

**IDEA Part B Maintenance of Effort (MOE)
Reduction and Coordinate Early Intervening
Services (CEIS) for School Year 2012- 2013**

OSEP Data Documentation

December 2015

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose	3
1.2 OSEP Background	3
2.0 OSEP Part B MOE Reduction & CEIS Data	4
2.1 LEA Data	4
2.2 Definitions	5
3.0 Data Quality	5
3.1 Coordinated Review	6
3.2 Data Notes	6
4.0 File Structure	7
5.0 Guidance for Using these Data- FAQs	11
5.1 Privacy Protections Used	12
Appendix A	15
Appendix B	17

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this document is to provide information necessary to appropriately use local educational agency (LEA) level data file on IDEA Part B Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Reduction and Coordinate Early Intervening Services (CEIS) Data from the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The MOE Reduction and CEIS data file provides the following information for every LEA or educational service agency (ESA) that receives a subgrant under IDEA Section 611 or 619:

- LEA/ESA Allocations which includes the IDEA 611 and 619 allocation amounts for each LEA/ESA in the State for the reference Federal fiscal year (FFY) and the previous FFY.
- Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Reduction which includes the determination under the 34 CFR § 300.600(a)(2) for each LEA/ESA and how much the LEA/ESA reduced of local and/or State funds taken under Section 613(a)(2)(C) for the reference school year.
- Provision of Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) which includes whether each LEA/ESA was required to reserve funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality during the reference school year and whether each LEA/SEA voluntarily reserved for funds for CEIS. For each LEA/ESA that reserved funds for CEIS (required or voluntary), the dollar amount that was reserved during the reference school year.
- Number of Children Receiving CEIS which includes the number of children who received CEIS during the reference school year and the number of children who received CEIS at any time during the reference school year and the two preceding school years and received special education and related services during the reference school year.

1.2 OSEP Background

OSEP is dedicated to improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities ages birth through 21 by providing leadership and financial support to assist states and local districts.

Section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that each State submit data about the infants and toddlers, birth through age 2, who

receive early intervention services under Part C of IDEA and children with disabilities, ages 3 through 21, who receive special education and related services under Part B of IDEA. There are 12 data collections authorized under Section 618: under Part B: (1) Child Count; (2) Educational Environments; (3) Personnel; (4) Exiting; (5) Discipline; (6) Assessment; (7) Dispute Resolution; and (8) Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services; and under Part C: (9) Child Count; (10) Settings; (11) Exiting; and (12) Dispute Resolution. These data are collected via an ED Facts system (i.e., EDEN Submission System (ESS) or the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)). Information related to the Section 618 data collected via ESS can be found in the ED Facts Series - ED Facts Special Education/IDEA 2011-12 Study in this Data Inventory (<http://datainventory.ed.gov/Search?seriesID=196&searchTerm=EDFacts&searchType=Exact>). Information related to the IDEA Section 618 data collected via ESS can be found in the IDEA Section 618 entry in the ED Data Inventory (<http://datainventory.ed.gov/Search?seriesID=1324&searchTerm=IDEA%20Section%20618&searchType=Exact>).. This data documentation deals only with Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS data collection and file.

2.0 OSEP Part B MOE Reduction & CEIS Data

2.1 LEA Data

States are required to report MOE Reduction and CEIS data under Title 1, Part A, Subsection 618 of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA).

Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Data come from one file:

- IDEA Part B MOE & CEIS

This information is submitted to OSEP via EMAPS by the IDEA Part B data managers in each of the 60 IDEA Part B reporting entities.

States were required to submit FFY 2012/ SY 2012-13 data to ED Facts no later than May 7, 2014. OSEP reviews the data for quality issues and provides feedback to states/entities. States or entities are given the opportunity to address the data quality issues prior to the data being published. Finalized data was extracted from the ED Facts system on August 30, 2014. Please see Appendix B for the specific date each state/ entity submitted these data.2.2

2.2 Definitions

EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) – A Web-based tool used to provide State Education Agencies (SEAs) with an easy method of reporting and maintaining data to (1) meet Federal reporting requirements, and (2) provide information on state policies, plans, and metadata in order to aid in the analysis of data collected

National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) identification number – The 7-character NCES LEA ID number that is used to uniquely identify a school district. These NCES ID numbers are also used to identify LEAs when entering data into the EDEN system.

3.0 Data Quality

OSEP reviews and evaluates the timeliness, completeness, and accuracy of the data submitted by States to meet the reporting requirements under Section 618 of IDEA. OSEP identifies a Section 618 data submission as timely if the State has submitted the required data to the appropriate data submission system (i.e., ESS or EMAPS) on or before the original due date. The due dates for the IDEA Section 618 data are:

- The first Wednesday in the month of November for Part B Personnel, Part B Exiting, Part B Discipline, Part B Dispute Resolution, Part C Exiting, and Part C Dispute Resolution data collections.
- The first Wednesday in the month in April for Part B Child Count, Part B Educational Environments, Part C Child Count, and Part C Settings data collections.
- During the third week in December for Part B Assessment data collection. This due date is aligned with the due date for the assessment data reported by States for the Consolidated State Performance Reports (CSPR).
- The first Wednesday in the month of May for the Part B Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services data collection.

OSEP identifies a Section 618 data submission as complete if the State has submitted data for all applicable fields, file specifications, category sets, subtotals, and grand totals for a specific Section 618 data collection. Additionally, OSEP

evaluates if the data submitted by the State match the information in metadata sources such as the EMAPS State Supplemental Survey-IDEA and the EMAPS Assessment Metadata Survey.

OSEP identifies a Section 618 data submission as accurate if the State has submitted data that meets all the edit checks for the specific data collection. The edit checks for each Section 618 data collection are identified in the Part B Data Edits and Part C Data Edits documents available to States in OMB Max. The majority of these edit checks are incorporated into the business rules in ESS and EMAPS. Specific business rules or edit checks are outlined in the EDfacts Business Rules Guide and the EMAPS user guides on www.ed.gov/edfacts.

OSEP reviews the data notes and explanations States provide in relation to the submission of the Section 618 data to better understand if and how the State is meeting the reporting instructions and requirements for the specific data collection.

In rare occasions, some data may need to be suppressed in the public release file due to data quality issues.3.1

3.1 Coordinated Review

The LEA MOE Reduction & CEIS data was submitted through EMAPS. After the original close date, staff from OSEP's Research To Practice (RTP) Division and OSEP's Monitoring and State Improvement Planning (MSIP) Division conducted a collaborative reviewed of the MOE Reduction & CEIS data submitted by states. The review includes the following areas: timeliness of the data submission, completeness of the data files, and accuracy of the data. Through the coordinated review, the states receive one set of data quality comments or inquiries associated with the MOE Reduction & CEIS data from OSEP. For states that have missing or inaccurate data, there are opportunities to resubmit their data files and have them reviewed prior to being published to the public.

3.2 Data Notes

States and entities have the option to provide additional information to OSEP related to the data quality issues or changes. This information has been compiled and accompanies the data files for data users. Please review the Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services Data Notes document when evaluating any state or entity data.

4.0 File Structure

The following table provides the layout of the MOE Reduction & CEIS file.

Number of Variables: 28

Extraction Date: The date the data was extracted from EMAPS.

Updated: The date of when changes were made to the text, format or template of the file; if no changes have occurred this line will be blank.

Revised: The date of when updates were made to the data; if no changes have occurred this line will be blank.

Created: The date the file was originally posted.

Variable Number	Variable Name	Definition
	Reporting Year	Reference Year
	StateName	State Name
	LEAName	Name of reporting Local Education Agency
	NCESID	National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) identification number
	Year used to make the LEA/ESA/SEA determinations	Which school year's data was used to make the LEA or ESA determinations that apply to whether the LEA or ESA may, based on FFY 2012 funding, reduce MOE during SY 2012-13
(A2A)	Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA FFY 2011 (\$)	Total FFY 2011 allocation of Section 611 funds each LEA or ESA received for FFY 2011 (i.e., funds available on July 1, 2011 and October 1, 2011)
(A2B)	Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 611 of IDEA FFY 2012 (\$)	Total FFY 2012 allocation of Section 611 funds each LEA or ESA received for FFY 2012 (i.e., funds available July 1, 2012 and October 1, 2012)
(A2C)	Increase in LEA/ESA allocations for	Dollar amount increase in the total allocation of Section 611 funds

	Section 611 from FFY 2011 to FFY 2012 (\$)	from FFY 2011 to FFY 2012 for each LEA or ESA. This figure was calculated by subtracting the FFY 2011 dollar amount from the FFY 2012 dollar amount.
(A3A)	Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 619 of IDEA FFY 2011 (\$)	Total FFY 2011 allocation of Section 619 funds each LEA or ESA received for FFY 2011 (i.e., funds available July 1, 2011)
(A3B)	Total LEA/ESA allocation for Section 619 of IDEA FFY 2012 (\$)	Total FFY 2012 allocation of Section 619 funds each LEA or ESA received for FFY 2012 (i.e., funds available July 1, 2012).
(A3C)	Increase in LEA/ESA allocations for Section 619 from FFY 2011 to FFY 2012 (\$)	Dollar amount increase in the total allocation of Section 619 funds from FFY 2011 to FFY 2012 for each LEA or ESA. This figure was calculated by subtracting the FFY 2011 dollar amount from the FFY 2012 dollar amount.
(A4)	Total LEA/ESA allocation for Sections 611 and 619 of IDEA for FFY 2012 (\$)	Sum of the total dollar amounts of Section 611 and 619 allocations from FFY 2012 for each LEA or ESA. This figure was calculated by adding the Section 611 allocation dollar amount to the Section 619 allocation dollar amount.
(A5)	15% of the total LEA/ESA allocation for Sections 611 and 619 of IDEA for FFY 2012	This figure represents 15% of the total (combined) dollar amount of Section 611 and 619 allocations from FFY 2012 for each LEA or ESA. Please see the User Guide for more information on this calculation.
(B2)	Determination under 34 CFR § 300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE during SY 2012-2013	Determination under 34 CFR § 300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able, based on FFY 2012 funding, to reduce MOE during SY 2012-2013. Determinations should be specified as one of the following: meets the requirements and purposes of Part B; needs assistance in implementing the

		requirements of Part B; needs intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B; or needs substantial intervention in implementing the requirements of Part B
(B3)	Reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C) by the LEA/ESA during SY 2012-13 (\$)	Dollar (\$) amount that each LEA or ESA reduced local, or State and local, expenditures under the IDEA MOE provision in IDEA §613(a)(2)(C) during SY 2012-13.
(B4)	Percent of the available reduction taken by LEA /ESA during SY 2012-13 (%)	This figure represents the percent of the available MOE reduction that the LEA or ESA took during SY 2012-13. Please see the User Guide for more information on this calculation.
(C2A)	Required CEIS Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2012-13? (Y/N)	Whether each LEA or ESA was required to use 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2012-13.
C2A.1	Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification as a child with a disability'?	Whether each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CEIS did so because they were identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification as a child with a disability' in SY 2012-13.
C2A.2	Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification by disability category'?	Whether each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CEIS did so because they were identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'identification by disability category' in SY 2012-13.
C2A.3	Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'placement in a particular educational setting'?	whether each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CEIS did so because they were identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'placement in a particular

		educational setting' in SY 2012-13.
C2A.4	Was the LEA/ESA identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'disciplinary action'?	whether each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CEIS did so because they were identified as having significant disproportionality due to 'disciplinary action' in SY 2012-13.
(C2B)	Required CEIS Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA /ESA in SY 2012-13 (\$)	Dollar (\$) amount that was reserved for CEIS in each LEA or ESA that was required to use IDEA funds for CEIS in SY 2012-13
(C2C)	Required CEIS Percent taken for required CEIS in the LEA /ESA in SY 2012-13 (\$)	The figure represents the percent of IDEA funds that the LEA or ESA was required to reserve for CEIS due to significant disproportionality in SY 2012-13. This figure was calculated using the dollar amounts from Column C2B, Column A2B, and Column A3B. Please see the User Guide for more information on this calculation.
(C3A)	Voluntary CEIS Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 fund for CEIS in SY 2012-13? (Y/N)	Whether the LEA or ESA voluntarily used up to 15% of IDEA 611 and 619 funds for CEIS in SY 2012-13
(C3B)	Voluntary CEIS Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS in SY 2012-13 (\$)	Dollar (\$) amount of funds reserved for voluntary CEIS during SY 2012-13
(C3C)	Voluntary CEIS Percent taken for voluntary CEIS during SY 2012-13 (%)	The figure represents the percent of IDEA funds that the LEA or ESA used for voluntary CEIS during SY 2012-13. This figure was calculated using dollar amounts from Column C3B,

		Column A2B, and Column A3B. Please see the User Guide for more information on this calculation.
(D2)	Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA during SY 2012-13	Total number of children who received CEIS under IDEA at any point during the course of the reporting year.
(D3)	Total number of children who received CEIS under the IDEA anytime in the past two school years (including SY 2010-11, SY 2011-12 and SY 2012-13) and received special education and related services in SY 2012-13	Total number of children who received CEIS under IDEA anytime in the past two school years (including SY 2010-11, 2011-12, and SY 2012-13) and received special education and related services in 2012-13.

5.0 Guidance for Using these data-FAQs

What is the primary use of this information?

The survey provides the following information for every LEA or ESA that receives a subgrant under IDEA Section 611 or 619:

- LEA/ESA Allocations which includes the IDEA 611 and 619 allocation amounts for each LEA/ESA in the State for the reference FFY and the previous FFY.
- MOE Reduction which includes the determination under the 34 CFR § 300.600(a)(2) for each LEA/ESA and how much the LEA/ESA reduced of local and/or State funds taken under Section 613(a)(2)(C) for the reference school year.
- Provision of CEIS which includes whether each LEA/ESA was required to reserve funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality during the reference school year and whether each LEA/ESA voluntarily reserved for funds for CEIS. For each LEA/ESA that reserved funds for CEIS (required or voluntary), the dollar amount that was reserved during the reference school year.

- Number of Children Receiving CEIS which includes the number of children who received CEIS during the reference school year and the number of children who received CEIS at any time during the reference school year and the two preceding school years and received special education and related services during the reference school year.

The data collected using this survey is authorized by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Section 618.

These data were previously reported in Table 8, “Report on IDEA Part B Maintenance of Effort Reduction (34 CFR §300.205(a)) and Coordinated Early Intervening Services (34 CFR §300.226).”

The data are also used for monitoring the programs and activities under IDEA and reported by in OSEP’s Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of IDEA.

Are all states required to submit the IDEA Part B MOE Reduction & CEIS Report via EMAPS for FFY 2012/SY 2012-13?

Yes; this data file will include all 50 states plus the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Bureau of Indian Education, outlying areas and freely associated states.

What reporting year will this data collection cover?

The LEA/ESA allocations reported in the IDEA Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Report represent both FFY 2011 and FFY 2012. FFY 2011 includes Section 611 funds available on July 1, 2011 and October 1, 2011 and Section 619 funds available on July 1, 2011. FFY 2012 includes Section 611 funds available on July 1, 2012 and October 1, 2012 and Section 619 funds available on July 1, 2012. The other data elements represent SY 2012-13. The count of children receiving CEIS should cover an entire year.

5.1 Privacy Protections Used

Beginning in August 2012, the US Department of Education established a Disclosure Review Board (DRB) to review proposed data releases by the Department’s principal offices (e.g., OSEP) through a collaborative technical assistance process so that the Department releases as much useful data as possible, while protecting the privacy of individuals and the confidentiality of their data, as required by law.

The DRB worked with OSEP to develop appropriate disclosure avoidance plans for the purposes of the Section 618 data releases that are derived from data protected by The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and IDEA and to help

prevent the unauthorized disclosure of personally identifiable information in OSEP's public IDEA Section 618 data file releases.

The DRB applied the FERPA standard for de-identification to assesses whether a "reasonable person in the school community who does not have personal knowledge of the relevant circumstances" could identify individual students in tables with small size cells (34 CFR §99.3 and §99.31(b)(1)). The "reasonable person" standard was used to determine whether the data have been sufficiently redacted prior to release such that a "reasonable person" (i.e., a hypothetical, rational, prudent, average individual) in the school community would not be able to identify a student with any reasonable certainty. School officials, including teachers, administrators, coaches, and volunteers, are not considered in making the reasonable person determination since they are presumed to have inside knowledge of the relevant circumstances and of the identity of the students.

The DRB has determined that the fiscal data from which data elements associated with allocations, provisions of MOE reduction, and provisions of CEIS are derived are not subject to the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, 5 U.S.C. § 552a, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, 20 U.S.C. § 1232g, or the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1417(c).

DRB has determined that the counts of children related to CEIS from which data elements are derived are "education records" within the meaning of The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U.S.C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) (20 U.S.C. § 1417c; 34 CFR § 300.610 & 34 CFR § 300.611) and are therefore protected by FERPA and IDEA.

Figures associated with LEA/ESA Allocations, MOE Reduction, and Provision of CEIS:

Because these data elements are not protected by any confidentiality or privacy statutes, no privacy protections are required.

CEIS Child Count:

CEIS funds can be used (1) to provide services to individual students, a classroom or multiple classrooms of students, or an entire school; and/or (2) to provide professional development to teachers. In the case of providing professional development, all the students working with that teacher would be counted as "receiving CEIS" (regardless of the students' need for special education or related services or whether they are actually receiving any services).

Because the definition of this data element includes all students of those teachers receiving professional development under CEIS, this child count represents an estimate and may not directly correspond to either the actual number of students who are not currently identified as needing special education or related services, but who need additional academic and behavioral supports to succeed in a general

education environment (i.e., students in need of receiving CEIS services) nor to the number of students in special education in the LEA. Consequently, because of the broad definition and the fact that these data are presented at the LEA level without being disaggregated by any other characteristics (i.e., they are not broken down by race, sex, or type of disability), the DRB has determined that the risk of disclosure is negligible and that no additional privacy protections are required for this data element.

2-year cumulative CEIS and Special Education Child Count:

The definition of this data element includes students with disabilities who received CEIS in the past 2 years and were identified for special education and related services in the current school year. This number could be higher or lower than the count of students with disabilities receiving special education and related services in the district, as reported in the Child Count data, in the current school year. The Child Count data are snapshot counts taken on the state-designated child count date. The total count of students with disabilities receiving special education and related services in the district, as reported in the Child Count data, could be **higher** than this count because there could be students with disabilities receiving special education and related services that did not receive CEIS. The total count of students with disabilities receiving special education and related services in the district, as reported in the Child Count data, could be **lower** than this count because this count is a cumulative count which is collected throughout the school year. Consequently, because this count does not directly correspond to the number of students with disabilities and the fact that these data are presented at the LEA level without being disaggregated by any other characteristics (i.e., they are not broken down by race, sex, or type of disability), the DRB has determined that the risk of disclosure is negligible and that no additional privacy protections are required for this data element.

Appendix A

Warning Messages

States received a warning message when their data submission met any of the following conditions:

Column	Warning Message
A2A A2B A3A A3B	A warning will be written to the final report when column A2A, A2B, A3A, or A3B contain either a zero or 'NA' or 'M'
A5 C2B	A warning will be written to the final report when column A5 (15% of the total LEA/ESA allocation for Sections 611 and 619 for FFY 2012) does not equal column C2B provided (Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA).
B4	A warning shall be written to the final report when the percent available reduction taken by the LEA/ESA (B4) is greater than 100%.
B2	A warning will be written to the final report when 'NA' is the value for column B2 (specify the determination under 34 CFR §300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able
C2A D2	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "Yes" and column D2 (Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA) was zero, M, or NA.
C3A D2	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was "Yes" and column D2 (Total number of children receiving CEIS under the IDEA in the LEA/ESA) was
C2A C3A	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "Yes" and Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for
A5 C3B	A warning will be written to the final report when column A5 (15% of the total LEA/ESA allocation for Sections 611 and 619 for FFY 2012) is less than column C3B (Amount reserved for voluntary
C2A C3A D2	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "No" and Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was "No" and column D2 (total number of children who received CEIS during reference period) is greater than

C2A C2B	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "Yes" and column C2B (Amount reserved for required CEIS in the LEA/ESA)
C3A C3B	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C3A (Did the LEA/ESA voluntarily use up 15% of IDEA 611 or 619 fund for CEIS) was "Yes" and column C3B (Amount reserved for voluntary CEIS) was zero or M
B2 B3	A warning will be written to the final report when column B2 (specify the determination under 34 CFR §300.600(a)(2) that controls whether the LEA may be able to reduce MOE) not equal '1' and column B3 (reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C)) is greater than 0
C2A B3	A warning will be written to the final report when column A2C (increase in LEA/ESA allocations for Section 611 of IDEA) is less than or equal to 0 and column B3 (reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section 613(a)(2)(C)) is greater
C2A B3	A warning will be written to the final report when Column C2A (Was the LEA/ESA required to use 15% of funds for CEIS due to significant disproportionality) was "Yes" and column B3 (reduction of local and/or State funds taken pursuant to Section
All	A warning will be written to the final report when a "M" is reported for any column.

Appendix B

Date of the Last State Level Submission

State	MOE & CEIS
ALABAMA	05/05/2014
ALASKA	05/05/2014
AMERICAN SAMOA	05/06/2014
ARIZONA	08/20/2014
ARKANSAS	04/24/2014
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	-
CALIFORNIA	05/07/2014
COLORADO	05/07/2014
CONNECTICUT	04/11/2014
DELAWARE	05/07/2014
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	05/07/2014
FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA	08/25/2014
FLORIDA	08/21/2014
GEORGIA	05/05/2014
GUAM	05/06/2014
HAWAII	08/21/2014
IDAHO	05/05/2014
ILLINOIS	05/13/2014
INDIANA	05/02/2014
IOWA	05/07/2014
KANSAS	05/01/2014

KENTUCKY	08/06/2014
LOUISIANA	08/29/2014
MAINE	08/06/2014
MARYLAND	04/30/2014
MASSACHUSETTS	05/07/2014
MICHIGAN	05/06/2014
MINNESOTA	08/26/2014
MISSISSIPPI	05/02/2014
MISSOURI	04/23/2014
MONTANA	08/06/2014
NEBRASKA	08/13/2014
NEVADA	05/07/2014
NEW HAMPSHIRE	04/30/2014
NEW JERSEY	05/01/2014
NEW MEXICO	08/29/2014
NEW YORK	04/08/2014
NORTH CAROLINA	05/02/2014
NORTH DAKOTA	04/22/2014
NORTHERN MARIANAS	08/06/2014
OHIO	08/26/2014
OKLAHOMA	05/12/2014
OREGON	04/29/2014
PENNSYLVANIA	08/29/2014
PUERTO RICO	08/25/2014

REPUBLIC OF PALAU	05/05/2014
REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS	08/22/2014
RHODE ISLAND	08/08/2014
SOUTH CAROLINA	05/06/2014
SOUTH DAKOTA	08/22/2014
TENNESSEE	08/04/2014
TEXAS	08/28/2014
UTAH	05/06/2014
VERMONT	04/10/2014
VIRGIN ISLANDS	05/05/2014
VIRGINIA	05/06/2014
WASHINGTON	08/25/2014
WEST VIRGINIA	05/05/2014
WISCONSIN	08/27/2014
WYOMING	05/06/2014

- Data not submitted