporting progress would be halted. Local health department contracts would be eliminated. Maintenance for TriSano would be halted. While 2.25 FTEs would be lost, contractual funds for informatics support would translate to additional personnel being lost as well. This level of reduction would be devastating to laboratory and epidemiology public health programs given the resulting sudden reduction in capacity, and this would have a negative impact on external partnerships, including with local health departments, medical providers and facilities, laboratories, and other key partners. Electronic laboratory reporting would be stagnant, which would be deleterious long-term given its potential for improving efficiencies and data quality, and given the frustration it would cause with partner laboratories waiting to be brought on to the system.
------	--

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

5 %	No.
25 %	No – mandated services would be from the State level; investigation of cases and outbreaks is required in State statute and rule. Internal personnel would be assigned to cover investigations and other critical work previously assigned to reduced or eliminated positions.

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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.511
Agency contact name and phone number	Darryl Snyder 801 538-6351

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,127,898
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	Public
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Grant funds are used to promote healthcare transparency. Clients include policy makers, public health employees, academic researchers, and healthcare consumers.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

<b>Funding Information</b>	<b>5 %</b>	<b>25 %</b>
Federal	(\$56,395)	(\$281,975)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
_____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$56,395)</b>	<b>(\$281,975)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	0	0
-------------	---	---

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

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

<b>5 %</b>	Remaining funds are a pass through to the Insurance Department for their rate review analysts. A 5% reduction would not require UDOH to change statute or rules.
<b>25 %</b>	Remaining funds are a pass through to the Insurance Department for their rate review analysts. A 25% reduction would not require UDOH to change 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?

<b>5 %</b>	A reduction of 5% would have no impact on UDOH and would need to be addressed by UID.
<b>25 %</b>	A reduction of 25% would have no impact on UDOH and would need to be addressed by UID.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
<b>5 %</b>	The State, specifically UID, would need to maintain its effective rate review program. UDOH is not mandated to perform services related to this grant without federal funding.
<b>25 %</b>	The State, specifically UID, would need to maintain its effective rate review program. UDOH is not mandated to perform services related to this grant without federal funding.

Department of Health  
**Hospital Preparedness Program**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,113,482
Number of FTEs	3.8
Recipients/Clients Served	Utah Hospitals, long term care facilities, LHDs, healthcare association, EMS, others/Statewide
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The HPP provides services to the entire state through funding and developing preparedness and response capacity and capability within healthcare systems, from hospitals, to local public health, to EMS, to long-term care, to outpatient clinics. Sub grantees include all (12) local health departments, 7 Regional Medical Surge Coalitions, all hospitals and long-term care facilities, all Community Health Center organizations in the state, and internally to the Bureau of EMSP.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$105,674)	(\$528,371)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$105,674)	(\$528,371)

FTEs	-0.3	-0.95
------	------	-------

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

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

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	See below, no statute or rule change needed.
25 %	See below, no statute or rule change needed.
What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	5% Cut will result in a slight reduction of facility level funds for hospitals, long-term care facilities, and community health clinics. It will also result in a reduction in local health department funding, but only for funds that were allocated for shared healthcare coalition purchases. Additional slight losses would be seen in UDOH program elements, including available funds for EMS Strike Teams, Disaster Response Units, and other projects. Overall the impact would be minimal on achieving successful project outcomes.

25 %	A 25% cut would result in a loss of \$572,005 for the HPP program. In order to keep under the administrative cap of 15% per the ASPR HPP grant, at least .6 FTE would have to be cut from the 3.8 FTE currently funded under the program. Additionally, travel would be cut by 40%, and equipment and supplies would be cut by half. Facility level funds would be reduced by as much as 50%, as well as funding to local health districts by a similar amount. Funding for UDOH projects such as EMS Strike Teams and maintenance of disaster response trailers would also be cut by as much as half under this scenario. This would have a severe impact to the program in terms of meeting all proposed outcomes, but we could scale back expectations and pass-through funding and still have a viable program that demonstrates success. The bigger concern would be with the reduction of UDOH FTE that get paid off this program, unsure how we would cover these losses with other funds.
------	---

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

5 %	We have four projects that are essential for the HPP 1) ESAR-VHP (Utah Responds) – an electronic system that enrolls, tracks, credentials, and deploys healthcare volunteers; 2) HAvBED (Utah Healthcare Resources Management System (UHRMS)) – an electronic system to track available beds in Utah hospitals; 3) Utah’s Health Alert Network (Utah Notification and Information System (UNIS)) which will need to continue operations; and 4) Sustainment of Regional Medical Surge Coalitions. Each of these projects will need to be sustained. There are no other identified resources available to meet these needs.
-----	--

25 %	Yes/Yes in part – See above. We would still need to sustain these programs, but it may be at the expense of other critical project components. The maintenance costs are fixed for these projects, and we could not cut them.
------	---

*This page is blank*

Department of Health  
**Immunization and Vaccines for Children**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.539
Agency contact name and phone number	Rich Lakin, (801) 538-6905

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,332,155
Number of FTEs	21
Recipients/Clients Served	Utah's children
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	36.1% of Utah children are served through the Vaccine for Children Program

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$166,608)	(\$833,039)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$166,608)	(\$833,039)

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

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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. Contracts to LHD's, and other stakeholders would be reduced which would result in reduced immunization services across the State of Utah.
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. Immunization program would have to reduce FTE's from 21 to 17 and LHD and other contracts would be dramatically reduced to where immunization services would be impacted. Additionally, 350 provider groups would be impacted resulting in us not meeting CDC requirements.

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

5 %	There would be a 5% reduction in pass through funding in provider contracts. This impact would reduce immunization services. LHD and other contracts would be reduced.
-----	--

25 %	There would be a 25% reduction in pass through funding in provider contracts. This impact would reduce immunization services significantly. This would result in possible cutting of all contracts and immunization services such as data loggers for CDC fridge compliance.
------	--

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

5 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Health  
**Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.181
Agency contact name and phone number	Meredith Mannebach 801-273-2890

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 6,046,076
Number of FTEs	4.75
Recipients/Clients Served	5,300
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 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$302,304)	(\$1,511,519)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: Parent Fee	0	0
Other:		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$302,304)	(\$1,511,519)

FTEs	-.25	-1.25
------	------	-------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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 <b>either</b> the amount of funding distributed to early intervention programs through contracts with local health departments, universities, and private non-profit agencies, or the amount of supplies, training and IT services purchased to implement systems activities.
25 %	Would reduce <b>both</b> the amount of funding distributed through contracts to early intervention programs, and the amount of supplies, training and IT services purchased to implement systems activities. Reduction to early intervention program contracts would require a change in child eligibility for services thereby limiting the number of children served in the program. This action would require approval from the federal funding agency, as well as a change in state rule R398.20.

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

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

Department of Health  
**Maternal and Child Health Block Grant**  
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 6,083,413
Number of FTEs	30
Recipients/Clients Served	226,351 clients served with Title V dollars. That included 65,940 pregnant women, 138,521 infants, 4,089 children with special health care needs, and 0 other.
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	These funds are used for all women of childbearing age and all children in the state.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$304,171)	(\$1,520,853)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: Collections/Clinical		
Other: _____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$304,171)</b>	<b>(\$1,520,853)</b>
<b>-</b>	<b>-1.5</b>	<b>-7.5</b>

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

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

<b>5 %</b>	This level of cut might result in RIFs to several staff, cuts of 5% to contracts
<b>25 %</b>	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?

<b>5 %</b>	Reduce funding of contracts to LHDs and others by 5%, reduce current expenses by 5%, and reduce travel expenses. This cut would reduce the numbers of mothers, infants, children including those with special health care needs served in the Department (CSHCN clinics) and in local health departments.
<b>25 %</b>	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?

<b>5 %</b>	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.
<b>25 %</b>	We are required to use 30% of the federal funds for Children with Special Health Care Needs and another 30% for children. There are no additional resources that could be used to offset the cut.

Department of Health  
**Medicaid – Federal Survey and Certification Title 19**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,378,320
Number of FTEs	16
Recipients/Clients Served	Health Facilities
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Nursing Care Facilities, Hospitals

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$68,916)	(\$344,580)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
_____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$68,916)</b>	<b>(\$344,580)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-8	-4
-------------	----	----

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

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	This would not require a change in rule or statute. A 5% cut would result in the reduction of 1 staff that inspects nursing facilities. These inspections are done to certify these providers to receive Medicaid funding for health services. Staff also completes complaint investigations on these types of facilities. This would reduce the ability of the office to respond to complaints from the public.
25 %	This may require a change in the state Medicaid Plan. A 25% cut would result in the reduction of 3 staff that inspects nursing facilities. These inspections are done to certify these providers to receive Medicaid funding for health services. If they cannot be certified, then Federal funding would not be available. Staff also completes complaint investigations on these types of facilities. This would significantly reduce the ability of the office to respond to complaints from the public.

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

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

Department of Health  
**Medicaid – Medical Assistance Program**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,651,312,720
Number of FTEs	N/A
Recipients/Clients Served	323,095 / month
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	People with low income, with physical or mental disabilities, and the aged.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$82,565,636)	(\$412,828,180)
State:		
General Fund		(28,254,400)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Hospital Provider Assessments #2241	(12,909,900)	(54,253,900)
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Nursing Care Facilities Account #1223	(6,587,299)	(27,720,800)
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Ambulance Service Provider Assessments #2242	(171,600)	(722,100)
Dedicated Credits	(15,154,905)	(63,640,100)
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$117,389,340)</b>	<b>(\$587,419,480)</b>
<b>FTEs</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

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

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Programs Reduced: Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH), Graduate Medical Education (GME), Inpatient UPL, University of Utah Medical Group (UUMG) Provider Enhancement, Outpatient UPL, Transitional Outpatient Payments (TOPPS), Nursing Home Quality Incentives, Hospital Provider Assessment, Ambulance Service Provider Assessment. The reductions to the Hospital Assessment, Nursing Home Assessment, and Ambulatory Provider Assessment will require statutory changes.
25 %	All the same programs in the 5% scenario would not only be reduced, but eliminated entirely.  Coverage Groups Eliminated: Medically Needy

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Non-State Government Owned Nursing Facilities will take reductions in funding from the reduction of the NSGO UPL and the Nursing Home Assessment. All hospitals that have Graduate Medical Education (GME) and Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) programs will take reductions. All hospitals participating in the Inpatient UPL program will take reductions. The University of Utah will take reductions in funding from the Physician Enhancement. All hospitals participating in the Outpatient UPL program will take additional reductions. All hospitals that have Transitional Outpatient payments will take reductions. Nursing Facilities will receive less in quality incentives. ACOs will take reductions for the Hospital Provider Assessment as well as their share of the Inpatient UPL, Outpatient UPL and UUMG Provider Enhancement. Ambulatory Service Providers will take reductions based on the reduction of the Ambulatory Service Provider Assessment.
25 %	All the same from the 5% scenario however, the reductions will be larger based on the eliminations of the programs. Additionally, 16,536 individuals will lose coverage with the elimination of the Medically Needy program.

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

Department of Health  
**Medicaid – Federal Survey and Certification Title 18**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,541,959
Number of FTEs	26
Recipients/Clients Served	Health Facilities
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Home health agencies, hospitals, surgery centers, dialysis centers, hospice agencies

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$127,098)	(\$635,490)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
_____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$127,098)</b>	<b>(\$635,490)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-1.3	-6.5
-------------	------	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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.

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

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

<b>5 %</b>	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.
<b>25 %</b>	If this reduction was implemented, our office would not be able to meet the Federal survey requirements to ensure compliance with Medicare requirements. Certification of these health providers to obtain Medicare funding may be in jeopardy. A 25% cut would result in a large number of health providers not being able to maintain certification for Medicare funds.

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

<b>5 %</b>	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.
<b>25 %</b>	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.

A Department of Health  
**National Cancer Prevention and Control**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,371,217
Number of FTEs	21
Recipients/Clients Served	4,251
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Uninsured or underinsured Women age 50 to 64

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$168,561)	(\$842,804)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$168,561)</b>	<b>(\$842,804)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-1	-5.25
-------------	----	-------

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

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
<b>5 %</b>	The Utah Cancer Control Breast & Cervical Cancer Screening program would reduce the number of Clinical Breast Exams and Pap tests from 4,251 screens to 4,038 (a reduction of 213 screens). This would not require a change in statute or rule.
<b>25 %</b>	The UCCP screening program would reduce the number of Clinical Breast Exams and Pap tests from 4251 screens to 3,188 (a reduction of 1,063 screens). This would not require a change in statute or rule.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
<b>5 %</b>	Women served by the program would receive 213 less screening services. Also, Local Health Departments and Community Health Centers currently receive \$548,850 to implement the UCCP screening program and outreach activities. With a 5% cut this amount would be reduced by \$27,193.
<b>25 %</b>	Women served by the program would receive 1,063 less screening services. Also the amount received by Local Health Departments and Community Health Centers would be reduced by \$135,962.

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

**Prescription Drug Overdose, Abuse, Misuse Prevention; Sexual Violence; Violent Death Reporting; Core Violence & Injury Prevention**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.136
Agency contact name and phone number	Trisha Keller, (801) 538-6865

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,511,994
Number of FTEs	12.25
Recipients/Clients Served	Approx. 3 million
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The reach of these combined grants is the state of Utah population. The overall goals of this funding is to reduce injuries and injury deaths in Utah, reduce or eliminate sexual assault in Utah, reduce drug overdose, abuse and misuse among Utahns, and to collect comprehensive data on violent deaths in Utah.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$75,600)	(\$377,999)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$75,600)	(\$377,999)

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

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Reductions in funding, particularly a 25% reduction, would result in a decrease of 3 FTE's. This would limit the scope and breadth of the program. Specifically, contract amounts with local communities to do rape prevention and prescription drug abuse prevention would be reduced in addition to the contracts to analyze and link data to the controlled substance database to help inform state prevention and intervention efforts.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would 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 travel for professional development and grantee site visits would be made. In addition, printing and dissemination of resources/materials would be limited.
25 %	Up to 3 FTE of staff time would be reduced. This would include the Prescription Drug Overdose Prevention Coordinator, the Program Evaluator, and the Epidemiologist. In addition, community-level funding would also be reduced to absorb the impact of the reduction.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state 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 limited opportunity to network with colleagues from other states to learn from their strategies and implementation of efforts. Reduced technical assistance available, as well as fewer resources and materials would be available to grantees and the public.
25 %	Community partners would receive limited data to help identify high risk areas in their community for targeted interventions. Community members, would not have needed resources and tools to address injury, sexual assault, opioid abuse, misuse, and overdose.

Are there mandated 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 aren't any mandated federal services the State would have to maintain with federal funding cuts. There is limited state funding available to address opioid abuse, misuse, and overdose but it would be difficult to absorb these programmatic efforts with those funds. No state funding exists for sexual assault or overall injury or surveillance. No other resources available to meet these needs.
25 %	There aren't any mandated federal services the State would have to maintain with federal funding cuts. There is limited state funding available to address opioid abuse, misuse, and overdose but it would be difficult to absorb these programmatic efforts with those funds. No state funding exists for sexual assault or overall injury or surveillance. No other resources available to meet these needs.

Department of Health  
**Preventive Health Services Block**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,404,430
Number of FTEs	2
Recipients/Clients Served	Statewide
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Prevention Block Grant funds a number of different programs with statewide reach, including efforts to promote physical activity and healthy eating, prevent unintentional injuries, such as motor vehicle crashes, falls and suicide, and prevent sexual assault.

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

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

<b>Funding Information</b>	<b>5 %</b>	<b>25 %</b>
Federal	(\$70,222)	(\$351,108)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$70,222)</b>	<b>(\$351,108)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	0	0
-------------	---	---

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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.

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

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

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

<b>5 %</b>	N/A
<b>25 %</b>	N/A

Department of Health  
**Public Health Emergency Preparedness & PHEP Ebola**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.069, 93.074
Agency contact name and phone number	Kevin McCulley 801-273-6669

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 7,463,860
Number of FTEs	17.7
Recipients/Clients Served	UDOH, 13 LHDs, Tribes /Population of the State of Utah
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Public Health Preparedness efforts benefit the population of Utah. Funds go to three UDOH bureaus (Epi, Lab, and Preparedness), all LHDs and tribes. No direct daily services are provided to individuals, but efforts are in place to protect all Utah citizens during emergencies. Funds go toward enhancing the public health system to protect citizens from laboratory functions to epidemiology and risk communication.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$373,193)	(\$1,865,965)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: Parent Fee		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$373,193)	(\$1,865,965)

<b>FTEs</b>	-0.9	-4.4
-------------	------	------

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

	<p>used as an indicator of nonfederal support for public health security before the infusion of federal funds. These expenditures are calculated by the awardee without reference to any federal funding that also may have contributed to such programmatic activities in the past. Awardees must stipulate the total dollar amount in their cooperative agreement applications. Awardees must be able to account for MSF separate from accounting for federal funds and separate from accounting for any matching funds requirements; this accounting is subject to ongoing monitoring, oversight, and audit. MSF may not include any matching funds requirement.</p> <p>The state of Utah does not contribute to this project, so we certify that MOF is \$0, and validate this by 'certifying with a sentence.'</p> <p>This requirement does not apply to future contingent supplemental emergency response awards that may be authorized under 317(a) and 317(d) of the Public Health Service Act.</p>
--	---

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

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Reduce funding to LHDs and tribes by percentage (5%); reduce funds to epidemiology, laboratory, Public Information Office (PIO), and preparedness by percentage. 5% cut would be handled with reduction in certain preparedness funded activities and capabilities, including release of 1 FTE.
25 %	Reduce funding to LHDs and tribes by percentage (25%); reduce funds to epidemiology, laboratory, PIO, and preparedness by percentage. 25% cut would eliminate preparedness funded activities and directly effect FTEs paid for from cooperative agreement at the UDOH. EMS/P: Cut 2 FTE, cut state travel by 75%, cut supplies and exercise funds. Chemistry & Bio laboratory: Staff would be let go (1 FTE), systems ended, or tests would not be able to be done. Epidemiology: End National Electronic Disease Surveillance System (NEDSS) work, PIO: 5 and 25% cuts would decrease 1 FTE status of employee.
	On Preparedness side there would be a need to approach EMS to cover some jointly funded staff.

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

Department of Health  
**Ryan White Part B**

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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$5,563,128
Number of FTEs	8.05
Recipients/Clients Served	941 (unduplicated)
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	HIV positive individuals receive assistance in accessing HIV-related medications either through coverage of cost of medication or with insurance costs.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$278,156)	(\$1,390,782)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$278,156)	(\$1,390,782)

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

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There is matching and maintenance of effort requirements for the Ryan White Care Act Title II funding (ADAP Supplemental funding). Match amount for FY2016 is \$41,943.
--	---

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	Reducing this funding source by 5% would result in 20 HIV positive individuals being removed from the AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP). No change in statute or rules is required.
25 %	Reducing this funding source by 25% would result in 97 HIV positive individuals being removed from the AIDS Drug Assistance Program (ADAP). No change in statute or rules is required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	The impact would be that the 20 individuals affected would not receive their HIV medications and would need to find another way to obtain HIV medications. The medications are expensive, the annual average cost per ADAP client is \$15,337.00 and individuals cannot afford them without assistance. There is no other state or local programs that assist with HIV medications.
25 %	The impact would be that there would be 97 individuals affected that would not receive their HIV medications and would need to find another way to obtain HIV medications. The medications are expensive, the annual average cost per ADAP client is \$15,337.00 and individuals cannot afford them without assistance. There is no other state or local programs that assist with HIV medications.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	The State is not obligated to provide medications to HIV positive individuals, but when the individuals become ill from lack of medications, the hospitals are obligated to provide medical care which would be much more expensive than the cost of the medications. Individuals may be able to receive the medications through a patient assistance program, but this is uncertain and depends on what HIV medications the person is on.
25 %	The State is not obligated to provide medications to HIV positive individuals, but when the individuals become ill from lack of medications, the hospitals are obligated to provide medical care which would be much more expensive than the cost of the medications. Individuals may be able to receive the medications through a patient assistance program, but this is uncertain and depends on what HIV medications the person is on.

Department of Health  
**Tobacco Control Program**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.305
Agency contact name and phone number	Janae Duncan, (801) 538-9273

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,326,843
Number of FTEs	5.75
Recipients/Clients Served	Around 200,000 Utah youth and adults
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Utah tobacco users

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$66,342)	(\$331,711)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$66,342)</b>	<b>(\$331,711)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	0	0
-------------	---	---

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> <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: Federal
---	-----------------------------

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

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

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

<b>5 %</b>	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.
------------	--

<b>25 %</b>	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?

<b>5 %</b>	N/A
<b>25 %</b>	N/A

Department of Health  
**Utah WISEWOMAN Program**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$1,440,549
Number of FTEs	6.5
Recipients/Clients Served	5,685
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 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$72,027)	(\$360,137)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$72,027)	(\$360,137)

FTEs	-.33	-1.63
------	------	-------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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 health coaching 285 fewer women (screening would be reduced from 5,685 to 5400) This would not require a change in statute or rule.
25 %	Eliminate proposed evaluation activities designed to demonstrate the success of the program and would eliminate the ability of the program to provide education and support materials to client to help them reach their physical activity, nutrition and weight loss goals. Additionally the program would be able to provide the services including health coaching to 1,422 fewer women (screening would be reduced from 5,685 to 4,263) This would not require a change in statute or rule.

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

5 %	Reduce the amount of funding by \$87,505 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 40-64 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 \$43,752 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 40-64 who live at or below 250% FPL. Program would offer services to fewer women and be required to evaluate the impact of the program with extremely limited resources.

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

5 %	No
25 %	No

Department of Health  
**Vaccine Distributions**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 25,511,784
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	345,110
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 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,275,589)	(\$6,377,946)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$1,275,589)</b>	<b>(\$6,377,946)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	0	0
-------------	---	---

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

<b>5 %</b>	The reduction would impact our ability to respond during an outbreak and reduce the number of vaccines that would be able to be purchased for VFC clients and the underinsured. The reduction would not require a change in statute or rule.
<b>25 %</b>	The reduction would seriously impact our ability to serve VFC and 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?

<b>5 %</b>	The reduction would impact our ability to respond during an outbreak.
<b>25 %</b>	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?	
<b>5 %</b>	No
<b>25 %</b>	No

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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$42,591,518
Number of FTEs	16
Recipients/Clients Served	Approx. 57,000/month
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Pregnant women, new mothers, and children up to the age of 5

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$2,129,576)	(\$10,647,880)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$2,129,576)	(\$10,647,880)

FTEs	-1	-4
------	----	----

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

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

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

	many individuals we would need to pull from the program. The last time Utah was forced into CM, due to tight financial times, many WIC families "auto-terminated" themselves from the Program without our knowledge or recommendation. It is a phenomenon that we cannot control.
--	---

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

5 %	No CM cuts expected if we only experience a 5% cut.
25 %	Immediate CM cuts would be expected if we experience a 25% cut from our funding streams.

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

5 %	All WIC services would continue to be required.
25 %	All WIC services would continue to be required, though we would only be able to serve a reduced number of participants and state and local staffing ratios may be impacted.

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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$2,235,681
Number of FTEs	Utah - 16
Recipients/Clients Served	9 state WIC programs
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	State WIC program operating systems for serving pregnant women, new mothers, and children up to the age of 5

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$111,784)	(\$558,920)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$111,784)</b>	<b>(\$558,920)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	0	0
-------------	---	---

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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.

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

	A 25% cut would affect the WIC programs of Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada, North Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah. This reduction may halt ongoing maintenance and support by our contractor, Ciber and then Computer Data Processing (CDP) when their new maintenance and enhancements contract is executed in January 2017.
--	---

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

<b>5 %</b>	No impact on recipients, however our services listed in the contract would need to be negotiated.
<b>25 %</b>	Immediate changes and delays in the implementation of WIC EBT would be expected if we experience a 25% cut from our funding streams.

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

<b>5 %</b>	All WIC services would continue to be required, and all WIC State agencies would still be required to implement WIC electronic benefit transfer (EBT) statewide by October 1, 2020.
<b>25 %</b>	All WIC services would continue to be required, and all WIC State agencies would still be required to implement WIC electronic benefit transfer (EBT) statewide by October 1, 2020.

Department of Heritage and Arts  
**Division of Arts and Museums**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 736,493
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	1,500,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Arts organizations, individual artists, students, schools, teachers, communities, and people attending events funded by the division.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$36,825)	(\$184,123)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$36,825)	(\$184,123)

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

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

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

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

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

5 %	Funding opportunities for arts organizations, schools, and school districts to support projects and programs would be limited.
-----	--

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

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

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

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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,568,652
Number of FTEs	1
Recipients/Clients Served	75,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	UServeUtah, the Utah Commission on Service & Volunteerism, in partnership with the Corporation for National and Community Service, brings National Service programs to Utah. Programs operate in almost every region of the state, bringing much needed support and training to rural and urban Utah. 1200 AmeriCorps members currently serve across the state serving thousands of clients. The Utah portfolio comprises 12 AmeriCorps programs that target underserved populations in the areas of: Economic Opportunity, Education, Environmental Stewardship, Disaster Preparedness, Healthy Futures and Veterans and Military Families. Programs currently operating in the state include the USU/Utah Conservation Corps; Association for Utah Community Health; Salt Lake City; Playworks; Boys and Girls Club; Utah Campus Compact; Red Cross; Four Corners School; Habitat for Humanity; and BYU.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$178,433)	(\$892,163)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$178,433)	(\$892,163)

<b>FTEs</b>	0	0
-------------	---	---

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

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

<b>5 %</b>	A 5% reduction would result in less program funding for support of local AmeriCorps members. Fewer members would be available to serve throughout the state. Admin funding is guaranteed at the Small State Minimum of \$250,000. No change in statute would be required.
------------	---

<b>25 %</b>	A 25% reduction would result in less program funding for support of local AmeriCorps members. Fewer members would be available to serve throughout the state. Admin funding is guaranteed at the Small State Minimum of \$250,000.No change in statute would be required.
	What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?
<b>5 %</b>	There would be fewer AmeriCorps members serving/volunteering throughout the state, which would directly impact children tutored, individuals receiving health care resource services, children served in after school programs, resources for the homeless and land maintenance projects completed.
<b>25 %</b>	There would be significantly less AmeriCorps members serving/volunteering through the state, which would directly impact children tutored, individuals receiving health care resource services, children served in after school programs, resources for the homeless and land maintenance projects completed.

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

Department of Heritage and Arts  
**Division of State History**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.069, 15.224, 15.904
Agency contact name and phone number	Roger Roper 801-245-7251

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,111,763
Number of FTEs	6
Recipients/Clients Served	3,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	State-wide oil, gas, highway, water, power, and housing and development projects received expedited assistance prior to project onset, as required by state and federal laws; Utah archaeological consultant firms receive ongoing cost-saving online access to approximately 100,000 archaeological records and 120,000 historic site records; State-wide local governments with historic preservation commissions receive technical assistance and preservation grants; Utah building owners obtain approximately \$20 million in historic preservation tax credits; Utah building owners are assisted with listing properties on the National Register, stimulating heritage tourism and economic development; the division formally interacts with 80 federal, state, and local agencies who receive on-going technical assistance and services.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$55,588)	(\$277,941)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$55,588)	(\$277,941)

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

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	\$112,143 of the federal funds listed above are derived from cooperative agreements with BLM and USDA and have no matching or maintenance of effort requirements. The remaining federal funds, \$999,620 are State Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) grants, for which half of the matching share is provided through sub-recipient match from local governments. The remaining HPF match is provided by general fund appropriations to the Historic Preservation program for state-mandated functions.
--	--

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

5 %	Reduction in grants to local governments. Impact would be negligible – No change to statutes or rules.
-----	--

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

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

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

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

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

Department of Heritage and Arts  
**Utah State Library General Operations**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,792,287
Number of FTEs	0
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Blind Library Program provides materials for blind, visually and print impaired; physically disabled populations; Lender Support Program supports 24 Utah libraries that that lend their materials to people outside their service areas; Public Pioneer Program provides educational and informational online premium resources to anyone in Utah. Library Development LSTA grants supports 14 academic libraries; 57 public libraries; 1236 schools; and 240 special libraries with grants to support underserved and rural Utah citizens

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$89,614)	(\$448,072)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$89,614)	(\$448,072)

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Adoption Assistance Title IV-E**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 9,250,772
Number of FTEs	136.6
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	5,989
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Clients are children with special needs who are adopted from foster care or who are recipients of Supplemental Security Income (SSI) due to disability who are adopted.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$462,539)	(\$2,312,693)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$462,539)	(\$2,312,693)

FTEs	-6.83	-34.15
------	-------	--------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Title IV-E requires state match as follows: *Adoption Assistance Payments – FMAP Rate *Adoption Assistance Administration – 50% *Enhanced Training Match – 25% *Short Term Partner Training -- 30% Social Security Act Part E, Section 474; 45 CFR 1356.60 The State is also required to meet MOE requirements pertaining to qualifying new IV-E adoptions under the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008, Social Security Act Subsection 473(a)(8).
--	---

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

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

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

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

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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$3,793,973
Number of FTEs	1.9
Recipients/Clients Served	53,431
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Adults with Serious and Persistent Mental Illness (SPMI) and Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) children.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$189,699)	(\$948,493)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$189,699)	(\$948,493)

<b>FTEs</b>	-0.1	-0.5
-------------	------	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	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. 42 U.S. Code, para 300x-4(b)
---	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would 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 %	Same description as 5% above

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

5 %	Local Mental Health Authorities would likely provide fewer services and could experience some staff reductions. Request for replacement State funds is an option.
-----	---

25 %	Local Mental Health Authorities would see staff reductions and a significant reduction of services and clients served. Request for replacement State funds is an option.
------	--

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

5 %	No.
25 %	No.

Department of Human Services  
Divisions of Division of Child & Family Services (DCFS)  
and Executive Director of Operations (EDO)  
**Child Welfare Title IV-B Subpart 1**  
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,846,700
Number of FTEs	300.4
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	4,659
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	This funding supports child welfare services for adults and children for which child abuse or neglect is a risk or a concern, in a variety of programs including, but not limited to, child protective services, in-home services, support services for children in foster care, adoption, and child abuse prevention.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$192,335)	(\$961,675)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$192,335)</b>	<b>(\$961,675)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-3.01	-15.02
-------------	-------	--------

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

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	This funding supports child welfare services. Reduction of this funding would impact child welfare services provided statewide, to an extent. The reduction would not require a change in statute or rules, but would lessen our capacity to fulfill our statutory obligation for child welfare.
25 %	This funding supports child welfare services. Reduction of this funding would impact child welfare services provided statewide, to an extent. The reduction may require a change in statute or rules.

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

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Yes, the State would continue to be obligated to provide core child welfare services including child protective services investigation, in-home services (pre-placement prevention activities to prevent entry into foster care), and supports for children in foster care, and adoption services. Other resources are limited.
25 %	See above.

Department of Human Services  
Division: Division of Child & Family Services (DCFS)  
**Family Violence Prevention and Services**  
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,204,389
Number of FTEs	0.92
Recipients/Clients Served	n/a -- Due to Federal guidelines individual information is unavailable.
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Adults and children who are victims of domestic violence receiving services through domestic violence shelters.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:  
(Insert amount of expected increase/(decrease) in State/other funds and FTEs associated with the potential federal reductions.)

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$60,219)	(\$301,097)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$60,219)</b>	<b>(\$301,097)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-0.92	-4.6
-------------	-------	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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 %	Same as 5% above.

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

5 %	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 %	Same as 5% above.

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

**Foster Care Title IV-E**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$25,592,963
Number of FTEs	395
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	4,845
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Clients are children in foster care that qualify for Title IV-E. These children are legal wards of the State.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,279,648)	(\$6,398,241)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$1,279,648)	(\$6,398,241)

FTEs	-18.4	-86.7
------	-------	-------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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 – 25% *Short Term Partner Training – 30% 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: <b>DCFS:</b> Reduction would impact funding to pay for room, board, and supervision of children in foster care, which are payments made to foster parents, small businesses that provide proctor or residential care, and local governments that provide shelter services; caseworkers (personnel) for children in foster care; administration of the foster care program; services to prevent entry into foster care; and training for staff, for individuals preparing for employment with DCFS, and for partner agencies. The reduction would not require a change in statute or
-----	--

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

	What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?
5 %	<b>DCFS</b> 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. <b>JJS</b> would experience a reduction in available community-based bed days resulting in increased pressure on more expensive and restrictive, less appropriate institutional placements. Request for replacement State funds is an option.
25 %	<b>DCFS</b> 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. <b>JJS</b> 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 %	<b>DCFS:</b> 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. <b>JJS:</b> The state would still be required to identify those clients who are Title IV-E eligible (in order to continue to receive the remaining 95% of federal funds). Although unlikely, other short-term federal grants may be available to address the Title IV-E loss impact. Otherwise, there are not any other resources available to meet these needs.
25 %	See above.

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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,102,633
Number of FTEs	11.7
Recipients/Clients Served	822
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Children and families in which there is risk for child abuse and neglect, children in foster care or returning home from foster care and their parents, and children adopted from foster care or from other child welfare services and their adoptive parents.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$105,132)	(\$525,658)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
_____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$105,132)</b>	<b>(\$525,658)</b>

  

<b>FTEs</b>	-0.59	-2.93
-------------	-------	-------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	State match is required at 25%, as well as MOE. 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.

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

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

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

Department of Human Services  
Divisions of Office of Recovery Services (ORS)  
Executive Director of Operations (EDO)  
**IV-D Child Support Collections / Incentives**  
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$19,234,613
Number of FTEs	264
Recipients/Clients Served	323,685
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Mothers, Fathers, & Children

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$961,731)	(\$4,808,653)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$961,731)	(\$4,808,653)

FTEs	-14	-68
------	-----	-----

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

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

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

Department of Human Services  
Divisions of Substance Abuse & Mental Health (DSAMH)  
Executive Director Operations (EDO)  
**Prevention and Treatment of Substance Abuse**  
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 15,618,456
Number of FTEs	3.7
Recipients/Clients Served	29,455
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Number of clients is a duplicated count. DSAMH does not collect data in a way that allows for unduplicated counting. The clients served are those who were at risk of abusing substances and/or abused substances during the period reported.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$780,923)	(\$3,904,614)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$780,923)	(\$3,904,614)

FTEs	-2	-1.0
------	----	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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. 45 CFR Part 9.134
--	---

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

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

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

Department of Human Services  
Division of Substance Abuse & Mental Health (DSAMH)  
Executive Director Operations (EDO)  
**Projects of Regional and National Significance**  
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$5,177,716
Number of FTEs	7.03
Recipients/Clients Served	1,220
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Substance Abuse prevention services to adults from 25 – 55 years of age. Substance Abuse prevention activities also included physician and pharmacy training, prescription drug take-back events, and website creation and maintenance. Services were also provided to mentally ill youth to assist them to successfully transition to adulthood. Recipients shown are a duplicated count due to the nature of prevention service delivery and data collection. In a joint effort with DCFS, families were served in parenting and prevention programming to decrease number of families entering DCFS services. Services to at-risk youth between the ages of 16 – 25 are also provided. Peer Support Training is provided to parents or other adults involved with children with serious mental health conditions, and to individuals at or above 18 and who are in recovery from serious mental illness and/or substance use disorders.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$258,886)	(\$1,294,429)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$258,886)	(\$1,294,429)

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

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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 %	A reduction in funds would result in a decrease in services provided to assist mentally ill adolescents successfully transition to adult living, mentally ill adults needing supported employment assistance, and community based substance abuse prevention activities. No change in statute or rules needed.
-----	--

25 %	Same description as 5% above
------	------------------------------

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

5 %	Amounts paid to providers (mostly local Substance Abuse and Mental Health Authorities) would be reduced. These entities would likely serve fewer clients. Program expenditures would be reduced by the same amount as the revenue reduction. A funding decrease could result in a loss of jobs for staff in the local communities.
-----	--

25 %	Same description as 5% above
------	------------------------------

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

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

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

Department of Human Services  
Executive Director of Operations (EDO)  
Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health (DSAMH)  
Division of Services for People with Disabilities (DSPD)  
Division of Child & Family Services (DCFS0)  
Division of Aging & Adult Services (DAAS)  
**Social Services Block Grant, Discretionary & TANF Transfers**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$21,867,308
Number of FTEs	390
Recipients/Clients Served (unduplicated)	62,416
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Funds are used for support and delivery of social services. Clients include vulnerable population of the state such as the elderly, at-risk children, and individuals with disabilities.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,093,365)	(\$5,466,827)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$1,093,365)	(\$5,466,827)

FTEs	-9.7	-48.3
------	------	-------

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

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

5 %	These funds are integral to the Human Service programs. If funds were cut across the board, see below for examples of impact: <b>DSAMH:</b> A reduction in funds would limit the Division's ability provide oversight of Mental Health programs. <b>DSPD:</b> 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. <b>DCFS:</b> 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. <b>DAAS:</b> All SSBG is pass-through to AAAs. There will be reduced funds for services. <b>EDO:</b> Reduction of funds distributed to local governments and for support services.
25 %	See above

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

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

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

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

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

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.043, 93.044, 93.045, 93.052, 93.053
Agency contact name and phone number	Thor Nilsen, (801) 538-3956, Don Moss (801-538-4142)

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 8,324,456
Number of FTEs	14.2
Recipients/Clients Served	32,244
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Duplicate count of vulnerable adults receiving home delivered meals, congregate meals, personal care, supportive services, transportation, nutrition counseling, etc.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$416,223)	(\$2,081,114)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$416,223)</b>	<b>(\$2,081,114)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-0	-0
-------------	----	----

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

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

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

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

Utah Labor Commission  
**UOSH (Utah OSHA) Compliance**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016  
—Does not include ARRA—

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.503
Agency contact name and phone number	Butch Luers, 801-530-6335 (grant accounting) or David Lamb 801-530-6816 (Dir Admin Services)

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,432,221
Number of FTEs	26.15
Recipients/Clients Served	940 workplace interventions; OSHA has jurisdiction over 1.3 million employees and 92,292 employers
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Employers and employees that have significant workplace safety risks

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5%	25%
Federal:	(\$ 71,611)	(\$ 358,055)
State:		
General Fund	\$ 0.0	\$ 0.0
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Workplace Safety	\$ 0.0	\$ 0.0
Other Fund		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL :	(\$ 71,611)	(\$ 358,055)

FTEs	-1	-7
------	----	----

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

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

5 %	UOSH compliance efforts would have to be reduced. This reduction would not require a change in statute or rules.
25 %	Same as 5% above.

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

5 %	Compliance with federal and state workplace safety rules may decrease if public and private employers become aware that inspections will be reduced. Safety of private employees, and state and local governmental workers could be compromised.
25 %	Same as 5% above.

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

5 %	Yes, there are mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain. At a 5% reduction, the State could maintain the level of service required by Utah statute and the existing agreement with the federal agency - OSHA.
25 %	Yes, there are mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain. At a 25% reduction, federal OSHA would need to determine whether the baseline requirement for compliance efforts would remain in effect, since resulting staffing reductions would likely bring the UOSH Division under the staffing levels required under our federal agreement.

Utah National Guard  
**Law Enforcement Assistance**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 4,907,250
Number of FTEs	60
Recipients/Clients Served	US Dept. of Justice
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA)

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$245,363)	(\$1,226,813)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$245,363)</b>	<b>(\$1,226,813)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-3	-15
-------------	----	-----

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

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

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

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

<b>5 %</b>	A 5% reduction would cause a corresponding reduction in translation capabilities of the Counter Drug program. The program would become moderately smaller, fewer services provided to DEA, and expenditures would be reduced. The program does not collect fees.
<b>25 %</b>	A 25% reduction would adversely affect the translation capabilities of the Counter Drug program. The program would become significantly smaller with fewer services provided to DEA. The program does not collect fees.

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

<b>5 %</b>	No
<b>25 %</b>	No

Utah National Guard  
**Military Construction Cooperative Agreement**  
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,125,449
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	Communities, Utah, U.S. Army
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Military Construction provides construction and major capital improvements of facilities necessary to support the 7,100 Soldiers and Airmen of the UNG and over 11,000 Soldiers who train here from other states. These facilities are essential to National Guard readiness to respond to national and state emergencies. UNG facilities become an integral part of their communities supporting, directly or indirectly, all citizens of the community.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$56,272)	(\$281,362)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$56,272)	(\$281,362)

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

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

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

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

	within available funding or cancelling or postponing a project. A funding cut would not directly result in a staff reduction. The reduction would not require any change in statute or rules.
--	---

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

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

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

5 %	No
25 %	No

Utah National Guard  
**Military Operations and Maintenance**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 34,732,369
Number of FTEs	142
Recipients/Clients Served	State, Army, Air Force
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The UNG has entered into a Master Cooperative Agreement with the National Guard Bureau (NGB). Under the terms of the various appendices of this agreement, NGB reimburses UNG for certain operations and maintenance expenses. These agreements provide federal funding in whole or in part to various programs necessary to support the 5,600 Soldiers and 1,500 Airmen of the Utah National Guard. It provides funds for facility maintenance of Army National Guard armories in 23 communities throughout Utah and the Air National Guard base at the Salt Lake Airport. These activities are essential to the National Guard readiness to respond to national and state emergencies. National Guard units become an integral part of their communities, supporting, directly or indirectly, all citizens of Utah.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,736,618)	(\$8,683,092)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$1,736,618)</b>	<b>(\$8,683,092)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	<b>-7</b>	<b>-35</b>
-------------	-----------	------------

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

<p>Federal funding reductions will result in reducing expenditures in these programs. However, some costs, such as facility O&amp;M, security, telecommunications, and emergency management, may continue without regard to federal funding.</p> <p>The federal funding for these programs is appropriated by congress and then apportioned and distributed by the Army and Air Force through NGB to the UNG. All federal funding is not interchangeable. To comply with federal fiscal law, there is limited local ability to reprogram federal funds.</p> <p>It is not likely that there would be a 5% or 25% "across the board" funding reduction. More likely, is a funding cut that would devastate some programs and leave others less effected. For this reason it is not possible to accurately present the effects of cuts to each program. The effect on personnel could vary widely depending on which program is cut. For example, a \$2 million cut in the Family Program would cut about 10 FTE. A \$2 million cut in the ARNG Facilities Program may not effect FTE.</p> <p>In 2016, total federal funding to the UNG was about \$329 million. Only a portion of that is represented in the State budget with the rest being spent directly through federal programs and payroll. A 5% cut would be about \$16.5 million. A 25% cut would be about \$82 million. A 25% cut could dramatically reduce UNG readiness to respond to state and federal missions. The FTE cuts presented here only address State of Utah employees. Depending on the federal program being cut, we could also expect UNG federal employee cuts.</p> <p>A short term funding decrease will have less effect than a long term funding decrease. For example, some facility repair or maintenance may be delayed in a short term funding reduction with little long term effect. A long term funding reduction causing a long term facility repair or maintenance delay could lead to a more expensive facility failure. The longer funding levels are reduced, the greater the negative effects.</p>
--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	A 5% cut in federal funding would have a minor effect on the UNG facilities programs and a significant effect if applied solely to other programs. A 5% reduction in funding will have a measurable effect on the training readiness of National Guard Soldiers and Airmen. A general 5% funding cut may result in a 7 FTE cut. If applied specifically to certain programs, the FTE cut could be greater. The reduction would not require any change in statute or rules.
25 %	A 25% funding cut would adversely affect the operation, training, and readiness of the Utah National Guard. We would expect deterioration of facility conditions due to the lack of maintenance funds. Multiple years of reduced funding could result in health, life, safety, and security problems in facilities. We would have to consider closing facilities. We would have to dramatically reduce our telecommunications, security surveillance, and fuel support to training units. It would devastate family programs which provide essential support to military families prior to, during, and after deployment. A general 25% funding cut could result in 37 FTEs staffing reduction. Depending on which programs are effected, FTE cuts could be more or less. The reduction would not require any change in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	A 5% federal funding reduction would have a measurable effect on the readiness of the Utah National Guard. There could be a negative effect on training and logistical readiness. It could also adversely affect facility maintenance. Depending on the program cut, some programs may need to be discontinued or dramatically curtailed. The National Guard would still maintain the capability to deploy in support of State and national emergencies.

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

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

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

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

*This page is blank.*

Department of Natural Resources  
**Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,944,230
Number of FTEs	10
Recipients/Clients Served	3,000,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Abandoned Mine Lands Program (AMRP) protects public health and safety, improves the environment by sealing open mines, stabilizes coal waste and revegetates areas disturbed by mining past mining activities and returns these lands to productive use. Therefore all citizens of the State, Visitors to the State, Outdoor recreation users including OHV users and hikers, and downstream communities of local mining districts are impacted by this grant.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

<b>Funding Information</b>	<b>5 %</b>	<b>25 %</b>
Federal	(\$97,212)	(\$486,058)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$97,212)	(\$486,058)

<b>FTEs</b>	0	0
-------------	---	---

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	No state match is required on the main source of federal funds for this program. However, sometimes there are projects with certain federal agencies which require state match funds, but only minimal state funds are available which restrict our participation.
--	--

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

<b>5 %</b>	No change in statute or rules. The AMRP would reduce engineering and/or construction work designed to reclaim hazards at abandoned mine sites. Mine openings would remain open longer and threaten the public's health and safety.
<b>25 %</b>	No change in statute or rules. The AMRP would <u>greatly reduce</u> engineering and/or construction work designed to reclaim hazards at abandoned mine sites. Mine openings would remain open much longer and threaten the public's health and safety.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
<b>5 %</b>	The liability of the State would continue by allowing identified abandoned mine related hazards to remain open and unreclaimed longer.
<b>25 %</b>	The State would reduce the amount of work outsourced to engineering and design consultants and construction contractors. Local businesses that supply engineering and/or construction workers (motel, restaurant, grocery, etc.) would see reduction in income derived from abandoned mine reclamation work.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
<b>5 %</b>	If the AMRP is unable to perform these services, the State primacy program could return to the federal agency.
<b>25 %</b>	The AMRP is the only state agency with a mission to reclaim abandoned mine related hazards. Minimal State funding is available for these purposes. Until all sites are reclaimed, the State's liability on State owned property will remain.

Department of Natural Resources  
**Boating Safety Coast Guard**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	97.012
Agency contact name and phone number	Scott Strong 801 664-1381

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,282,709
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	25 State Parks and an estimate of 62,000 registered boats
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Boating projects, patrol boats, ramps, etc.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$64,135)	(\$320,677)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$64,135)	(\$320,677)

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

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	We do not receive a state match for this grant.
---	---

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

5 %	The Program aims to educate and inform boat operators about boating laws and rules established to provide public safety and protect our natural resources on Utah's waterways. Our efforts are funded through boat registration fees, state taxes on gasoline used in motorboats, and federal boating safety grants. If the funding is reduced less money would be available to maintain boating.
25 %	A funding reduction would result in less money being available to us in maintaining and purchasing boats, building docks, etc.

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

5 %	The impact on recipients would have a negative impact because fewer resources would be available to educate and inform boat operators about boating laws. Fewer boating related improvement projects would be constructed. These laws were established to provide public safety and protect our natural resources on Utah's waterways.
25 %	The impact on recipients would have a negative impact because fewer resources would be available to educate and inform boat operators about boating laws. Fewer boating related improvement projects would be

	constructed. These laws were established to provide public safety and protect our natural resources on Utah's waterways.
--	--

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

5 %	There are no mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut.
25 %	There are no mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut.

Department of Natural Resources  
**Coal Program**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$2,085,663
Number of FTEs	16
Recipients/Clients Served	2,800,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Over 80% of the electricity generated in Utah is from coal. Therefore, all citizens of the state, coal mining operators and communities, downstream water users are impacted by this grant.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$104,283)	(\$521,416)
State:		
General Fund	(\$14,220)	(\$71,102)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$118,503)</b>	<b>(\$592,518)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-1	-5
-------------	----	----

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Funding is based on the percentage of federal lands involved in coal mining in Utah. Funding is approximately 88% federal funds and 12% General Funds (state match).
--	--

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

<b>5 %</b>	No change in statute or rules. The program would lose approximately 1 FTE. The permitting and inspecting process for coal mines would be performed by remaining staff, thus causing a slower response time to the coal mines.
<b>25 %</b>	No change in statute or rules. The program would lose approximately 5 FTEs. The permitting and inspecting process for coal mines would be performed by remaining staff, thus causing a <u>much slower</u> response time to the coal mines and not as many inspections will be completed.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
<b>5 %</b>	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.
<b>25 %</b>	The impact to the mining community would be that the approvals of their permits would take much longer and the mandatory inspections would not get done and will slow down production and their ability to make money.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
<b>5 %</b>	We would still have to provide the services delegated to us by the cooperative agreement with the Secretary of the Interior.
<b>25 %</b>	We would still have to provide the services delegated to us by the cooperative agreement with the Secretary of the Interior. If we are unable to do these services, the federal agency may need to take back the primacy.

Department of Natural Resources  
**Cooperative Agreements**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.664, 15.504, 15.529, 15.642, Various DOI, DOD, EPA, DOE, and USDA
Agency contact name and phone number	Eric Hyatt, (801) 538-4850

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,420,504
Number of FTEs	13
Recipients/Clients Served	Public
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Co-Operative Projects, Watershed

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$171,025)	(\$855,126)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$171,025)</b>	<b>(\$855,126)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-65	-3.25
-------------	-----	-------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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.

<b>5 %</b>	These are funds that are used for projects impacting a wide variety of species. These include, but are not limited to: owls, foxes, big horn sheep, birds, rabbits, range trend projects, guzzlers, and watershed projects.
<b>25 %</b>	These are funds that are used for projects impacting a wide variety of species. These include, but are not limited to: owls, foxes, big horn sheep, birds, rabbits, range trend projects, guzzlers, and watershed projects.

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

<b>5 %</b>	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.
<b>25 %</b>	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?	
<b>5 %</b>	No
<b>25 %</b>	No

Department of Natural Resources  
**Fish, Wildlife, and Plant Conservation Resource Management**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.231
Agency contact name and phone number	Eric Hyatt, (801) 538-4850

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 4,537,903
Number of FTEs	4
Recipients/Clients Served	Public
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Watershed

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$226,895)	(\$1,134,476)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$226,895)	(\$1,134,476)

FTEs	-2	-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>	N/A
--	-----

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

5 %	These are funds that are used to assist in the advancement of watershed restoration, conservation, and the improvement and maintenance of fish and wildlife habitat
25 %	These are funds that are used to assist in the advancement of watershed restoration, conservation, and the improvement and maintenance of fish and wildlife habitat

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

5 %	A reduction in funds would cause fewer projects to be completed. Because these projects affect everything from big game to fish, the quantity and quality for hunters and fishers would be diminished.
25 %	A reduction in funds would cause fewer projects to be completed. Because these projects affect everything from big game to fish, the quantity and quality for hunters and fishers would be diminished.

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

Department of Natural Resources  
**Forestry, Fire, and State Lands**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.664, 10.676, 10.680, 10.691, 10.932
Agency contact name and phone number	Roger Lewis, (801) 537-3206

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$4,137,628
Number of FTEs	29
Recipients/Clients Served	Approx. 2,500
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Private landowners of forested lands, fire departments, counties, cities, etc.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$206,881)	(\$1,034,407)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$206,881)	(\$1,034,407)

<b>FTEs</b>	-2	-6
-------------	----	----

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> <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.

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

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

<b>5 %</b>	No. The only other funding source to continue this work would be State funds.
<b>25 %</b>	No. The only other funding source to continue this work would be State funds.

Department of Natural Resources  
**Recreational Trails Program**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	20.219
Agency contact name and phone number	Scott Strong (801)-664-1381

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,047,893
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	Patrons that access non-motorized trails
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The funding is pass-through to Cities and Counties.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$52,395)	(\$261,973)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$52,395)	(\$261,973)

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

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	We do not receive a state match for this grant.
---	---

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

5 %	This National Trails program provides funding for cities and counties to improve and or build non-motorized trails. If this funding is not received there would be a reduction of funding available for non-motorized trails.
25 %	This National Trails program provides funding for cities and counties to improve and or build non-motorized trails. If this funding is not received there would be a reduction of funding available for non-motorized trails.

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

5 %	There would be fewer non-motorized trails built or maintained if the services were not received or the funding was reduced.
25 %	There would be fewer non-motorized trails built or maintained if the services were not received or the funding was reduced.

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

Department of Natural Resources  
**Sportfish Restoration**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.605
Agency contact name and phone number	Eric Hyatt, (801) 538-4850

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 6,179,415
Number of FTEs	66
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 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$308,971)	(\$1,544,854)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Wildlife Resources Restricted Account - 1170	(102,990)	(514,951)
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$411,961)</b>	<b>(\$2,059,805)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-3.3	-16.5
-------------	------	-------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	State match is a required 25%. This match most typically comes from our restricted funds or license sales.
---	--

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

<b>5 %</b>	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.
<b>25 %</b>	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?	
<b>5 %</b>	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.
<b>25 %</b>	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?	
<b>5 %</b>	No
<b>25 %</b>	No

Department of Natural Resources  
**Wildlife Restoration**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	15.611
Agency contact name and phone number	Eric Hyatt, (801) 538-4850

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 12,035,340
Number of FTEs	71
Recipients/Clients Served	Public
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	All Big Game Species, Habitat Management, Hunter Education, Administration of Federal Funds

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$601,767)	(\$3,008,835)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name: Wildlife Resources Restricted Account - 1170	(200,587)	(1,002,935)
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$802,354)</b>	<b>(\$4,011,770)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-3.65	-18.25
-------------	-------	--------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	State match is a required 25%. This match most typically comes from our restricted funds or license sales.
--	--

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

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

<b>5 %</b>	A reduction in funds would cause a reduction in the quantity and quality of wildlife available to the hunting public.
------------	---

<b>25 %</b>	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?

<b>5 %</b>	No
<b>25 %</b>	No

Board of Education  
**ASPIRE**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.418
Agency contact name and phone number	Jennifer Roth, (801) 535-3883

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts (US Dept. of Education)	\$ 5,036,893
Number of FTEs (in Utah)	11
Recipients/Clients Served	2,000
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	ASPIRE is a US Department of Education award (PROMISE research study) in partnership with the Social Security Administration, Department of Labor and Health and Human Services. ASPIRE will enroll 2000 youth receiving Supplemental Security Income, and their families residing in six states – Arizona, Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota and Utah, and directly serve the 1000 youth randomly assigned to the treatment group.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$251,845)	(\$1,259,223)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$251,845)	(\$1,259,223)

FTEs	-1	-4
------	----	----

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 %	As a six-state consortium, reductions to funds in ASPIRE will directly impact the contracts with those states, their staff, any subcontractors/vendors providing services (there are currently 37) and limit the ability of ASPIRE to fulfill the requirements of the award from the US Department of Education. No state statute or rule change would be necessary.
25 %	As a six-state consortium, reductions to funds in ASPIRE will directly impact the contracts with those states, their staff, any subcontractors/vendors providing services (there are currently 37) limit the ability of ASPIRE to fulfill the requirements of the award from the US Department of Education. A reduction of 25% will result in USOR being unable to fulfill the requirements of the award from the US Department of Education. No state statute or rule change would be necessary.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	A 5% reduction in funds would result in ASPIRE not being able to serve 1000 of the youth and families through September 2018. This amount cannot be solely absorbed by the ASPIRE Utah team and project leadership in USOR. Contracts with five states would have to be amended, reducing their funds, resulting in a reduction of staff, a minimum of one staff member in each state. Current budgets are proportionate to the number of youth served in each state, so a single state could not absorb the full cost. Fewer staff would result in higher caseloads for the remaining staff. Higher caseloads will result in not meeting the ASPIRE policy of providing services and supports, including monthly face to face meetings with the youth and families, thereby jeopardizing the research study outcomes.
25 %	A 5% reduction in funds would result in ASPIRE not being able to serve 1000 of the youth and families through September 2018. This amount cannot be solely absorbed by the ASPIRE Utah team and project leadership in USOR. Contracts with five states would have to be amended, reducing their funds, resulting in a reduction of staff in the states, a minimum of one staff member each in MT, ND, SD and UT, two in CO and three in Arizona Fewer staff would result in higher caseloads for the remaining staff. Higher caseloads will result in not meeting the ASPIRE policy of providing services and supports, including monthly face to face meetings with the youth and families, thereby jeopardizing the research study outcomes. A reduction of 25% will result in ASPIRE not satisfying the requirements of the PROMISE/ASPIRE award from the US Department of Education.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	ASPIRE does not require any state or locally matched funds. If federal funds were to be cut 5%, it is anticipated that the US Department of Education would determine which areas of the ASPIRE research would be directly impacted.
25 %	ASPIRE does not require any state or locally matched funds. If federal funds were to be cut 25%, it is anticipated that the US Department of Education would determine that the ASPIRE research study would end.

**Board of Education  
Assessment and Accountability**

**Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016**

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,757,216
Number of FTEs	14
Recipients/Clients Served	Students, Teachers and Administrators in Public Schools
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Administer all required student federal and state assessments and create all required federal and state accountability reports, and provide professional development and training for Assessment and data use to improve instruction.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

<b>Funding Information</b>	<b>5 %</b>	<b>25 %</b>
Federal	(\$187,861)	(\$939,304)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$187,861)</b>	<b>(\$939,304)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-1	-3.5
-------------	----	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> <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.

<b>5 %</b>	Slow down assessment and testing development, and reduction of testing services
<b>25 %</b>	Significantly slow down assessment and testing development, and reduce testing services, and possible elimination of federally mandated tests.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
<b>5 %</b>	Reduced ability to ensuring that the State's schools and local education agencies are held accountable for results. Possible impact on services to highly impacted students, and ability to target services and interventions for all students.
<b>25 %</b>	Reduced ability to ensuring that the State's schools and local education agencies are held accountable for results. Probable impact on services to highly impacted students, and ability to target services and interventions for all students.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
<b>5 %</b>	The WIDA assessment for English learners would be impacted, the DLM for significantly cognitively impaired population of students, The Center for Assessment technical Advisory group, and portions of the SAGE assessments are all at least partially or fully funded from federal sources.
<b>25 %</b>	A definite reduction or elimination of the WIDA assessments, the DLM, and elimination of services from the Center for the Assessment technical Advisory group and reduction of services around the end of level SAGE assessment system.

**Board of Education  
Career and Technology Education**

**Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016**

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.002, 84.048
Agency contact name and phone number	Thalea Longhurst, (801) 538-7889

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 17,516,703
Number of FTEs	7.75
Recipients/Clients Served	274,533
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	School Districts and Charter Schools (school children), Technology centers (school children and adults), and Adult education.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

**Note:** Education funding at district level will be impacted 64 percent of these funds flow to other organizations.

<b>Funding Information</b>	<b>5 %</b>	<b>25 %</b>
Federal	(\$875,835)	(\$4,379,176)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
_____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$875,835)</b>	<b>(\$4,379,176)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-5	-2
-------------	----	----

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Both Perkins and AEFLA have state MOE requirements as well as state matching requirements. Levels of state funding would need to be maintained regardless of whether federal funds are reduced.
--	---

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

<b>5 %</b>	Reductions will impact both local and state-led projects as well as programs, equipment purchases, resource development, and professional development that support existing programs. Staffing will also be affected.
<b>25 %</b>	Reductions at this level would significantly impact state and local FTE to work on projects related directly to meeting program requirements including technical assistance, data reporting, and program monitoring. In addition, support for programs, equipment, resources, professional development would be reduced.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
<b>5 %</b>	Recipients will have less funds to provide direct services to students. Services provided and numbers of students served would be reduced
<b>25 %</b>	Recipients will have significantly less funds to provide direct services to students. Services provided and numbers of students served would be reduced.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
<b>5 %</b>	Federal services would still need to be maintained at the level that could be sustained with the available federal funds. This includes technical assistance, data reporting, and program monitoring.
<b>25 %</b>	Federal services would still need to be maintained at the level that could be sustained with the available federal funds. This includes technical assistance, data reporting, and program monitoring.

Board of Education  
**Child Nutrition Programs**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.553, 10.555, 10.556, 10.558, 10.559, 10.560, 10.568, 10.569, 10.574, 10.575, 10.579, 10.582
Agency contact name and phone number	Kathleen Britton, (801) 538-7513

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 175,775,822
Number of FTEs	26.5
Recipients/Clients Served	<p>There are 7 Family Day Care sponsors, serving about 16,300 children a day year round.</p> <p>There are 155 Child and Adult Care Food Program sponsors, serving about 21,700 children a day year round.</p> <p>There are 135 sponsors of School Nutrition Programs, serving approximately 575,000 children a day during the school year.</p> <p>There are 45 Summer Food Service Program sponsors, serving about 50,700 children a day during the summer months.</p>
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Children served by Local Education Agencies and Residential Child Care Institutions, children and adults served by the Child and Adult Care Programs, individuals and families are provided food through The Emergency Food Assistance Program

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$8,788,791)	(\$43,943,956)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$8,788,791)	(\$43,943,956)

FTEs	-1.5	-7
------	------	----

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	<p>MOE requirement for USDA State Administrative Expenses grant is \$178,569. State appropriated funds of \$143,200 and \$36,369 from state liquor tax are used to meet this requirement (CFDA 10.560).</p> <p>MOE requirement, matching requirement and the salary for Commodities Assistance Program—Temporary Emergency Food Assistance Administrative Costs (CAP TEFAP) is from State appropriated funds (CFDA 10.568).</p> <p>MATCH-USDA National School Lunch Program State Revenue Matching Requirement, State FY2016-2017 is \$1,516,785 which is matched with state</p>
--	--

liquor tax. This dedicated credit is set by 32B-2-304 (4) Liquor Price—School Lunch 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 %	<p>10.555 - Block Grant- National School Lunch Program (Entitlement Grant) – To assist States, through cash grants and food donations, in providing a nutritious nonprofit lunch service for school children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities. No change in statute or rules. Entitlement Grants - Provide funds to specific grantees based on formula, prescribed by legislation or regulation. The formula is based on factors such as population, enrollment, per capita income or specific need. No change in statute or rules.</p> <p>10.560 - Child Nutrition Programs State Administrative Expenditures: To provide each State agency with funds for its administrative expenses in supervising and giving technical assistance to local schools, school districts and institutions in their conduct of Child Nutrition Programs. State agencies that administer the distribution of USDA Foods to schools and child or adult care institutions are also provided with State Administrative Expense funds. No change in statute or rules.</p> <p>10.568- The Emergency Food Assistance Program: To help supplement the diets of low-income persons by making funds available to States for processing, storage and distribution costs incurred by State agencies and local organizations, such as soup kitchens, food banks, and food pantries, including faith-based organizations, in providing food assistance to needy persons. No change in statute or rules.</p> <p>10.582-Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Program: To assist States, through cash grants, in providing free fresh fruits and vegetables to elementary schools with high percentages of children that receive free or reduced price meals through the National School Lunch Program.</p>
25 %	See program descriptions above and change in statute or rules.

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

5 %	<p>10.555 - Block Grant- National School Lunch Program (Entitlement Grant) - Reducing this funding source by 5% would result in reduced reimbursements to schools and child care centers.</p> <p>10.560 - Child Nutrition Programs State Administrative Expenditures: This would impact training of state and local level of employees, audits, program compliance, travel, supplies, etc.</p> <p>10.568-The Emergency Food Assistance Program: This would reduce the amount that is flowed through to Utah Food Bank.</p> <p>10.582-Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Program: This would reduce the amount of funding flowed through to the elementary schools.</p>
25 %	10.555 - Block Grant- National School Lunch Program (Entitlement Grant) - Reducing this funding source by 25% would result in reduced reimbursements to schools and child care centers. Which would likely reduce the quality of meals served, staffing levels at the sub-awardee level, participation in initiatives and auxiliary programs such as farm to school, universal breakfast, After School Snack Program (ASSP). It may also give them incentive to sell non-reimbursable items to compensate for the loss in revenue. Child Care Centers may choose not to participate in the program because the compensation may not be worth the administrative burden of running the program. For After School Meal Program sponsors they may halt the current expansion of sites and even eliminate some of the smaller programs from their list which may also have with our current Summer Sponsors.

	<p>10.560 - Child Nutrition Programs State Administrative Expenditures: This would decrease the number of employees from 26.5 to 21. This would impact training of state and local level of employees, audits, program compliance, travel, supplies, etc. The subrecipient monitoring that is federally mandated would be impacted in timeliness and how often; which in turn would result in more findings.</p> <p>10.568-Emergency Food Assistance Program: This would reduce the amount of funding that is flowed through to Utah Food Bank.</p> <p>10.582-Fresh Fruits and Vegetable Program: This would reduce the amount of funding flowed through to the elementary schools.</p>
--	---

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
<b>5 %</b>	The state would need to maintain their MOE and matching level for CFDA 10.560 and 10.555.
<b>25 %</b>	The state would need to maintain their MOE and matching level for CFDA 10.560 and 10.555.

*This page is blank*

Board of Education  
**Elementary Secondary Education Act**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.010, 84.011, 84.013, 84.287, 84.365, 84.377
Agency contact name and phone number	Ann White (801) 538-7509

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 106,728,190
Number of FTEs	12.75
Recipients/Clients Served	40 districts 71 charter schools 298 schools Approximately 126,000 students
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Schools qualify for Title I funding if the school has at least a poverty rate of 35%. Students who are at-risk of failing to meet academic success are served through schools receiving funds for limited English proficiency, immigrant students, migrant students, and students participating in after school programs.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$5,336,410)	(\$26,682,048)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$5,336,410)</b>	<b>(\$26,682,048)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-1	-3.5
-------------	----	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Maintenance of Effort requires that state and local fund expenditures cannot be less than 90% of the expenditures from the previous year.
--	---

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

<b>5 %</b>	Programs and services to help local educational agencies (LEA's) improve teaching and learning in high-poverty schools in particular for children failing, or most at-risk of failing, to meet challenging State academic achievement standards would have to be reduced.
<b>25 %</b>	Programs and services to help local educational agencies (LEA's) improve teaching and learning in high-poverty schools in particular for children failing, or most at-risk of failing, to meet challenging State academic achievement standards would have to be reduced.

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

<b>5 %</b>	Programs and services to help local educational agencies (LEA's) improve teaching and learning in high-poverty schools in particular for children failing, or most at-risk of failing, to meet challenging State academic achievement standards would have to be reduced.
<b>25 %</b>	Programs and services to help local educational agencies (LEA's) improve teaching and learning in high-poverty schools in particular for children failing, or most at-risk of failing, to meet challenging State academic achievement standards would have to be reduced.

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

<b>5 %</b>	At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and state funding efforts.
<b>25 %</b>	At this level of reduction, we would receive further guidance on program requirements and state funding efforts.

Board of Education  
**Office of Rehabilitation, Disability Determination Services**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	96.001
Agency contact name and phone number	Jennifer Roth, (801) 535-3883

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 14,671,827
Number of FTEs	96.5
Recipients/Clients Served	23,557
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Citizens of Utah who have a physical or mental disability and are receiving or applying for assistance from social security. Funds are used to determine eligibility for Social Security funds.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$733,591)	(\$3,667,957)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$733,591)	(\$3,667,957)

<b>FTEs</b>	-5	-24
-------------	----	-----

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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 activities and expenditures that would impact would the payroll of the staff. The staff would possibly have to be reduced and that would impact the services to the clients and to ensure that proper federal guidelines are met for clients to receive funds and for the funds to be accounted for correctly.
25 %	Staff would not be able to process SSA claims for clients. The backlog of claims would be greater and the ability for people to use Social Security and Determination Services would be less.

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

5 %	The backlog of SSA claims would be greater and the ability for people to use Social Security and Determination services would be less.
-----	--

25 %	The backlog of SSA claims would be greater and the ability for people to use Social Security and Determination services would be less.
------	--

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

5 %	No, if the SSA federal funds were cut, the State DDS would only be able to process the number of SSA disability claims for which they received funding. SSA works with the State DDS to set annual goals for the number of SSA disability claims to produce. Every fiscal year SSA agrees to provide the DDS with the funds to reach that goal. If the funds were to be reduced by Congressional Budget, then the goal would be reduced by same amount. In the past, Congress has limited funds to SSA Disability with the instructions that certain funds would only be used for certain types of claims (such as initial claims or Continuing Disability Claims). The DDS will then concentrate its available resources on the directive claims. If SSA funding were to be cut, the State would not need to make up the difference as the only claims the Utah DDS reviews are SSA claims. SSA directs the number of staff that the DDS can hire and places freezes on DDS hiring when SSA funding is restricted such as when a Continuing Resolution is in place that does not cover any additional hiring or when the Federal Government was shut down, SSA contracted to cover all DDS budgets when the funding was restored.
-----	--

25 %	No, if the SSA federal funds were cut, the State DDS would only be able to process the number of SSA disability claims for which they received funding. SSA works with the State DDS to set annual goals for the number of SSA disability claims to produce. Every fiscal year SSA agrees to provide the DDS with the funds to reach that goal. If the funds were to be reduced by Congressional Budget, then the goal would be reduced by same amount. In the past, Congress has limited funds to SSA Disability with the instructions that certain funds would only be used for certain types of claims (such as initial claims or Continuing Disability Claims). The DDS will then concentrate its available resources on the directive claims. If SSA funding were to be cut, the State would not need to make up the difference as the only claims the Utah DDS reviews are SSA claims. SSA directs the number of staff that the DDS can hire and places freezes on DDS hiring when SSA funding is restricted such as when a Continuing Resolution is in place that does not cover any additional hiring or when the Federal Government was shut down, SSA contracted to cover all DDS budgets when the funding was restored.
------	--

Board of Education  
**Office of Rehabilitation, Vocational Rehabilitation**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	84.126
Agency contact name and phone number	Jennifer Roth, (801) 535-3883

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 18,573,445
Number of FTEs	240
Recipients/Clients Served	20,826
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Eligible Individuals with disabilities who require Vocational Rehabilitation services in order to obtain or maintain meaningful employment.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$928,672)	(\$4,643,361)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$928,672)</b>	<b>(\$4,643,361)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-8	-37
-------------	----	-----

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	At a minimum a match of 21.3% is required for the Vocational Rehabilitation grant. As such, the required state match would decrease as a result of decreasing federal funds. However, the Vocational Rehabilitation grant also has a maintenance of effort requirement which would not allow for a decrease in state funds, even in the event of decreasing federal funds. As such, we have not shown a reduction in state funding in the table above.
--	--

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

<b>5 %</b>	The Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) program provides personalized services to eligible individuals with disabilities, ages 14 and up, to meet their specific needs in achieving a meaningful and integrated employment outcome. Examples of VR services include counseling and guidance, disability restoration interventions, assistive technology, training and job placement. This reduction would not require a change in statute or rules.
<b>25 %</b>	The Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) program provides personalized services to eligible individuals with disabilities, ages 14 and up, to meet their specific needs in achieving a meaningful and integrated employment outcome. Examples of VR services include counseling and guidance, disability restoration interventions, assistive technology, training and job placement. This reduction would not require a change in statute or rules.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
<b>5 %</b>	USOR's Vocational Rehabilitation Program is currently operating under an Order of Selection, which is a federally-sanctioned Wait List by which individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities are served first. At a 5% reduction USOR would have to reduce the number of individuals who are released from the Wait List for services.
<b>25 %</b>	USOR's Vocational Rehabilitation Program is currently operating under an Order of Selection, which is a federally-sanctioned Wait List by which individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities are served first. At a 25% reduction, USOR would be forced to close the first priority category of the Wait List. Individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities, in addition to keeping closed the other two categories, Individuals with Significant Disabilities and Individuals with Disabilities. This would substantially limit the provision of VR services to eligible individuals.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
<b>5 %</b>	As defined in federal regulations (34 CFR Part 361) the State is required to provide vocational rehabilitation services on a statewide level for eligible individuals with disabilities. There are no other comparable resources available to meet these needs.
<b>25 %</b>	As defined in federal regulations (34 CFR Part 361) the State is required to provide vocational rehabilitation services on a statewide level for eligible individuals with disabilities. There are no other comparable resources available to meet these needs.

Board of Education  
**Special Education IDEA**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 110,138,130
Number of FTEs	25.25
Recipients/Clients Served	77,925
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Students with disabilities attending Utah districts and charter schools (Local Education Agency or LEA).

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$5,506,907)	(\$27,534,533)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$5,506,907)	(\$27,534,533)

FTEs	-1.25	-6.5
------	-------	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	IDEA has a Maintenance of Effort requirement at both the State and LEA level.  For Maintenance of State Fiscal Support the State must not reduce the amount of State financial support for special education and related services for children with disabilities below the amount of that support for the preceding fiscal year (34 CFR §300.163). Allocations included in this calculation include Special Education funds distributed in the Minimum School Program, funding for USDB, and some funding from other State Agencies such as the Department of Health.  In addition to this State requirement, IDEA funds provided to the LEA must not be used to reduce the level of expenditures for the education of children with disabilities made by the LEA from state and/or local funds below the level of those expenditures for the preceding fiscal year (34 CFR §300.203). In limited circumstances, the LEA may apply for an exception to the Maintenance of Effort requirement (34 CFR §300.204 & 205).
--	---

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

5 %	A 5% reduction in federal funds would result in a reduction of statewide activities that support the implementation of IDEA. These statewide activities eliminate unnecessary expenditure on the part of each LEA. Examples of statewide activities that would be impacted include: Technical Assistance to LEAs, grants to Utah's colleges and universities provided to increase the number of qualified special education teachers,
-----	---

	professional development activities for teachers and administrators, special education support publications, projects designed to meet the unique needs of students with specific types of disabilities, projects designed to improve academic outcomes for students with disabilities, and support to LEAs with critical needs. In addition to these changes in statewide activities, the amount of funding provided to each Utah LEA for services to students with disabilities would be reduced by 5%.
25 %	A 25% reduction in federal funds would result in elimination or reduction of statewide activities that support the implementation of IDEA. Examples of statewide activities that would be eliminated or reduced include: Technical Assistance to LEAs, grants to Utah's colleges and universities provided to increase the number of qualified special education teachers, professional development activities for teachers and administrators, special education support publications, projects designed to meet the unique needs of students with specific types of disabilities, projects designed to improve academic outcomes for students with disabilities, and support to LEAs with critical needs. In addition to these changes in statewide activities, the amount of funding provided to each Utah LEA for services to students with disabilities would be reduced by 25%.

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

5 %	94% of IDEA funds are distributed to LEAs by formula. In addition, a portion of the funds reserved for statewide activities is distributed to LEAs, IHES, and other state agencies. This reduction would require LEAs to reorganize programs of service delivery for students. LEAs may not charge fees for special education services. LEAs may not restrict or adjust services required by the Individualized Education Program based on budget reductions. LEAs may need to use funds intended for the operation of general educational programs to maintain the level of services that are required for students to receive a Free and Appropriate Public Education, as required by IDEA.
25 %	94% of IDEA funds are distributed to LEAs by formula. In addition, a portion of the funds reserved for statewide activities is distributed to LEAs, IHES, and other state agencies. This reduction would require LEAs to reorganize programs of service delivery for students. LEAs may not charge fees for special education services. LEAs may not restrict or adjust services required by the Individualized Education Plan based on budget reductions. It is expected that LEAs will begin using general education funding to support special education programs with a cut at this level. Therefore, these cuts will likely impact all Utah students and not only those with disabilities. A cut of this magnitude would result in the elimination of all funds distributed to IHES and other state agencies, and also of funds distributed to LEAs in addition to the formula. LEAs may need to use funds intended for the operation of general educational programs to maintain the level of services that are required for students to receive a Free and Appropriate Public Education, as required by IDEA.

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

5 %	Special Education and Related Services as described on the Individualized Education Program for each student with a disability must be provided even though federal funding is cut. State special education funds currently account for 75% of special education funding. Due to Maintenance of Effort requirements, LEAs may not reduce the state and/or local contribution to special education services even when federal funds are reduced.
25 %	Special Education and Related Services as described on the Individualized Education Program for each student with a disability must be provided even though federal funding is cut. State special education funds currently account for 75% of special education funding. Due to Maintenance of Effort requirements, LEAs may not reduce the state and/or local contribution to special education services even when federal funds are reduced.

Board of Education  
**Teaching and Learning**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 15,447,147
Number of FTEs	3.5
Recipients/Clients Served	Teachers in 41 Districts and 105 Charter Schools
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Public Schools (School Children) Level 1 teachers, higher ed.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$772,357)	(\$3,861,787)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$772,357)	(\$3,861,787)

FTEs	-175	-875
------	------	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Both State and local expenditures for free public education within the State must be considered in determining whether a State has maintained effort under Title II, Part A. LEAs are required to maintain fiscal effort in order to receive their full allocation of Title II, Part A funds for any fiscal year. An LEA has maintained effort when either the combined fiscal effort per student, or the aggregate expenditures of the LEA and the State with respect to the provision of free public education for the preceding fiscal year, was not less than 90 percent of the combined fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures for the second preceding fiscal year (34 CFR 81.41). If the LEA fails to meet the requirements for maintenance of effort, the SEA reduces the LEA's allocation of Title II, Part A funds in any fiscal year in the exact proportion by which an LEA fails to meet the 90 percent test mentioned in the preceding answer, using the measure most favorable to the LEA Section [9521(b)(2)].
--	---

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

5 %	Formula funds to LEAs would be reduced by 5%. Programs supported would need to be reduced or eliminated including support for endorsements, EYE, class-size reduction, high quality teacher preparation, and other local professional development initiatives.
-----	--

25 %	Formula funds to LEAs would be reduced by 25%. Programs supported would need to be reduced or eliminated including support for endorsements, EYE, class-size reduction, high quality teacher preparation, and other local professional development initiatives.
------	---

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

5 %	Teachers would be required to personally fund some coursework to become highly qualified or to gain required endorsements sometimes imposed due to shortages in critical areas. In some LEAs class sizes in grades K-3 would increase and teachers would lose jobs.
25 %	Teachers would be required to personally fund additional coursework to become highly qualified or to gain required endorsements. Many LEAs would need to increase K-3 class size and lay off teachers. USOE would be severely hampered in efforts to support teacher quality, including potential impact to programs in teacher effectiveness and endorsement support. USOE may need to lay-off one or two specialists.

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

5 %	Receipt of Title IIA monies requires monitoring and support. Loss of FTE's would require existing personnel to provide these services along with their state-funded duties.
25 %	Same as above with greater impact due to additional FTE loss. We would no longer be able to fund outside monitoring that we currently use. There are no other funds to support this.

Department of Public Safety  
**Emergency Management Federal Funds**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	20.703, 97.023, 97.036, 97.039, 97.042, 97.045, 97.046, 97.047, 97.067
Agency contact name and phone number	Jona Whitesides, (801) 538-9613; Matt Ferguson (801) 538-3435

Fiscal Year 2016 federal program information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 15,680,207
Number of FTEs	50
Recipients/Clients Served	160
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	State, local, and Tribal governments; special service districts, universities; and school districts are the primary customers/sub-recipients served. Several programs reach out to the communities, faith-based organizations, and individual citizens (including special needs populations). The Be Ready Utah outreach program targets citizens and businesses throughout the state. The Citizen Corps Program reaches out to Citizen Corps Councils, citizen volunteers, Community Emergency Response Teams, Volunteers in Police Service, Fire Corps, Medical Reserve Corps, and Neighborhood Watch programs.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$784,010)	(\$3,920,052)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$784,010)	(\$3,920,052)

FTEs	-2.5	-12.5
------	------	-------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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 grant sub-recipients.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	The division's budget profile consists of; 75% - 80% pass thru to local and Tribal governments, special service districts, and school districts. A 5% reduction would equate to a \$577,000 drop to grant sub-recipients; \$140,000 decrease in state personnel costs; \$20,000 reduction in current operating expenses for preparation, mitigation, response, and recovery programs; and another \$32,300 reduction in technology and other expenses. A 5% reduction in federal funding would not significantly impact the function of the division.

25 %	The division's budget profile consists of; 75% - 80% pass thru to local governments, etc. A 25% reduction would mean a \$2.91 million reduction to local and Tribal governments, special service districts, and school districts; \$700,000 reduction in state personnel costs; \$200,000 reduction in current operating expenses for preparation, mitigation, response, and recovery programs; and another \$66,800 reduction in technology and other expenses. A 25% reduction in federal funding would significantly impact the function of the division.
------	--

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

5 %	2.5 Full Time Equivalents would need to be eliminated with a 5% reduction in federal funds. The division would likely be able to absorb this reduction through attrition and other cost savings. Local agencies (particularly smaller jurisdictions) wouldn't be able to support a local emergency program manager (a grant requirement).
25 %	Approximately 12.5 positions will need to be eliminated with a 25% reduction in federal funds. Local emergency management positions would be significantly impacted and many local emergency program managers throughout the state would be eliminated without the support of federal funding. The State and local agencies would be forced to discontinue preparedness outreach programs and additional capabilities would be greatly impacted at this funding reduction level. There would be an increased need to rely on state 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 %	None
25 %	None, but preparedness levels would be difficult to maintain.

Department of Public Safety  
**Highway Safety Program**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	20.614, 20.616, 20.600
Agency contact name and phone number	Kristy Rigby, (801) 366-6040

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,576,207
Number of FTEs	13
Recipients/Clients Served	Statewide
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Subgrantees include Utah state, county and city governmental units, and some non-profit, traffic-safety oriented organizations. Benefits residents and visitors statewide.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$178,810)	(\$894,052)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$178,810)	(\$894,052)

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

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Public Law 112-141 (MAP-21) requires the State to maintain its aggregate expenditures from all State and local sources for programs at or above the average level of such expenditures in fiscal years 2010 and 2011 to qualify for highway safety funding under certain Section 405 grants: Occupant Protection Grants, State Traffic Information System Improvement Grants, and Impaired Driving Countermeasures Grants. As a condition of receiving grant funds, States will be required to certify in their Section 405 grant applications that they meet the applicable MOE requirements. 23 CFR 1200.21(d)(5); 23 CFR 1200.22(f), 23 CFR 1200.23(d)(2); Appendix D
--	--

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

5 %	A 5% reduction would result in selected decreases in activities related to police traffic services, occupant protection, impaired driving, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and motorcycle safety.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in losing up to 4 FTE's and significant decreases in activities related to police traffic services, occupant protection, impaired driving, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and motorcycle safety.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in limited cutbacks in funding related to police traffic services, occupant protection, impaired driving, pedestrian and bicycle safety and motorcycle safety which are sub-awarded to state, local and non-profit agencies.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in severe cutbacks in funding related to police traffic services, occupant protection, impaired driving, pedestrian and bicycle safety, and motorcycle safety which are sub-awarded to state, local and non-profit agencies.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Not mandated.
25 %	Not mandated.

Department of Transportation  
**Highway Planning and Construction Program**  
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	20.205
Agency contact name and phone number	Bill Lawrence, (801) 964-4468

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 294,437,394
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served	State and Local Governments, and Metropolitan Planning Organizations
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	To assist State transportation agency in the planning and development of an integrated, interconnected transportation system important to interstate commerce and travel by constructing and rehabilitating the National Highway System (NHS), including the Interstate System; and for transportation improvements to most other federally eligible public roads; to provide aid for the repair of Federal-aid highways following disasters; to foster safe highway design; to replace or rehabilitate deficient or obsolete bridges; and to provide for other special purposes. The Federal Lands Access Program (FLAP), as an adjunct to the Federal Aid Highway Program, provides assistance to the Federal Land Management Agencies (FLMAs) for roads that access federal lands. It provides transportation engineering services for planning, design, construction, and rehabilitation of the highways and bridges providing access to federally owned lands. The Federal Lands Highway organization also provides training, technology, deployment, engineering services, and products to other customers.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$14,721,870)	(\$73,609,349)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other: _____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$14,721,870)</b>	<b>(\$73,609,349)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	0	0
-------------	---	---

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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.	
<b>5 %</b>	The State is given an Apportionment amount of funding in the Federal Transportation Program. Of the 2016 Apportioned amount given, UDOT programmed it at 100%. The federal program for 2017 is also programmed at 100%. A reduction of 5% in the Federal program (or a 5% rescission), would lead to slight delays in new project starts. The primary use of these funds is for rehabilitation and preservation of the system. This would slightly affect one of UDOT's primary drivers, "Preserve Infrastructure". No change in statute or rules would be required.
<b>25 %</b>	A reduction of 25% in the Federal program (a 25% rescission), would impact the program and actual projects. The reduction in programmed funding at this level would lead to delays and halts in ongoing projects and new project starts. The primary use of these funds is for rehabilitation and preservation of the system. This would directly impact one of UDOT's primary drivers, "Preserve Infrastructure". No change in statute or rules would be required.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
<b>5 %</b>	This would lead to minor delays in new project starts, slightly 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 slightly impact one of UDOT's primary drivers, "Preserve Infrastructure".
<b>25 %</b>	This would lead to delays and halts in ongoing projects and new project starts, impacting the consulting and contracting community that assist in design and construction of these projects. The primary use of these funds is for rehabilitation and preservation of the transportation system. This would directly impact one of UDOT's primary drivers, "Preserve Infrastructure".

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

Department of Transportation  
**Motor Carrier Safety Assistance Program**  
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

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

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$2,677,522
Number of FTEs	92
Recipients/Clients Served	6,457,711 commercial vehicles operated through the Ports of Entry
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	<p>20.218 - The MCSAP is a Federal grant program that provides financial assistance to States to reduce the number and severity of accidents and hazardous materials incidents involving commercial motor vehicles (CMV). The goal of the MCSAP is to reduce CMV-involved accidents, fatalities, and injuries through consistent, uniform, and effective CMV safety programs. Investing grant monies in appropriate safety programs will increase the likelihood that safety defects, driver deficiencies, and unsafe motor carrier practices will be detected and corrected before they become contributing factors to accidents.</p> <p>20.231 - Performance and Registration Information Systems Management links FMCSA systems with State commercial vehicle registration and licensing systems and enables a State to (1) determine the safety fitness of a motor carrier or registrant when licensing or registering; and (2) deny, suspend, or revoke the commercial motor vehicle registrations of a motor carrier or registrant that has been issued an operation out-of-service order by FMCSA.</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 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$133,876)	(\$669,381)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$133,876)	(\$669,381)

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

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	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>(a). The State must maintain the average aggregate expenditure of the State and its political subdivisions, exclusive of Federal funds and State matching funds, for CMV safety programs eligible for funding under this part at a level at least equal to the average level of expenditure for the 3 full fiscal years beginning after October 1 of the year 5 years prior to the beginning of each Government fiscal year.</p> <p>(continued)</p> <p>(b). Determination of a State's level of effort must not include the following three things:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Federal funds received for support of motor carrier and hazardous materials safety enforcement.</li> <li>2. State matching funds.</li> <li>3. State funds used for federally sponsored demonstration or pilot CMV safety programs.</li> <li>4.</li> </ol> <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: <a href="http://www.fmcsa.dot.gov/safety-security/safety-initiatives/mcsap/mcsapforms.htm">www.fmcsa.dot.gov/safety-security/safety-initiatives/mcsap/mcsapforms.htm</a> 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 oversized 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.
------	-----

*This page is blank.*

Department of Transportation  
**Public Transit Program**  
Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	20.509, 20.513, 20.516, 20.521, 20.526, 20.528
Agency contact name and phone number	Tim Boschert, Director Public Transit Plans & Programs, (801) 964-4508

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 9,211,607
Number of FTEs	2.5
Recipients/Clients Served	39 Recipients/ 71,395 Clients served
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	<p>20.505 – Assist in the development of metropolitan and state transportation improvement programs, long-range transportation plans, and other technical studies.</p> <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 and Rural Transit Assistance Program (RTAP).</p> <p>20.513 - Assist the transportation needs of seniors (65+) 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> <p>20.526 – Provides capital funding to replace, rehabilitate and purchase buses and bus related equipment and to construct bus-related facilities.</p> <p>20.528 – To improve public transportation safety by assisting States with the financing of safety oversight of fixed guideway public transportation systems in the jurisdiction of the state not regulated by the Federal Railroad Administration.</p>

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$460,580)	(\$2,302,902)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$460,580)	(\$2,302,902)

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

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	No state funds are used for match. All matching funds are provided either by the local sales tax revenue or by local agencies.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	All program aspects would be okay for the next couple of years, but if funding remained at the lower rate, the programs would be reduced across the board 5%. No change in statute or rules would apply.
25 %	All program aspects would be okay for the next couple of years, but if funding remained at the lower rate, the programs would be reduced across the board 25%. No change in statute or rules would apply.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	Recipient Programs would need to be cut to match available funds for services locally. Possible reduction in services provided.
25 %	Recipient Programs would need to be cut to match available funds for services locally. Likely reduction in services provided.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Yes, the mandates follow the funds; however, services would need to be adjusted to meet the amount of reduced funding. No, there are no other resources available to meet these needs.
25 %	Yes, the mandates follow the funds; however, services would need to be adjusted to meet the amount of reduced funding. No, there are no other resources available to meet these needs.

Department of Veterans Affairs  
**Veterans Nursing Homes**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	64.015
Agency contact name and phone number	Raitos Archuleta 801-326-1834

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 20,353,179
Number of FTEs	0
Recipients/Clients Served/Patient Beds	417
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Elderly nursing home patients

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,017,659)	(\$5,088,295)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$1,017,659)	(\$5,088,295)

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

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

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions. Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.	
5 %	The federal VA pays approximately 50% of the nursing home costs, and the resident/family has to pay the remainder. A 5% decrease would result in an increased financial burden on the families of the veterans in the nursing homes and/or a reduction in services provided to the residents.
25 %	A 25% reduction would place a very heavy burden on the families of the veterans and require substantial decreases in services and could result in the closure of the facility – denying benefits to all veterans.

What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?	
5 %	The residents would not have the full range of nursing home services that they now enjoy, or the financial burden to veterans and their families would be proportionally greater.
25 %	The financial burden to the residents/families would be so great as to impact their ability to stay in the nursing home. Loss of enough residents could cause the facility to close, thus denying nursing home benefits to all. Such a reduction in services would essentially end the program services. Many residents of limited income would be forced to leave the nursing home and seek alternative placement in facilities with Medicaid beds (the State Veterans Homes have only 52 Medicaid beds.) This would take them out of the desired environment of a Veterans facility and force them to scatter into many other nursing homes where there are no special programs or efforts to benefit veterans. This would also greatly increase the burden of care to the state Medicaid funds. There could be many dozen additional nursing home patients on the Medicaid rolls if this were to occur.

Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?	
5 %	Yes. At the current time there are inadequate state resources or other resources to meet these needs. The State does not presently contribute to the care of the residents of the State Veterans Homes. A five percent cut would most likely be absorbed by the families of the nursing home residents, but some might be forced to rely on State Medicaid funds.
25 %	Yes. At the current time there are no state resources or other resources to meet these needs. Some veterans with limited incomes would be forced to rely on state Medicaid funds in order to receive nursing home care, placing a much greater burden on Medicaid.

Department of Workforce Services  
**Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS)**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.002
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,245,058
Number of FTEs	13.15
Recipients/Clients Served	N/A
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The purpose of this funding is to gather labor market information and for special projects related to this data. DWS clients include partner state agencies, private industry constituents, policy makers, academia, the nation, state and local economic communities, jobseekers, employers, and the general public. All of these client groups use, and benefit from, labor market information. Further, the Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) mainframe system is being maintained by Utah for the National Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$62,253)	(\$311,265)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$62,253)	(\$311,265)

FTEs	-0.66	-3.29
------	-------	-------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There are no maintenance-of-effort or match requirements for this program.
--	--

<b>Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.</b>	
<b>Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.</b>	
5 %	In light of recent federal measures to save federal Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) dollars, additional reductions in BLS funding would have a noticeable impact. If we were to experience a 5% reduction, meeting our BLS program deliverables as they currently exist would be a challenge.
25 %	A 25% BLS budget reduction would significantly compromise the state's ability to meet our BLS program deliverables. Even with a commensurate reduction in deliverable requirements and workload, it is very likely that the loss of experienced FTEs would lead to a considerable deterioration of the quality of BLS estimates and the widely-used economic indicators that are derived from those estimates.

<b>What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?</b>	
5 %	Responses to data request from employers, partner agencies, and other clients could be delayed as remaining resources would be more heavily focused on immediate deliverables. Data integrity could also become an issue with reduced effort toward data collection. All states would be negatively impacted by delayed use of the National QCEW system.
25 %	Adjustments to our federal BLS deliverable requirements would be made under this level of budget reduction. Specific program changes are at this time unknown; however, data completeness, data quality, and data timelines are all probably areas of concern to our client groups under a 25% budget reduction. All states would be non-functional without the use of the National QCEW system.

<b>Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?</b>	
5 %	None anticipated
25 %	It would depend on the mandated federal services required under the reduced funding.

Department of Workforce Services  
**Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF)**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.575, 93.596
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 71,884,272
Number of FTEs	58.44
Recipients/Clients Served	6,360 Average Monthly Child Care Assistance Caseload
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Children of low-income, working parents

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$3,594,214)	(\$17,971,068)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$3,594,214)	(\$17,971,068)

FTEs	-2.0	-6.0
------	------	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	CCDF requires annual maintenance-of-effort of \$4,474,924 per 45 CFR Parts 98 and 99.
--	---

<b>Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.</b>	
<b>Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.</b>	
5 %	Reduce quality activities to accommodate the federal funds receipts reduction. Quality activities that could be affected may include afterschool programs, infant/toddler programs, career ladder programs, and child care resource and referral agencies.
25 %	CCDF is broken up into 3 funding lines by Congress. The Mandatory grant is unlikely to be subject to cuts. If the cut affected the Matching or Discretionary grant, however, the impact would be significant. The first action would be scaling back quality activities as much as allowable under Federal regulations which currently require 4% of spending on quality activities. If we are not able to meet the cut through these measures, the next step would be to either reduce the population served or reduce the amount of the subsidy. If the population served was reduced, there would be a corresponding reduction of approximately 6 FTEs.

<b>What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?</b>	
5 %	Depending upon the services reduced there could be fewer after-school programs or greater turn-over at child care facilities if the career ladder programs were cut back.
25 %	Cutting back quality activities would have a long lasting impact including reductions in the skill level and training of child care providers and reductions in available child care. Reducing the population served and reducing the amount of the subsidy would have similar effects. The child care subsidy allows low-income, working parents to work while their children are cared for in safe, quality facilities. Without the subsidy, parents could lose jobs or place children in unsafe child care environments.

<b>Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?</b>	
5 %	CCDF requires we spend certain amounts on infant toddler, as well as Child Care Quality. There aren't other resources available to meet these needs.
25 %	CCDF requires we spend certain amounts on infant toddler, as well as overall Child Care Quality. There aren't other resources available to meet these needs.

Department of Workforce Services  
**Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	14.228
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 4,782,514
Number of FTEs	2.9
Recipients/Clients Served	177 residential households, 27 businesses, and 18,227 citizens benefited from community projects
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The 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 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$239,126)	(\$1,195,629)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$239,126)	(\$1,195,629)

FTEs	-0.1	-1.0
------	------	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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.
--	--

<b>Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.</b>	
<b>Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.</b>	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$4,782 less in admin funding and \$234,344 less in program funding for local projects. Approximately 0.1 FTE would be redeployed to another program. No change in statute would be required.

25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$23,913 less in admin funding and \$1,171,716 less in program funding for local projects. It is likely that the 25% fewer program dollars would not create the demand necessary for 2.9 FTEs and the program would be reduced by 1.0 FTEs. No change in statute would be required.
------	---

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

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

Department Workforce Services  
**Community Services Block Grant (CSBG)**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.569
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 3,662,604
Number of FTEs	2.25
Recipients/Clients Served	123,738 individuals and 28,227 families
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The DWS State Community Services Office, of which CSBG is one funding source, provides guidance, oversight, and funding to help communities assist people to become more self-sufficient socially, physically, culturally, and economically by reducing poverty and improving the quality of life for low-income Utahans.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$183,130)	(\$915,651)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$183,130)	(\$915,651)

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

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> <i>(Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)</i>	There is no match requirement.
---	--------------------------------

<b>Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.</b>	
<b>Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.</b>	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$8,699 less in admin funding and \$174,431 less in program funding for local projects. Approximately 0.25 FTE would be redeployed to another program. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$43,493 less in admin funding and \$872,158 less in program funding for local projects. It is likely that 25% fewer program dollars would not create the demand necessary for 3 FTEs and the program would be reduced by at least 1.0 FTE. No change in statute would be required.

<b>What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?</b>	
5 %	Because CSBG funds are used to leverage local funds and are spread across all counties of the state, the 5% decrease will not likely have a significant impact on any one project or region.
25 %	Because CSBG funds are used to leverage local funds and are spread across all counties of the state, a 25% decrease could seriously affect local delivery of poverty mitigation programs.

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

Department Workforce Services  
**Emergency Solutions Grant (ESG) Program**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	14.231
Agency contact name and phone number	Kimberley Brown Schmeling, (801) 503-8970

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 1,266,378
Number of FTEs	1.95
Recipients/Clients Served	3,829 individuals and 357 families
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The DWS State Community Services Office, of which ESG is one funding source, provides guidance, oversight, and funding to understand, prevent and address homelessness through the administration of funding for emergency housing, shelters, and other programs/services to prevent or mitigate homelessness.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$63,319)	(\$316,595)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other: _____		
Other: _____		
TOTAL	(\$63,319)	(\$316,595)

FTEs	0	-0.4
------	---	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There is no match requirement in ESG.
--	---------------------------------------

<b>Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.</b>	
<b>Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.</b>	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$4,749 less in admin funding and \$58,570 less in program funding for local projects. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$23,745 less in admin funding and \$292,850 less in program funding for local projects. Approximately 0.3 FTE would be redeployed to another program. No change in statute would be required.

<b>What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?</b>	
5 %	Because ESG funds are used to leverage local funds and are spread across all counties of the state, a 5% reduction will not likely have significant impact on any one project or region.
25 %	Because ESG funds are used to leverage local funds and are spread across all counties of the state, a 25% reduction could affect local delivery of poverty mitigation programs.

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

Department of Workforce Services  
**Employment Service (ES) Cluster**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	Employment Service/Wagner-Peyser Funded Activities: 17.207 Disabled Veterans' Outreach Program (DVOP): 17.801 Local Veterans' Employment Representative (LVER) Program: 17.804
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	Wagner-Peyser: \$8,819,528 DVOP: \$1,103,225 LVER: \$149,560 Totaling: \$10,072,313
Number of FTEs	Wagner-Peyser: 79.65 DVOP/LVER: 18.96
Recipients/Clients Served	Employers Served: 7,974 Job Seekers Served: 205,787
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 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$513,734)	(\$2,518,078)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$513,734)	(\$2,518,078)

FTEs	-4.93	-24.65
------	-------	--------

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

<b>Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.</b>	
<b>Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.</b>	
5 %	Wagner-Peyser and the Veterans' Programs are almost completely FTE driven; thus, a 5% reduction in funding would result in a reduction of staffing. No change in statute would be necessary.
25 %	A 25% reduction in funding would result in a corresponding reduction of staffing. No change in statute would be necessary.

<b>What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?</b>	
5 %	A reduction of these FTEs would not seriously impact services rendered to recipients.
25 %	A reduction of these FTEs would limit the availability of services to clients coming into employment centers, and employers seeking for assistance in recruiting.

<b>Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?</b>	
5 %	No mandatory services will be affected.
25 %	Mandatory services will still be provided, but the speed, efficiency, and quality of providing those services would be affected.

Department of Workforce Services  
**Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.568
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	Home Heating Assistance: \$15,659,483 Weatherization Assistance: \$4,389,221 Totaling: \$20,048,704
Number of FTEs	7.2
Recipients/Clients Served	Households Served with Home Heating Assistance: 30,754 Households Served with Weatherization Assistance: 453
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) provides winter home heating assistance and year-round energy crisis intervention for eligible low-income households throughout Utah. LIHEAP also provides funds to the State Weatherization Program to help weatherize homes and to provide emergency repair or replacement of defunct furnaces and air conditioning units. These programs assist individuals and families in the lowest income brackets.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,002,435)	(\$5,012,176)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$1,002,435)</b>	<b>(\$5,012,176)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-0.2	-1.0
-------------	------	------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (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.**

<b>5 %</b>	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$22,489 less in admin funding, approximately \$765,409 less in program funding for HEAT assistance payments to approximately 1,537 individuals/families, and approximately \$214,537 less in program funding for weatherization improvements to approximately 23 individuals/families. No change in statute would be required.
<b>25 %</b>	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$117,446 less in admin funding, approximately \$3.8 million less in program funding for HEAT assistance payments to approximately 7,689 individuals/families and approximately \$1.1 million less in

	program funding for weatherization improvements to approximately 113 individuals/families. No change in statute would be required.
--	--

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

<b>5 %</b>	DWS contracts with local agencies who hire seasonal workers to process LIHEAP applications across the state and complete weatherization measures in low-income homes. Approximately 3 fewer LIHEAP workers and 1 fewer weatherization workers may be hired. Certain individuals and families slated to receive benefits would no longer receive the utility payment benefits. Individuals and families slated to have their homes weatherized would remain on the waiting list and pay higher utility bills for a longer period of time, creating a tremendous burden on these low-income clients.
<b>25 %</b>	DWS contracts with local agencies who hire seasonal workers to process LIHEAP applications across the state and complete weatherization measures in low-income homes. Approximately 18 fewer LIHEAP workers and 3 fewer weatherization workers may be hired or hours would be significantly curtailed. Certain individuals and families slated to receive benefits would no longer receive the utility payment benefits. Individuals and families slated to have their homes weatherized would remain on the waiting list and pay higher utility bills for a longer period of time, creating a tremendous burden on these low-income clients.

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

<b>5 %</b>	There are no mandated services.
<b>25 %</b>	There are no mandated services.

Department of Workforce Services  
**Refugee and Entrant Assistance**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.566
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 7,567,050
Number of FTEs	12.35
Recipients/Clients Served	1,243
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Recently resettled Refugees

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$378,353)	(\$1,891,763)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$378,353)	(\$1,891,763)

FTEs	-3.97	-12.35
------	-------	--------

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

<b>Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.</b>	
<b>Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.</b>	
5 %	Refugee cash and medical assistance are mandated activities by federal statute and regulation. Services that must be maintained are refugee cash assistance, refugee medical assistance, refugee medical screening, and unaccompanied refugee minor assistance. These benefits cannot be eliminated without statute and regulation changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act. Refugee assistance funds are also used to help refugees become economically self-sufficient as quickly as possible, primarily through the provision of employment services. Administrative costs can be reduced by reducing the number of FTEs working on these activities.
25 %	Refugee cash and medical assistance are mandated activities by federal statute and regulation. Services that must be maintained are refugee cash assistance, refugee medical assistance, refugee medical screening, and unaccompanied refugee minor assistance. These benefits cannot be eliminated without statute and regulation changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act. Refugee assistance funds are also used to help refugees become economically self-sufficient as quickly as possible, primarily through the provision of employment services. A 25% reduction would impact our ability to provide employment services to refugees. Administrative costs can be reduced by reducing the number of FTEs working on these activities.

<b>What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?</b>	
5 %	A reduction of 5% would eliminate approximately 4 FTEs assigned to work on these activities.
25 %	A reduction of 25% would essentially eliminate all FTEs assigned to work on these activities and would critically impact services to refugees as well as other community partners serving these customers.

<b>Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?</b>	
5 %	Refugee cash and medical assistance are mandated activities by federal statute and regulation. Services that must be maintained are refugee cash assistance, refugee medical assistance, refugee medical screening, and unaccompanied refugee minor assistance. These benefits cannot be eliminated without statute and regulation changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act.
25 %	Refugee cash and medical assistance are mandated activities by federal statute and regulation. Services that must be maintained are refugee cash assistance, refugee medical assistance, refugee medical screening, and unaccompanied refugee minor assistance. These benefits cannot be eliminated without statute and regulation changes to the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Department of Workforce Services  
**Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	10.551, 10.561
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 321,694,585
Number of FTEs	317.91
Recipients/Clients Served	Average monthly caseload: 89,070
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 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$16,084,729)	(\$80,423,646)
State:		
General Fund	(\$846,565)	(\$4,232,823)
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$16,931,294)	(\$84,656,469)

<b>FTEs</b>	-15.9	-79.5
-------------	-------	-------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	Most non-benefit expenditures require a 50/50 match.
--	--

<b>Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.</b>	
<b>Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.</b>	
5 %	This program provides financial assistance to purchase food. Any cuts that affect the benefit levels increase hunger and food insecurity in the community. This is an entitlement program and we must serve whomever is eligible for the program. Eligibility rules are set by federal regulation.
25 %	This program provides financial assistance to purchase food. Any cuts that affect the benefit levels increase hunger and food insecurity in the community. This is an entitlement program and we must serve whomever is eligible for the program. Eligibility rules are set by federal regulation.

<b>What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?</b>	
5 %	If the cut is to non-benefit funding only, we would need to reduce staffing and this would decrease service levels and accuracy for the customers. If benefits were cut, the impact could be significant with an increase in hunger and food insecurity.
25 %	A reduction this large would have an impact on services. We are mandated to serve all who are eligible so the service levels and program accuracy would potentially suffer. Cuts of this magnitude to benefits would have far reaching impacts in the general economy. An \$84.7 million lost to the food industry would have a significant impact with a ripple of lost jobs, hunger, and homelessness.

<b>Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?</b>	
5 %	All eligible persons must be served.
25 %	All eligible persons must be served.

Department of Workforce Services  
**Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	93.558
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$ 67,495,744
Number of FTEs	293.85
Recipients/Clients Served	20,412 Individuals 8,316 Households
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Un-employed and under-employed families with dependent children

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$3,374,787)	(\$16,873,936)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$3,374,787)</b>	<b>(\$16,873,936)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	-14.7	-73.5
-------------	-------	-------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	The state provides annual maintenance-of-effort (MOE) of \$24,889,035. This amount includes \$4,474,924 of Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF) MOE which can also be counted towards meeting the MOE requirement for TANF.
--	---

**Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.**

**Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.**

<b>5 %</b>	If cuts are left to the discretion of the Department, the activities most likely to be eliminated are those that are not employment-related (e.g., after school care to vulnerable children and two-parent family formation and maintenance activities). No change in statute would be necessary. However, it is anticipated that the current TANF reserve would be sufficient to provide all services for approximately five months.
<b>25 %</b>	If cuts are left to the discretion of the Department, the activities listed in the 5% reduction scenario above would be eliminated first, followed by other non-employment activities (e.g., homelessness prevention, home baby visits, and other discretionary contractual spending). Also likely to be cut would employment-related but non-mandatory programs (e.g., mental health counseling and training to non-Family Employment Program customers). In order to reach the 25% target, the Department would also have to reduce the amount of TANF that is transferred to CCDF to pay for child care related activities, seriously impacting the program. With the reduction of the above-mentioned services, an accompanying reduction of staff by approximately 25% would also be likely. Another option is to cut or reduce the amount of TANF transferred to the Social Services Block Grant (SSBG). Currently, 10% of the base TANF grant is transferred annual to the Department of

	Human Services (DHS) for SSGB. However, it is anticipated that the current TANF reserve would be sufficient to provide all services for approximately five months.
--	--

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

<b>5 %</b>	The elimination of the after school programs would affect at-risk youth throughout the state who utilize the programs to develop critical life skills and are encouraged through those programs to avoid out-of-wedlock pregnancies. A reduction in TANF funding would eliminate funding available for the Marriage Commission which provides two-parent family formation activities; thus, persons considering marriage would have less information available to them regarding the development and maintenance of successful marriages.
<b>25 %</b>	In addition to the impact described in the 5% reduction scenario, many other individuals and families throughout the state would be affected if the 25% reduction scenario were enacted. The working poor would be the hardest hit, no longer having access to such programs as housing assistance, training, mental health counseling, winter shelter, and subsidized child care.

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

<b>5 %</b>	No mandated services will be affected.
<b>25 %</b>	If the activities discussed above are sufficient to meet the 25% cut, then no mandated services will be affected. However, if the cuts fall short of the target, the Department will likely reduce the amount of grant funds given to each client. No other funding resources are available to meet these needs.

Department of Workforce Services  
**Trade Adjustment Assistance**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2106

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.245, 17.225
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2106 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 2,393,020
Number of FTEs	11.18
Recipients/Clients Served	344
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 2106:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$119,651)	(\$598,255)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
Other Fund:		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
Other:		
TOTAL	(\$119,651)	(\$598,255)

FTEs	-0.56	-2.80
------	-------	-------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There are no maintenance-of-effort or match requirements for this program.
--	--

Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.

Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.

5 %	This is a mandatory and entitlement based federal program driven by approval on a company by company basis. Any funding cuts would require corresponding program changes, resulting in fewer approvals and, therefore, fewer customers served. A 5% reduction would not require a statutory change.
25 %	This is a mandatory and entitlement based federal program driven by approval on a company by company basis. Any funding cuts would require corresponding program changes, resulting in fewer approvals and, therefore, fewer customers served. A 25% reduction would not require a statutory change.

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

5 %	No impact.
25 %	Impact would only be minimal to the customers as the majority of Trade funds are entitlement funds based on eligible clients.

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

5 %	Services would continue. Funding is available to expend for 3 years. Funds are expended based on eligible clients.
25 %	Services would continue. Fewer clients would be served or additional funds would be requested based on program needs. Trade unemployment insurance benefits and wage subsidies are based on need and would not be reduced if there are eligible clients. Training services would be reduced unless additional federal funds are acquired.

Department of Workforce Services  
**Unemployment Insurance (UI)**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.225
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 27,677,240
Number of FTEs	275,56
Recipients/Clients Served	Total Determinations: 315,455 Volume Counts (Claims): 81,579
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	Unemployment Insurance claimants, employers

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$1,383,862)	(\$6,919,310)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$1,383,862)	(\$6,919,310)

FTEs	-13.7	-68.9
------	-------	-------

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

<b>Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.</b>	
<b>Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.</b>	
5 %	Very little impact, all UI program activities should be able to continue with little interruption.
25 %	Significantly longer call wait times, UI benefit payments may take longer to get issued, integrity and compliance programs would be reduced leading to reduced detection of UI benefit overpayments, less employer audits, and less collections—all of which results to a negative impact on the UI Trust Fund.

<b>What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?</b>	
5 %	Slightly longer call wait times on UI claimants filing initial claims or calling with questions
25 %	Significantly longer call wait times, UI benefit payments may take longer to get issued, and appeals would take longer to be resolved. UI integrity and compliance programs would be reduced significantly leading to reduced detection of UI benefit overpayments, less employer audits, and less collections—all of which results to a negative impact on the UI Trust Fund.

<b>Are there mandated federal services that the State would have to maintain even though federal funding is cut? Are there other resources available to meet these needs?</b>	
5 %	The UI division is required to maintain efforts related to core UI activities including UI claims processing, appeals, quality control, tax assessments and collections, UI integrity and compliance activities. The state is given substantial leeway, however, in determining how much resources are allocated to each activity.
25 %	The Special Administrative Expense Account (SAEA) could potentially be used to partially offset the UI administrative grant fund reduction; however, this would negatively impact the current training and re-employment programs the SAEA currently funds.

Department of Workforce Services  
**Weatherization Assistance for Low-Income Persons**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	81.042
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

**Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:**

Federal Receipts	\$1,780,420
Number of FTEs	3.0
Recipients/Clients Served	477 families
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	The U.S. Department of Energy funds the Weatherization Assistance for Low-Income Persons program to weatherize homes and to provide emergency repair or replacement of defunct furnaces and air conditioning units. This program assists individuals and families in the lowest income brackets.

**Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:**

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$89,021)	(\$445,105)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
_____		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$89,021)</b>	<b>(\$445,105)</b>

<b>FTEs</b>	0	-0.5
-------------	---	------

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

<b>Describe the program, activity, or expenditure type that would be impacted by the proposed federal funds receipts reductions.</b>	
<b>Would this reduction require a change in statute or rules? If so list references.</b>	
5 %	A 5% reduction would result in approximately \$8,905 less in admin funding and approximately \$80,116 less in program funding for weatherization improvements to approximately 24 individuals/families. No change in statute would be required.
25 %	A 25% reduction would result in approximately \$45,505 in admin funding and approximately \$399,600 less in program funding for weatherization improvements to approximately 119 individuals/families. No change in statute would be required.

<b>What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?</b>	
5 %	DWS contracts with local agencies who hire workers to complete weatherization measures in low-income homes. Approximately 1 fewer weatherization worker may be hired. Individuals and families slated to have their homes weatherized would remain on the waiting list and pay higher utility bills for a longer period of time, creating a tremendous burden on these low-income clients.
25 %	DWS contracts with local agencies who hire workers to complete weatherization measures in low-income homes. Approximately 2 fewer weatherization workers may be hired. Individuals and families slated to have their homes weatherized would remain on the waiting list and pay higher utility bills for a longer period of time, creating a tremendous burden on these low-income clients.

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

Department of Workforce Services  
**Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Cluster**

Plan of Potential 5 % and 25 % Federal Receipts Reductions  
Based on Fiscal Year 2016

CFDA numbers that comprise this program	17.258, 17.259, 17.278
Agency contact name and phone number	Nathan Harrison, (801) 526-9402

Fiscal Year 2016 Federal Program Information:

Federal Receipts	\$ 11,185,419
Number of FTEs	72.27
Recipients/Clients Served	6,196
Describe Recipients/Clients Served	WIOA clients are economically disadvantaged Adults and Youth, or Dislocated Workers who have lost employment in the past 2 years and are unlikely to return to their previous occupation or industry. Services include career and training services. The majority of WIOA customers age 18 and older are also eligible to be served with Wagner-Peyser funding.

Potential 5 % and 25 % federal receipts reductions based on fiscal year 2016:

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

Funding Information	5 %	25 %
Federal	(\$559,271)	(\$2,796,355)
State:		
General Fund		
Education Fund		
Transportation Fund		
Transportation Investment Fund		
Restricted Fund/Account Name:		
_____		
Other Fund:		
_____		
Dedicated Credits		
Other:		
_____		
TOTAL	(\$559,271)	(\$2,796,355)

FTEs	-3.61	-18.07
------	-------	--------

<b>Maintenance of Effort</b> (Describe any State matching and/or maintenance of effort requirements. Include references to federal laws, regulations, or grant provisions.)	There are no maintenance-of-effort or match requirements for this program
--	---

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

<b>What would be the impact on recipients (including state and local agencies) receiving these services? What changes in program(s), services, expenditures, fees, etc. would be made if this reduction is implemented?</b>	
5 %	Minimal impact on clients.
25 %	The impact would be a significant reduction in the number of clients served with the available funds. DWS would serve far fewer clients than we currently serve.

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