



The Impact of the Sequester on Communities Across America

Anna Chu

February 22, 2013

In just one week our nation faces yet another manufactured fiscal crisis. This time a refusal to compromise by conservative leaders in Congress would lead to massive, damaging across-the-board spending cuts on March 1, potentially dragging the economy back into recession and hurting American families by slashing critical investments in job training, public health, and public safety.¹

The spending cuts, also known as the “sequester,” are a direct result of a long push by conservatives to take the nation’s economy hostage in order to secure massive, harmful spending cuts. In the summer of 2011, in exchange for agreeing to pay America’s bills, House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) negotiated the deal that wrote the sequester into law, stating that he had gotten 98 percent of what he wanted.² Though there is a concerted effort to blame the president for the sequester, no amount of whitewashing can erase the fact that many conservative members of Congress voted for this plan.³

Under the terms of the sequester, federal spending would be cut by \$1.2 trillion from March 2013 to March 2021. States stand to lose billions of dollars in critical grants needed to fund everything from schools to new police officers to parks. In fiscal year 2013 alone, states stand to lose an estimated \$6.4 billion in federal funding. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that as many as 750,000 jobs could be lost because of the sequester. Taking a meat cleaver to spending in such a blunt, unfocused manner would send a shockwave through our economy and would hurt countless American families. Just months ago, leading Republicans such as Rep. Paul Ryan (R-WI) agreed, saying that these cuts would “devastate” the country.⁴

But now, several prominent congressional Republicans are saying they would prefer the harmful spending cuts to a balanced approach that would close wasteful tax loopholes for millionaires and special interests.⁵ This choice to reject measures to replace the sequester with a smarter, more balanced mix of spending cuts and new revenue has devastating consequences for our economy and real-life implications for families across the United States. By choosing to protect millionaires and special interests instead of asking them to pay their fair share in taxes, intransigent members of Congress are threatening drastic cuts to vital programs, including:

- **Education.** Instead of investing in our children’s future, the spending cuts would hurt students of all ages across the United States. The indiscriminate cuts would slash funding that helps some of our youngest children succeed, cut funding for teachers, and reduce grants and work-study programs. Among other education programs, the sequester would cut more than \$400 million from Head Start, a program that provides at-risk preschoolers with education, health, nutrition, and family-support services. These cuts would force roughly 70,000 young children out of the Head Start program. The sequester would also slash nearly \$725 million from Title I—the largest federal-funded education program in the United States—meaning schools serving more than 1 million disadvantaged students would be left struggling to pay for teachers and tutors.⁶ Texas, for example, could lose more than \$67 million in Title I education funding, meaning local schools could be forced to furlough teachers.
- **Public safety.** The sequester cuts threaten to make our communities less safe. The across-the-board spending cuts would mean fewer firefighters protecting us and less security monitoring our nation’s flight systems. Because of the sequester, programs such as Assistance to Firefighters Grants, or FIRE, and Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response, or SAFER, which help local fire departments meet their equipment and staffing needs, would be cut by an estimated combined amount of more than \$35 million. This could lead to understaffed fire departments working without necessary, critical equipment. Additionally, the sequester would include cuts to the Federal Aviation Administration, or FAA, and the Transportation Security Administration, or TSA. Possible furloughs in the Federal Aviation Administration and the Transportation Security Administration would mean more delayed flights and even longer wait times at the airport.
- **Public health.** The sequester would have disastrous consequences to our public health. Programs that help fight hunger and make us healthier are on the chopping block. The sequester would cut funding to the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Food Safety and Inspection Service, for example, resulting in more than 2,100 fewer food inspections across the nation.⁷ This means an increased likelihood for tainted food reaching American dinner tables. Senior nutrition programs, which help to provide congregate and home-delivered meals to the elderly, would face cuts of more than \$43 million, meaning that countless seniors could go hungry. The sequester would also cut more than \$18 million from HIV prevention and testing programs, leading to 450,000 fewer HIV screenings. That would mean 38,000 fewer HIV screenings in Florida alone. Few programs escape the sequester axe, including the National Institutes of Health, or NIH. Although the National Institutes of Health plays an important role in advancing medical research in the United States leading to groundbreaking new products, services, and technologies, the sequester could reduce NIH awards by more than \$1 billion, and result in the loss of more than 20,000 jobs.

- **Workforce training.** The spending cuts championed by deficit hawks would impede the American workforce that has been struggling to recover from the recession. The sequester would reduce funding for key programs such as the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment Services Operations and Job Corps. Employment Services helps connect workers looking for local employment opportunities. Under the sequester, Employment Services would be cut by more than \$37 million, leading to more than 830,000 fewer workers receiving services. In Ohio that could mean more than 30,000 fewer workers would receive Employment Services. Additionally, Job Corps, which provides economically at-risk youths with jobs and academic training, could be cut by more than \$83 million. Cuts to these services would be a blow to the unemployed, especially the long-term unemployed who may lose 10 percent of their benefits due to sequestration.⁸
- **Women's health and child care.** The sequester could leave hundreds of thousands of women to fend for themselves and for their families. The sequester would slash a number of federal programs that help women access critical health care programs and child care assistance. The program that provides low-income, uninsured, and underinsured women access to breast and cervical cancer screening and diagnostic testing would be cut by more than \$8 million. Cuts to this program could mean more than 31,000 fewer cancer screenings for women, including 1,750 fewer screenings in North Dakota. The Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children also could be forced to cut almost 600,000 participants, endangering the health of our children.⁹

American families and our economy simply cannot afford the sequester. To expect American families to shoulder the entire burden of deficit reduction would mean turning a blind eye to the families who would be less safe, less healthy, and less prepared for modern workforce demands. It is time for congressional leaders to act responsibly and face the reality that new revenue from closing wasteful tax loopholes must be part of the equation in addressing the deficit.

Anna Chu is the CAP War Room Policy Director at the Center for American Progress.

Methodology

In order to estimate the effect of the sequester on fiscal year 2013 nondefense discretionary grants to states, we started by taking the federal aid to states outlays from 2010, 2008, 2007, and 2006 to determine the relative share of discretionary spending each state receives. (We omitted 2009 because of the distorting effects of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.) Mandatory, defense spending, grants from the Department of Transportation and Department of Veterans' Affairs were removed. We then took the Office of Management and Budget's overall figure for discretionary grants to states, minus grants from the Department of Transportation and Department of Veterans' Affairs, for fiscal year 2012 and increased that by 0.612 percent—the increase from the fiscal year 2013 CR—in order to obtain an estimate of the nondefense discretionary grants to states subject to sequester. We then used the average of each state's respective share of grants to estimate the amount of each state's federal funding that is subject to the sequester. Lastly, we multiplied this figure by 5.3 percent to determine the estimated reduction in nondefense discretionary grants to each state.

In order to estimate the effect of the sequester on HIV Testing, Seniors Nutrition, Breast and Cervical Cancer Screening and Diagnostic Testing, Employment Services, and Job Corps, we first took the fiscal year 2012 funding levels for each of these programs and then increased that by 0.612 percent—the increase from the fiscal year 2013 CR—to obtain an estimate of the fiscal year 2013 funding levels. We then multiplied this by 5.3 percent to determine the estimated reduction in these programs caused by the sequester. To determine the number of people who would no longer receive HIV tests, we took the estimated sequester cut and divided it by the estimated cost of the HIV tests. To determine the number of people who would no longer receive breast and cervical cancer screenings, we took the estimated sequester cut and divided it by the estimated cost of the screenings.

In order to estimate the impact of the sequester on the Assistance to Firefighters Grant, or FIRE, program and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response, or SAFER, program, we first took the FIRE and SAFER award levels for fiscal year 2011. (The fiscal year 2012 awards are not yet complete.) We then used each state's respective share of grants to estimate each state's federal funding for fiscal year 2013. We multiplied this by 5.3 percent to obtain the estimated reduction in FIRE and SAFER grants for each state from the sequester.

The impact of the sequester on funding to the National Institutes of Health is courtesy of a report by United for Medical Research.¹⁰ The impact of the sequester on funding for the Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children is courtesy of a report by the National WIC Association.¹¹ The impact of the sequester on Childcare Assistance and Head Start is courtesy of a report by the House Appropriations Committee Democratic Staff.¹² The impact of the sequester on other education programs is courtesy of materials prepared by the Department of Education.

Endnotes

- 1 Adam Hersh, "Fiscal Austerity Threatens the U.S. Economy" (Washington: Center for American Progress, 2013), available at <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/report/2013/01/30/51146/fiscal-austerity-threatens-the-u-s-economy/>.
- 2 Daniel Strauss, "Boehner: I got '98 percent' of what I wanted in debt deal," *The Hill*, August 2, 2011, available at <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/174925-boehner-i-got-98-percent-of-what-i-wanted-in-debt-deal>.
- 3 John Avlon, "The PowerPoint That Proves It's Not Obama's Sequester After All," *The Daily Beast*, February 20, 2013, available at <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/02/20/the-powerpoint-that-proves-it-s-not-obama-s-sequester-after-all.html>.
- 4 Igor Volsky, "Paul Ryan Embraces Spending Cuts He Said Would Devastate The Country," *ThinkProgress*, January 27, 2013, available at <http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2013/01/27/1501461/paul-ryan-suddenly-embraces-the-sequester-we-cant-lose-those-spending-cuts/>.
- 5 Sahil Kapur, "Tom Cole: GOP Prefers Deep Defense Cuts To Any Revenue," *Talking Points Memo*, February 5, 2013, available at <http://tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2013/02/tom-cole-sequester-house-republicans.php>.
- 6 Michael Linden and Lori Lodes, "The Consequences of the Romney-Ryan Budget Plan on State and Local Budgets" (Washington: Center for American Progress Action Fund, 2012), available at <http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/budget/report/2012/09/27/39353/the-consequences-of-the-romney-ryan-budget-plan-on-state-and-local-budgets/>.
- 7 The White House, "Fact Sheet: Examples of How the Sequester Would Impact Middle Class Families, Jobs and Economic Security," Press release, February 8, 2013, available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/02/08/fact-sheet-examples-how-sequester-would-impact-middle-class-families-job>.
- 8 Tami Luhby, "Unemployed would lose benefits if federal budget cuts go through," *CNNMoney*, February 20, 2013, available at <http://money.cnn.com/2013/02/20/news/economy/unemployment-benefits-budget-cuts/>.
- 9 National WIC Association, "Impact of Sequestration on WIC," January 2013, available at http://www.paramountcommunication.com/nwica/Impact_of_Sequestration_2_11_13.pdf.
- 10 Everett Ehrlich, "The Impact of a Sequester on the National Institutes of Health and Implications for Jobs and the U.S. Economy," *United for Medical Research*, February 2013, available at http://www.unitedformedicalresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/UMR_Impact_of_Sequestration_2013.pdf.
- 11 National WIC Association, "Impact of Sequestration on WIC"
- 12 House Appropriations Committee Democrats, "Report on Sequestration" (2013), available at http://democrats.appropriations.house.gov/images/sequester_full_report.pdf.

TABLE 1
Estimated impact of sequester on nondefense discretionary grants

State	Four-year average percent	Percent of FY 2012 CBO discretionary (+.612%)	FY 2013 sequester cut	Postsequester funding
Alabama	1.41%	\$1,750,510,539	\$92,777,059	\$1,657,733,480
Alaska	0.60%	\$749,089,221	\$39,701,729	\$709,387,492
Arizona	1.77%	\$2,204,467,024	\$116,836,752	\$2,087,630,271
Arkansas	0.87%	\$1,081,969,018	\$57,344,358	\$1,024,624,660
California	10.75%	\$13,356,559,035	\$707,897,629	\$12,648,661,407
Colorado	1.35%	\$1,678,035,255	\$88,935,869	\$1,589,099,387
Connecticut	1.20%	\$1,493,584,760	\$79,159,992	\$1,414,424,767
Delaware	0.31%	\$380,727,469	\$20,178,556	\$360,548,913
District of Columbia	1.95%	\$2,427,043,098	\$128,633,284	\$2,298,409,813
Florida	4.68%	\$5,813,508,578	\$308,115,955	\$5,505,392,623
Georgia	2.05%	\$2,543,411,070	\$134,800,787	\$2,408,610,284
Hawaii	0.49%	\$607,678,968	\$32,206,985	\$575,471,982
Idaho	0.44%	\$544,105,628	\$28,837,598	\$515,268,030
Illinois	3.99%	\$4,956,600,100	\$262,699,805	\$4,693,900,294
Indiana	1.49%	\$1,850,277,408	\$98,064,703	\$1,752,212,705
Iowa	0.85%	\$1,058,542,278	\$56,102,741	\$1,002,439,537
Kansas	0.80%	\$992,094,629	\$52,581,015	\$939,513,613
Kentucky	1.22%	\$1,514,026,605	\$80,243,410	\$1,433,783,195
Louisiana	3.42%	\$4,252,819,987	\$225,399,459	\$4,027,420,528
Maine	0.54%	\$668,048,551	\$35,406,573	\$632,641,978
Maryland	1.81%	\$2,245,309,456	\$119,001,401	\$2,126,308,055
Massachusetts	2.54%	\$3,153,403,246	\$167,130,372	\$2,986,272,874
Michigan	2.91%	\$3,620,318,486	\$191,876,880	\$3,428,441,607
Minnesota	1.49%	\$1,856,787,460	\$98,409,735	\$1,758,377,725
Mississippi	1.96%	\$2,438,229,373	\$129,226,157	\$2,309,003,217
Missouri	1.42%	\$1,771,108,639	\$93,868,758	\$1,677,239,881
Montana	0.50%	\$626,287,412	\$33,193,233	\$593,094,179
Nebraska	0.54%	\$670,196,899	\$35,520,436	\$634,676,464
Nevada	0.69%	\$853,351,441	\$45,227,626	\$808,123,815
New Hampshire	0.43%	\$537,383,234	\$28,481,311	\$508,901,922
New Jersey	2.66%	\$3,303,834,023	\$175,103,203	\$3,128,730,820
New Mexico	1.08%	\$1,341,128,641	\$71,079,818	\$1,270,048,823
New York	8.84%	\$10,989,733,223	\$582,455,861	\$10,407,277,362
North Carolina	2.42%	\$3,002,279,563	\$159,120,817	\$2,843,158,746
North Dakota	0.31%	\$380,699,369	\$20,177,067	\$360,522,302
Ohio	2.85%	\$3,541,258,322	\$187,686,691	\$3,353,571,631
Oklahoma	1.26%	\$1,567,550,026	\$83,080,151	\$1,484,469,874

State	Four-year average percent	Percent of FY 2012 CBO discretionary (+.612%)	FY 2013 sequester cut	Postsequester funding
Oregon	1.13%	\$1,410,195,440	\$74,740,358	\$1,335,455,081
Pennsylvania	3.80%	\$4,726,127,461	\$250,484,755	\$4,475,642,706
Rhode Island	0.42%	\$527,109,139	\$27,936,784	\$499,172,355
South Carolina	1.26%	\$1,562,020,515	\$82,787,087	\$1,479,233,427
South Dakota	0.37%	\$454,998,117	\$24,114,900	\$430,883,217
Tennessee	1.65%	\$2,045,584,211	\$108,415,963	\$1,937,168,247
Texas	7.03%	\$8,740,826,307	\$463,263,794	\$8,277,562,513
Utah	0.70%	\$876,026,010	\$46,429,379	\$829,596,631
Vermont	0.32%	\$393,233,930	\$20,841,398	\$372,392,531
Virginia	1.92%	\$2,382,154,656	\$126,254,197	\$2,255,900,459
Washington	1.87%	\$2,322,532,529	\$123,094,224	\$2,199,438,305
West Virginia	0.70%	\$867,168,736	\$45,959,943	\$821,208,793
Wisconsin	1.49%	\$1,857,001,893	\$98,421,100	\$1,758,580,793
Wyoming	0.82%	\$1,017,016,966	\$53,901,899	\$963,115,067
Total		\$121,003,953,941	\$6,413,209,559	\$114,590,744,382

TABLE 2
Education

States	Head Start ¹		Title I ²			IDEA		
	FY 2012 appropriation	FY 2013 sequester cut	FY 2012 appropriation	FY 2013 sequester cut	Potential staff lost	FY 2012 appropriation	FY 2013 sequester cut	Potential staff lost
Alabama	\$126,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$227,278,830	\$10,843,307	149	\$181,561,826	\$8,915,770	108
Alaska	\$14,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$39,278,064	\$1,530,626	21	\$36,471,208	\$1,919,022	23
Arizona	\$122,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$327,395,879	\$17,701,960	243	\$188,005,122	\$10,040,553	121
Arkansas	\$75,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$153,155,728	\$5,896,114	81	\$111,979,248	\$5,633,069	68
California	\$961,000,000	\$51,000,000	\$1,640,259,048	\$87,639,039	1,205	\$1,224,661,066	\$62,855,318	759
Colorado	\$81,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$147,958,019	\$8,396,675	115	\$154,234,781	\$8,108,108	98
Connecticut	\$59,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$116,392,175	\$8,743,729	120	\$132,768,017	\$6,314,489	76
Delaware	\$15,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$43,995,443	\$1,372,058	19	\$34,446,453	\$1,839,638	22
District of Columbia	\$28,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$44,613,929	\$533,368	7	\$17,319,779	\$924,976	11
Florida	\$314,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$755,819,636	\$54,491,175	749	\$631,152,474	\$31,092,117	375
Georgia	\$199,000,000	\$11,000,000	\$519,276,209	\$28,564,889	393	\$328,077,843	\$17,458,448	211
Hawaii	\$26,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$53,546,699	\$4,656,681	64	\$39,851,841	\$2,035,593	25
Idaho	\$27,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$57,650,672	\$3,725,486	51	\$55,221,261	\$2,865,332	35
Illinois	\$315,000,000	\$17,000,000	\$662,757,047	\$33,438,385	460	\$505,651,259	\$24,657,563	298
Indiana	\$116,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$264,759,438	\$13,843,914	190	\$257,576,165	\$12,376,969	149

States	Head Start ¹		Title I ²			IDEA		
	FY 2012 appropriation	FY 2013 sequester cut	FY 2012 appropriation	FY 2013 sequester cut	Potential staff lost	FY 2012 appropriation	FY 2013 sequester cut	Potential staff lost
Iowa	\$59,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$89,710,187	\$6,428,911	88	\$121,910,726	\$5,770,827	70
Kansas	\$60,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$103,395,025	\$5,494,604	76	\$104,506,181	\$5,251,785	63
Kentucky	\$126,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$221,853,862	\$11,763,626	162	\$157,888,110	\$7,688,909	93
Louisiana	\$169,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$294,930,772	\$15,758,401	217	\$188,962,577	\$9,752,289	118
Maine	\$32,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$51,497,664	\$2,677,921	37	\$54,641,461	\$2,586,535	31
Maryland	\$90,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$196,409,008	\$14,389,021	198	\$199,916,833	\$9,719,363	117
Massachusetts	\$123,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$218,130,356	\$13,880,128	191	\$283,465,895	\$13,418,282	162
Michigan	\$269,000,000	\$14,000,000	\$534,773,578	\$22,000,398	303	\$399,883,942	\$20,279,289	245
Minnesota	\$84,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$152,207,679	\$7,049,024	97	\$189,532,481	\$9,199,308	111
Mississippi	\$181,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$182,321,524	\$5,486,363	75	\$119,980,160	\$6,123,987	74
Missouri	\$139,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$237,616,955	\$11,922,383	164	\$226,829,933	\$10,762,593	130
Montana	\$24,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$44,558,240	\$1,535,816	21	\$37,221,455	\$1,919,022	23
Nebraska	\$42,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$67,453,194	\$2,987,935	41	\$74,564,188	\$3,529,607	43
Nevada	\$30,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$110,783,802	\$9,014,284	124	\$70,702,984	\$3,775,945	46
New Hampshire	\$16,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$40,987,112	\$1,077,688	15	\$47,389,192	\$2,247,666	27
New Jersey	\$150,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$290,470,247	\$11,673,681	161	\$360,945,645	\$17,085,902	206
New Mexico	\$63,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$119,678,921	\$6,097,742	84	\$91,005,697	\$4,354,823	53
New York	\$496,000,000	\$26,000,000	\$1,122,225,549	\$42,676,313	587	\$758,002,911	\$36,378,359	439
North Carolina	\$172,000,000	\$9,000,000	\$404,282,233	\$25,446,351	350	\$326,077,875	\$16,776,161	202
North Dakota	\$20,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$33,600,475	\$1,131,608	16	\$27,970,106	\$1,493,764	18
Ohio	\$288,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$577,625,821	\$25,191,122	346	\$436,958,357	\$22,008,413	266
Oklahoma	\$98,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$152,222,025	\$4,855,464	67	\$147,674,175	\$7,300,677	88
Oregon	\$71,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$155,302,290	\$10,265,050	141	\$128,760,236	\$6,372,225	77
Pennsylvania	\$263,000,000	\$14,000,000	\$558,288,830	\$26,383,877	363	\$426,427,814	\$21,381,079	258
Puerto Rico	\$279,000,000	\$15,000,000	\$458,479,285	\$4,850,811	67	\$114,923,374	\$6,137,568	74
Rhode Island	\$25,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$49,681,231	\$2,413,436	33	\$43,668,156	\$2,067,098	25
South Carolina	\$100,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$220,042,564	\$12,522,323	172	\$140,625,448	\$8,583,510	104
South Dakota	\$22,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$42,676,499	\$1,162,158	16	\$33,319,673	\$1,779,462	21
Tennessee	\$138,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$278,582,222	\$14,737,229	203	\$236,469,821	\$11,706,600	141
Texas	\$561,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$1,380,824,054	\$67,825,655	933	\$980,678,753	\$51,026,919	616
Utah	\$45,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$91,669,729	\$6,260,266	86	\$109,453,830	\$5,672,990	68
Vermont	\$15,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$33,111,922	\$1,127,690	16	\$26,968,524	\$1,440,274	17
Virginia	\$116,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$237,637,536	\$14,024,356	193	\$281,475,855	\$13,878,260	167
Washington	\$118,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$213,541,399	\$11,606,368	160	\$220,953,409	\$11,251,352	136
West Virginia	\$58,000,000	\$3,000,000	\$95,098,920	\$5,771,940	79	\$75,837,277	\$3,589,871	43
Wisconsin	\$106,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$217,905,021	\$8,543,403	117	\$207,862,974	\$10,097,151	122
Wyoming	\$13,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$33,635,833	\$1,153,897	16	\$28,292,653	\$1,510,990	18

States	Head Start ¹		Title I ²			IDEA		
	FY 2012 appropriation	FY 2013 sequester cut	FY 2012 appropriation	FY 2013 sequester cut	Potential staff lost	FY 2012 appropriation	FY 2013 sequester cut	Potential staff lost
Tribal	\$225,000,000	\$12,000,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Migrant Program	\$327,000,000	\$18,000,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
National Activities/Other	\$278,000,000	\$14,000,000	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
American Samoa	n/a	n/a	10,668,336	85,212	n/a	\$6,358,510	\$317,925	4
Guam	n/a	n/a	13,683,105	2,511,646	n/a	\$14,098,659	\$704,933	9
Northern Mariana Islands	n/a	n/a	6,448,488	2,107,782	n/a	\$4,831,832	\$241,592	3
Virgin Islands	n/a	n/a	13,472,568	0	n/a	\$8,960,866	\$448,043	5
Total	\$7,969,000,000	\$424,000,000	\$14,411,620,877	\$723,269,289	9,880	\$11,414,976,891	\$572,668,313	6912

1 House Appropriations Committee Democrats, "Report on Sequestration" (2013).

2 Data prepared by the Department of Education

TABLE 3
Public safety

State	FIRE grants ¹				SAFER grants ²			
	FY11 FIRE award total	Percent of total FY11 FIRE award	Approximate share of CRFY13 FIRE appropriation	FIRE sequester cut	FY 11 SAFER award total	Percent of total FY11 SAFER award	Approximate share of CRFY13 SAFER appropriation	SAFER sequester cut
Alabama	\$18,591,195	5.39%	\$18,294,669	\$969,617	1,293,624	0.39%	\$1,316,649	\$69,782
Alaska	\$568,356	0.16%	\$559,291	\$29,642	73,810	0.02%	\$75,124	\$3,982
Arizona	\$4,952,515	1.44%	\$4,873,523	\$258,297	2,809,538	0.84%	\$2,859,545	\$151,556
Arkansas	\$4,253,085	1.23%	\$4,185,249	\$221,818	1,136,109	0.34%	\$1,156,331	\$61,286
California	\$35,334,234	10.24%	\$34,770,660	\$1,842,845	56,356,112	16.90%	\$57,359,200	\$3,040,038
Colorado	\$5,213,946	1.51%	\$5,130,785	\$271,932	5,431,892	1.63%	\$5,528,575	\$293,014
Connecticut	\$3,670,354	1.06%	\$3,611,813	\$191,426	5,099,260	1.53%	\$5,190,022	\$275,071
Delaware	\$366,324	0.11%	\$360,481	\$19,106		0.00%		\$0
District of Columbia	\$1,380,000	0.40%	\$1,357,989	\$71,973		0.00%		\$0
Florida	\$16,200,525	4.70%	\$15,942,130	\$844,933	30,494,444	9.14%	\$31,037,217	\$1,644,973
Georgia	\$5,174,566	1.50%	\$5,092,033	\$269,878	1,273,620	0.38%	\$1,296,289	\$68,703
Hawaii	\$1,534,584	0.44%	\$1,510,108	\$80,036		0.00%		\$0
Idaho	\$439,110	0.13%	\$432,106	\$22,902	4,068,574	1.22%	\$4,140,991	\$219,473
Illinois	\$12,753,979	3.70%	\$12,550,556	\$665,179	2,456,366	0.74%	\$2,500,087	\$132,505
Indiana	\$7,728,822	2.24%	\$7,605,549	\$403,094	4,587,530	1.38%	\$4,669,184	\$247,467
Iowa	\$6,629,640	1.92%	\$6,523,899	\$345,767	1,604,335	0.48%	\$1,632,891	\$86,543
Kansas	\$3,072,852	0.89%	\$3,023,841	\$160,264	381,174	0.11%	\$387,959	\$20,562
Kentucky	\$5,426,036	1.57%	\$5,339,492	\$282,993	155,277	0.05%	\$158,041	\$8,376

State	FIRE grants ¹				SAFER grants ²			
	FY11 FIRE award total	Percent of total FY11 FIRE award	Approximate share of CRFY13 FIRE appropriation	FIRE sequester cut	FY 11 SAFER award total	Percent of total FY11 SAFER award	Approximate share of CRFY13 SAFER appropriation	SAFER sequester cut
Louisiana	\$6,337,887	1.84%	\$6,236,799	\$330,550	1,672,260	0.50%	\$1,702,025	\$90,207
Maine	\$2,118,880	0.61%	\$2,085,084	\$110,509	518,554	0.16%	\$527,784	\$27,973
Maryland	\$4,524,212	1.31%	\$4,452,052	\$235,959	4,299,853	1.29%	\$4,376,386	\$231,948
Massachusetts	\$10,679,512	3.10%	\$10,509,176	\$556,986	23,127,145	6.93%	\$23,538,787	\$1,247,556
Michigan	\$16,904,051	4.90%	\$16,634,435	\$881,625	47,646,287	14.28%	\$48,494,348	\$2,570,200
Minnesota	\$10,638,720	3.08%	\$10,469,035	\$554,859	4,463,942	1.34%	\$4,543,396	\$240,800
Mississippi	\$3,694,914	1.07%	\$3,635,981	\$192,707	488,283	0.15%	\$496,974	\$26,340
Missouri	\$7,594,539	2.20%	\$7,473,408	\$396,091	10,619,001	3.18%	\$10,808,010	\$572,825
Montana	\$725,248	0.21%	\$713,680	\$37,825	1,252,466	0.38%	\$1,274,759	\$67,562
Nebraska	\$1,378,613	0.40%	\$1,356,624	\$71,901		0.00%	\$0	\$0
Nevada	\$564,637	0.16%	\$555,631	\$29,448	13,438,720	4.03%	\$13,677,917	\$724,930
New Hampshire	\$1,690,406	0.49%	\$1,663,444	\$88,163	1,479,848	0.44%	\$1,506,188	\$79,828
New Jersey	\$10,402,474	3.02%	\$10,236,557	\$542,538	18,072,964	5.42%	\$18,394,646	\$974,916
New Mexico	\$2,122,649	0.62%	\$2,088,793	\$110,706		0.00%		\$0
New York	\$10,253,623	2.97%	\$10,090,080	\$534,774	6,142,217	1.84%	\$6,251,543	\$331,332
North Carolina	\$13,864,573	4.02%	\$13,643,436	\$723,102	5,833,751	1.75%	\$5,937,586	\$314,692
North Dakota	\$710,083	0.21%	\$698,757	\$37,034	48,686	0.01%	\$49,553	\$2,626
Ohio	\$23,281,933	6.75%	\$22,910,591	\$1,214,261	18,654,102	5.59%	\$18,986,128	\$1,006,265
Oklahoma	\$3,187,225	0.92%	\$3,136,389	\$166,229	1,435,395	0.43%	\$1,460,944	\$77,430
Oregon	\$5,590,049	1.62%	\$5,500,889	\$291,547	8,353,728	2.50%	\$8,502,417	\$450,628
Pennsylvania	\$26,227,162	7.60%	\$25,808,844	\$1,367,869	13,831,483	4.15%	\$14,077,671	\$746,117
Rhode Island	\$2,314,505	0.67%	\$2,277,589	\$120,712	3,108,382	0.93%	\$3,163,708	\$167,677
South Carolina	\$4,948,682	1.43%	\$4,869,752	\$258,097	2,146,863	0.64%	\$2,185,075	\$115,809
South Dakota	\$1,135,929	0.33%	\$1,117,811	\$59,244	255,360	0.08%	\$259,905	\$13,775
Tennessee	\$6,268,606	1.82%	\$6,168,623	\$326,937	993,615	0.30%	\$1,011,300	\$53,599
Texas	\$11,031,412	3.20%	\$10,855,463	\$575,340	2,881,712	0.86%	\$2,933,004	\$155,449
Utah	\$883,518	0.26%	\$869,426	\$46,080	208,140	0.06%	\$211,845	\$11,228
Vermont	\$498,268	0.14%	\$490,321	\$25,987		0.00%		\$0
Virginia	\$3,500,769	1.01%	\$3,444,932	\$182,581	4,978,137	1.49%	\$5,066,743	\$268,537
Washington	\$7,341,963	2.13%	\$7,224,860	\$382,918	16,139,921	4.84%	\$16,427,197	\$870,641
West Virginia	\$2,173,761	0.63%	\$2,139,090	\$113,372		0.00%		\$0
Wisconsin	\$8,635,259	2.50%	\$8,497,528	\$450,369	3,101,616	0.93%	\$3,156,822	\$167,312
Wyoming	\$488,538	0.14%	\$480,746	\$25,480	1,148,788	0.34%	\$1,169,235	\$61,969
Puerto Rico	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Guam	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Virgin Islands	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	\$345,002,723		\$339,500,000	\$17,993,500	333,562,884		\$339,500,000	\$17,993,500

1 FEMA, "Assistance to Firefighters Grant FY 2011 Awards," available at <http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=5704>.

2 FEMA, "FY 2011 Staffing For Adequate Fire & Emergency Response Grants (SAFER) Awards," available at <http://www.fema.gov/library/viewRecord.do?fromSearch=fromsearch&id=5926>.

TABLE 4
Public health

State	HIV testing ¹			National Institutes of Health funding ²				Seniors nutrition ¹	
	FY 2012 funding	FY 2013 sequester cut	Fewer people tested for HIV	NIH awards (2012) (\$M)	Total employment (2012)	Reduction in NIH awards (\$M)	Total job loss	FY 2012 funding	FY 2013 sequester cut
Alabama	\$3,302,581	\$176,108	4,403	229.9	4,630	11.7	236	\$12,748,557	\$679,808.64
Alaska	\$1,077,036	\$57,432	1,436	8.7	430	0.4	22	\$3,599,752	\$191,954.47
American Samoa	\$195,829	\$10,442	261	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$2,014,237	\$107,407.90
Arizona	\$3,711,339	\$197,905	4,948	173.4	4,197	8.8	214	\$15,426,259	\$822,595.39
Arkansas	\$1,672,521	\$89,186	2,230	54	1,568	2.8	80	\$8,905,848	\$474,898.64
Baltimore	\$3,107,563	\$165,709	4,143	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
California	\$17,504,189	\$933,400	23,335	3,334.30	59,363	170.1	3,028	\$77,482,961	\$4,131,729.31
Chicago	\$8,133,928	\$433,737	10,843	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Philadelphia	\$7,280,576	\$388,232	9,706	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Colorado	\$4,240,679	\$226,131	5,653	303.8	6,018	15.5	307	\$10,178,784	\$542,777.14
Connecticut	\$5,454,822	\$290,875	7,272	473.4	6,350	24.1	324	\$9,291,371	\$495,456.41
Delaware	\$1,405,574	\$74,951	1,874	32.7	520	1.7	26	\$3,849,236	\$205,258.05
District of Columbia	\$6,479,212	\$345,500	8,637	186	500	9.5	25	\$3,845,023	\$205,033.39
Federated States of Micronesia	\$223,177	\$11,901	298	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Florida	\$28,707,460	\$1,530,807	38,270	491.9	12,564	25.1	641	\$54,797,662	\$2,922,050.26
Fulton County	\$4,514,127	\$240,713	6,018	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Georgia	\$6,910,211	\$368,483	9,212	441.2	10,378	22.5	529	\$19,183,738	\$1,022,960.55
Guam	\$374,092	\$19,948	499	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$468,427	\$24,978.57
Hawaii	\$1,510,475	\$80,545	2,014	53.9	1,229	2.7	63	\$3,718,778	\$198,301.46
Houston	\$7,115,040	\$379,405	9,485	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Idaho	\$821,800	\$43,822	1,096	9.5	438	0.5	22	\$3,920,028	\$209,032.98
Illinois	\$3,714,830	\$198,091	4,952	745.9	14,248	38	727	\$32,449,254	\$1,730,335.70
Indiana	\$2,921,999	\$155,814	3,895	201.8	4,689	10.3	239	\$14,658,935	\$781,678.33
Iowa	\$1,223,831	\$65,260	1,632	184.2	3,934	9.4	201	\$9,265,390	\$494,070.99
Kansas	\$1,300,621	\$69,355	1,734	101.7	2,013	5.2	103	\$8,167,216	\$435,511.57
Kentucky	\$1,665,675	\$88,821	2,221	150.8	3,498	7.7	178	\$10,726,704	\$571,994.63
Los Angeles County	\$14,264,539	\$760,647	19,016	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Louisiana	\$6,407,932	\$341,699	8,542	163.9	4,319	8.4	220	\$11,763,750	\$627,294.44
Maine	\$1,213,626	\$64,716	1,618	73.4	1,749	3.7	89	\$3,835,658	\$204,534.01
Maryland	\$8,787,185	\$468,571	11,714	969.9	14,575	49.5	743	\$12,875,523	\$686,579.02
Massachusetts	\$7,346,706	\$391,758	9,794	2,470.00	34,031	125.9	1,736	\$20,135,988	\$1,073,738.67
Michigan	\$6,296,938	\$335,780	8,395	619.1	11,065	31.6	564	\$27,908,122	\$1,488,182.74

State	HIV testing ¹			National Institutes of Health funding ²				Seniors nutrition ¹	
	FY 2012 funding	FY 2013 sequester cut	Fewer people tested for HIV	NIH awards (2012) (\$M)	Total employment (2012)	Reduction in NIH awards (\$M)	Total job loss	FY 2012 funding	FY 2013 sequester cut
Minnesota	\$2,546,896	\$135,812	3,395	478.2	8,887	24.4	453	\$12,280,576	\$654,853.86
Mississippi	\$2,816,120	\$150,168	3,754	30.9	1,068	1.6	54	\$7,032,533	\$375,005.32
Missouri	\$4,215,691	\$224,799	5,620	465.1	7,226	23.7	369	\$16,713,458	\$891,234.45
Montana	\$1,003,703	\$53,522	1,338	26.4	695	1.3	35	\$4,399,743	\$234,613.48
Nebraska	\$1,012,726	\$54,003	1,350	91.5	1,865	4.7	95	\$5,229,381	\$278,853.40
Nevada	\$2,452,681	\$130,788	3,270	21.5	847	1.1	43	\$6,170,037	\$329,013.27
New Hampshire	\$1,196,820	\$63,820	1,595	91.6	1,424	4.7	73	\$4,344,147	\$231,648.86
New Jersey	\$15,033,218	\$801,637	20,041	238.4	4,962	12.2	253	\$21,977,363	\$1,171,928.82
New Mexico	\$1,683,100	\$89,750	2,244	94.6	1,843	4.8	94	\$6,096,342	\$325,083.54
New York City	\$32,298,387	\$1,722,291	43,057	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
New York	\$22,229,164	\$1,185,356	29,634	1,998.50	32,249	101.9	1,645	\$57,547,500	\$3,068,683.61
North Carolina	\$6,819,608	\$363,651	9,091	964.4	18,779	49.2	958	\$22,329,973	\$1,190,731.52
North Dakota	\$710,257	\$37,874	947	14.7	427	0.8	22	\$4,048,348	\$215,875.57
Northern Mariana Islands	\$264,000	\$14,078	352	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$11,244,396	\$599,600.22
Ohio	\$6,048,850	\$322,551	8,064	661.2	13,751	33.7	701	\$30,167,791	\$1,608,678.15
Oklahoma	\$1,958,549	\$104,438	2,611	81.9	2,497	4.2	127	\$9,673,183	\$515,816.29
Oregon	\$2,269,360	\$121,012	3,025	304.6	6,221	15.5	317	\$10,034,380	\$535,076.89
Pennsylvania	\$5,502,205	\$293,402	7,335	1,431.60	23,709	73	1,209	\$38,123,314	\$2,032,901.32
Puerto Rico	\$5,912,683	\$315,290	7,882	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$3,780,956	\$201,617.06
Republic of Palau	\$239,347	\$12,763	319	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Republic of The Marshall Islands	\$158,999	\$8,479	212	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Rhode Island	\$1,218,672	\$64,985	1,625	146.9	2,289	7.5	117	\$11,477,564	\$612,033.75
San Francisco	\$7,655,336	\$408,216	10,205	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
South Carolina	\$5,519,479	\$294,323	7,358	135.7	3,350	6.9	171	\$4,194,335	\$223,660.23
South Dakota	\$672,265	\$35,848	896	19.9	388	1	20	\$14,755,499	\$786,827.54
Tennessee	\$5,041,421	\$268,831	6,721	451.9	8,839	23	451	\$52,931,968	\$2,822,563.32
Texas	\$15,796,929	\$842,361	21,059	1,040.90	25,408	53.1	1,296	\$5,129,979	\$273,552.85
Utah	\$910,740	\$48,565	1,214	155.3	3,787	7.9	193	\$3,997,690	\$213,174.26
Vermont	\$1,097,967	\$58,548	1,464	51.4	1,032	2.6	53	\$17,666,619	\$942,061.15
Virgin Islands	\$629,949	\$33,592	840	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$1,822,373	\$97,176.87
Virginia	\$6,732,464	\$359,004	8,975	272	5,404	13.9	276	\$15,024,550	\$801,174.51
Washington	\$3,478,393	\$185,483	4,637	859	14,067	43.8	717	\$6,437,582	\$343,279.94
West Virginia	\$1,249,602	\$66,634	1,666	37.3	980	1.9	50	\$14,327,400	\$763,999.44

State	HIV testing ¹			National Institutes of Health funding ²				Seniors nutrition ¹	
	FY 2012 funding	FY 2013 sequester cut	Fewer people tested for HIV	NIH awards (2012) (\$M)	Total employment (2012)	Reduction in NIH awards (\$M)	Total job loss	FY 2012 funding	FY 2013 sequester cut
Wisconsin	\$2,163,675	\$115,377	2,884	373.9	7,454	19.1	380	\$4,030,912	\$214,945.80
Wyoming	\$767,270	\$40,914	1,023	7.2	322	0.4	16	\$731,341	\$38,998.29
Native American set-aside	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$3,187,965	\$169,996.19
Undistributed	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$8,162,893	\$435,281.04
Total	\$338,192,639	\$18,033,906.03	450,848	22,020	402,078	1,123	20,506	\$816,289,292	\$43,528,104

1 Senate Appropriations Committee Majority Staff, "Under Threat: Sequestration's Impact on Nondefense Jobs and Services" (2012).

2 United for Medical Research, "The Impact of a Sequester on the National Institutes of Health and Implication for Jobs and the U.S. Economy" (2013).

TABLE 5
Workforce training

State	Employment services			Job Corps	
	FY 2012 funding ¹	FY 2013 sequester cut	Fewer job seekers served	FY 2012 funding ¹	FY 2013 sequester cut
Alabama	\$9,114,728	\$486,037	10,818	\$23,560,030	\$1,256,324
Alaska	\$7,618,486	\$406,251	9,042	\$12,644,080	\$674,237
Arizona	\$13,416,510	\$715,427	15,923	\$16,586,410	\$884,460
Arkansas	\$5,641,422	\$300,825	6,695	\$26,443,790	\$1,410,098
California	\$83,874,952	\$4,472,578	99,545	\$133,291,090	\$7,107,662
Colorado	\$11,123,996	\$593,180	13,202	\$20,725,490	\$1,105,173
Connecticut	\$7,886,732	\$420,555	9,360	\$16,780,580	\$894,814
Delaware	\$1,957,574	\$104,386	2,323	\$5,328,560	\$284,142
District of Columbia	\$2,361,773	\$125,940	2,803	\$66,216,070	\$3,530,930
Florida	\$41,597,929	\$2,218,183	49,370	\$50,282,420	\$2,681,278
Georgia	\$20,518,463	\$1,094,134	24,352	\$16,692,660	\$890,125
Hawaii	\$2,474,455	\$131,949	2,937	\$10,599,290	\$565,200
Idaho	\$6,347,555	\$338,479	7,533	\$31,540,830	\$1,681,895
Illinois	\$28,905,034	\$1,541,342	34,305	\$21,718,930	\$1,158,148
Indiana	\$13,614,524	\$725,986	16,158	\$16,315,360	\$870,006
Iowa	\$6,439,570	\$343,386	7,643	\$8,858,530	\$472,375
Kansas	\$5,924,673	\$315,929	7,032	\$94,072,750	\$5,016,369
Kentucky	\$9,063,496	\$483,305	10,757	\$23,859,270	\$1,272,280
Louisiana	\$8,712,855	\$464,607	10,341	\$23,631,340	\$1,260,126
Maine	\$3,774,830	\$201,290	4,480	\$30,864,630	\$1,645,837
Maryland	\$11,687,183	\$623,212	13,871	\$42,027,460	\$2,241,087
Massachusetts	\$14,148,935	\$754,483	16,792	\$34,806,580	\$1,856,039
Michigan	\$23,547,173	\$1,255,638	27,947	\$10,501,750	\$559,999
Minnesota	\$11,868,691	\$632,890	14,086	\$32,166,100	\$1,715,237
Mississippi	\$6,118,274	\$326,253	7,261	\$53,489,360	\$2,852,286

State	Employment services			Job Corps	
	FY 2012 funding ¹	FY 2013 sequester cut	Fewer job seekers served	FY 2012 funding ¹	FY 2013 sequester cut
Missouri	\$12,837,723	\$684,563	15,236	\$22,411,650	\$1,195,087
Montana	\$5,187,254	\$276,607	6,156	\$31,067,740	\$1,656,667
Nebraska	\$6,234,060	\$332,427	7,399	\$8,130,510	\$433,554
Nevada	\$6,505,421	\$346,897	7,721	\$21,480,620	\$1,145,440
New Hampshire	\$2,803,840	\$149,513	3,328	\$0	\$0
New Jersey	\$19,163,297	\$1,021,871	22,744	\$19,797,380	\$1,055,683
New Mexico	\$5,821,012	\$310,402	6,909	\$20,745,420	\$1,106,236
New York	\$39,748,915	\$2,119,585	47,175	\$75,047,420	\$4,001,856
North Carolina	\$19,836,199	\$1,057,753	23,542	\$3,399,830	\$181,294
North Dakota	\$5,282,176	\$281,669	6,269	\$45,578,350	\$2,430,436
Ohio	\$25,946,567	\$1,383,584	30,794	\$43,107,740	\$2,298,693
Oklahoma	\$6,779,019	\$361,487	8,046	\$49,452,270	\$2,637,011
Oregon	\$8,758,927	\$467,064	10,395	\$61,535,500	\$3,281,341
Pennsylvania	\$26,310,462	\$1,402,989	31,226	\$20,624,640	\$1,099,796
Puerto Rico	\$7,686,516	\$409,879	9,123	\$7,739,940	\$412,727
Rhode Island	\$2,618,648	\$139,638	3,108	\$9,818,570	\$523,569
South Carolina	\$9,785,215	\$521,790	11,613	\$7,634,710	\$407,116
South Dakota	\$4,881,946	\$260,327	5,794	\$19,383,810	\$1,033,629
Tennessee	\$13,308,517	\$709,668	15,795	\$96,622,440	\$5,152,330
Texas	\$49,945,739	\$2,663,325	59,277	\$42,477,600	\$2,265,091
Utah	\$7,113,078	\$379,300	8,442	\$10,106,890	\$538,943
Vermont	\$2,286,981	\$121,952	2,714	\$26,520,990	\$1,414,215
Virginia	\$15,905,779	\$848,165	18,877	\$19,040,370	\$1,015,316
Washington	\$14,673,520	\$782,456	17,415	\$36,661,620	\$1,954,957
West Virginia	\$5,587,868	\$297,969	6,632	\$21,236,850	\$1,132,441
Wisconsin	\$12,597,349	\$671,746	14,951	\$25,402,800	\$1,354,588
Wyoming	\$3,787,650	\$201,974	4,495	\$1,049,000	\$55,937
Guam	\$327,940	\$17,487	389	N/A	N/A
Virgin Islands	\$1,380,469	\$73,613	1,638	N/A	N/A
Total	\$700,841,900	\$37,371,946	831,782	1,569,078,020	\$83,670,081

¹ Senate Appropriations Committee Majority Staff, "Under Threat: Sequestration's Impact on Nondefense Jobs and Services" (2012).

TABLE 6
Women's health and child care

State	Breast and cervical cancer screening ¹			Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	Child care assistance ³	
	FY 2012 funding	FY 2013 sequester cut	Fewer cancer screenings for women	FY 2013 estimated sequester caseload cut ²	Funding before sequester	FY 2013 sequester cut
Alabama	\$2,232,272	\$119,034	472	9,700	\$43,103,918	\$2,284,508
Alaska	\$3,037,037	\$161,948	643	1,700	\$4,560,828	\$241,724
Arizona	\$2,600,486	\$138,669	550	11,700	\$57,215,425	\$3,032,418
Arkansas	\$2,365,779	\$126,154	501	6,400	\$28,315,726	\$1,500,733
California	\$6,878,103	\$366,770	1,455	100,300	\$245,497,817	\$13,011,384
Colorado	\$3,681,532	\$196,315	779	7,100	\$28,616,516	\$1,516,675
Connecticut	\$1,192,129	\$63,570	252	3,900	\$15,031,656	\$796,678
Delaware	\$1,049,867	\$55,983	222	1,500	\$5,563,569	\$294,869
District of Columbia	\$510,020	\$27,196	108	1,100	\$2,980,313	\$157,957
Florida	\$4,800,000	\$255,957	1,016	33,700	\$121,750,151	\$6,452,758
Georgia	\$4,130,000	\$220,230	874	20,700	\$93,560,602	\$4,958,712
Hawaii	\$1,134,616	\$60,503	240	2,500	\$7,729,646	\$409,671
Idaho	\$2,660,235	\$141,855	563	3,000	\$14,331,816	\$759,586
Illinois	\$1,777,813	\$94,801	376	19,700	\$80,568,588	\$4,270,135
Indiana	\$6,315,920	\$336,792	1,337	11,200	\$53,084,393	\$2,813,473
Iowa	\$2,000,000	\$106,649	423	4,700	\$21,226,717	\$1,125,016
Kansas	\$2,269,995	\$121,046	480	5,100	\$21,772,262	\$1,153,930
Kentucky	\$2,680,066	\$142,913	567	9,100	\$39,822,749	\$2,110,606
Louisiana	\$1,693,558	\$90,308	358	9,900	\$42,750,913	\$2,265,798
Maine	\$2,266,695	\$120,870	480	1,800	\$7,838,865	\$415,460
Maryland	\$4,538,523	\$242,014	960	10,000	\$27,732,806	\$1,469,839
Massachusetts	\$1,692,904	\$90,273	358	8,300	\$27,231,747	\$1,443,283
Michigan	\$8,693,584	\$463,580	1,840	17,400	\$70,453,680	\$3,734,045
Minnesota	\$4,409,466	\$235,132	933	8,700	\$30,878,799	\$1,636,576
Mississippi	\$2,905,217	\$154,919	615	6,400	\$33,538,919	\$1,777,563
Missouri	\$2,111,748	\$112,608	447	10,000	\$44,656,405	\$2,366,789
Montana	\$2,167,744	\$115,594	459	1,400	\$6,812,772	\$361,077
Nebraska	\$3,307,063	\$176,347	700	2,900	\$13,521,188	\$716,623
Nevada	\$1,362,021	\$72,629	288	5,100	\$16,631,638	\$881,477
New Hampshire	\$2,793,001	\$148,935	591	1,100	\$5,385,971	\$285,456
New Jersey	\$1,484,330	\$79,151	314	11,700	\$40,325,765	\$2,137,266
New Mexico	\$2,787,555	\$148,645	590	4,100	\$20,200,190	\$1,070,610
New York	\$3,271,548	\$174,453	692	35,700	\$102,142,717	\$5,413,564
North Carolina	\$2,357,718	\$125,724	499	18,300	\$76,593,981	\$4,059,481
North Dakota	\$8,269,773	\$440,980	1,750	900	\$4,181,889	\$221,640
Ohio	\$4,197,806	\$223,845	888	18,800	\$80,880,608	\$4,286,672
Oklahoma	\$1,241,041	\$66,178	263	6,400	\$34,094,036	\$1,806,984
Oregon	\$2,182,532	\$116,382	462	800	\$26,385,920	\$1,398,454
Pennsylvania	\$2,585,219	\$137,855	547	17,200	\$70,071,621	\$3,713,796
Puerto Rico	\$330,000	\$17,597	70	13,200	\$32,711,878	\$1,733,730

State	Breast and cervical cancer screening ¹			Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children	Child care assistance ³	
	FY 2012 funding	FY 2013 sequester cut	Fewer cancer screenings for women	FY 2013 estimated sequester caseload cut ²	Funding before sequester	FY 2013 sequester cut
Rhode Island	\$1,544,551	\$82,362	327	1,700	\$5,656,138	\$299,775
South Carolina	\$3,092,870	\$164,925	654	8,900	\$41,485,151	\$2,198,713
South Dakota	\$811,951	\$43,297	172	1,400	\$6,259,353	\$331,746
Tennessee	\$1,197,505	\$63,856	253	11,100	\$53,213,674	\$2,820,325
Texas	\$6,467,652	\$344,883	1,369	66,100	\$244,486,494	\$12,957,784
Utah	\$2,244,920	\$119,709	475	4,700	\$27,432,852	\$1,453,941
Vermont	\$2,578,483	\$137,496	546	1,100	\$3,223,287	\$170,834
Virginia	\$997,700	\$53,202	211	10,900	\$43,711,342	\$2,316,701
Washington	\$4,432,050	\$236,336	938	13,300	\$39,354,401	\$2,085,783
West Virginia	\$3,125,115	\$166,645	661	3,300	\$14,449,612	\$765,829
Wisconsin	\$4,050,607	\$215,996	857	8,100	\$36,255,763	\$1,921,555
Wyoming	\$683,359	\$36,440	145	800	\$3,000,062	\$159,003
American Samoa	\$238,433	\$12,714	50	500	\$3,020,354	\$160,079
Guam	\$392,840	\$20,948	83	500	\$4,321,966	\$229,064
Northern Mariana Islands	\$242,796	\$12,947	51	300	\$1,916,651	\$101,582
Native American set-aside	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$44,839,002	\$2,376,467
Technical Assistance	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$5,705,812	\$302,408
Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	\$11,966,887	\$634,245
Total	\$150,065,748	\$8,002,160	31,756	595,900	\$2,290,053,801	\$121,372,850

1 Senate Appropriations Committee Majority Staff, "Under Threat: Sequestration's Impact on Nondefense Jobs and Services" (2012).

2 National WIC Association, "Impact of Sequestration on WIC," January 2013.

3 House Appropriations Committee Democrats, "Report on Sequestration" (2013).