



Sportsmen's Priorities in President Trump's FY18 Budget Proposal

Subject: This document lists the deep agency and program cuts that would most likely impact fish and wildlife habitat, and therefore affect hunting and fishing in America.

Agency Level Cuts:

- The Environmental Protection Agency budget would be cut by 31 percent or \$2.6 billion. The current enacted funding level is \$8 billion.
- The Department of the Interior budget would be cut by 11 percent or \$1.4 billion. The current enacted funding level is \$12.3 billion.
- The Department of Agriculture budget would be cut by 20.5 percent or \$4.6 billion. The current enacted funding level is \$20.8 billion.
- The Department of Commerce budget would be cut by 16 percent or \$1.5 billion. The current enacted funding level is \$9.2 billion.

Specific Program Reductions or Eliminations:

- Department of Agriculture
 - The Natural Resource Conservation Service's (NRCS) Conservation Operations budget would be reduced by \$83 million from FY2017 enacted levels.
 - The budget proposes to cut U.S. Forest Service Land and Water Conservation Fund dollars by \$55 million, from \$63 million to just \$8 million, to shift funding to land management.
 - The budget eliminates the Rural Water and Waste Disposal Program, cutting \$498 million, to focus instead on EPA State Revolving funds.
 - Cuts an additional \$53 million from Rural Development, citing the need for less staff at rural county offices across America's heartland who provide critical services to farmers and ranchers. The staff who would be eliminated are arguably some of the most widely-trusted individuals in government service.
 - The Watershed Operations account under NRCS would be zeroed out, reducing technical and financial assistance for watershed protection and erosion reduction to states, local governments, and Tribes.
 - On a positive note, the budget fully funds wildland fire needs with \$2.5 billion for Wildland Fire Management, including \$1 billion for suppression (100 percent of the 10-year average).
- Department of the Interior
 - The Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act (GOMESA) State payments would be repealed. GOMESA funds long-term coastal restoration projects that protect coastal communities and provides important state match funding for federal conservation projects in GOMESA states.
 - \$31 million cut in funds for the Bureau of Land Management resource protection programs that provide planning, assessing, and monitoring of public land management. The reduction in funds would affect habitat restoration efforts, like sage-grouse conservation.
 - The National Wildlife Refuge Fund would be eliminated from the Fish and Wildlife Service budget.
 - DOI Land and Water Conservation Fund land acquisition funding would be cut by \$129 million. Combined, both DOI and USDA would lose more than \$180 million in funding for the acquisition of high priority public lands, acquisitions that can actually serve to reduce the costs of federal lands management over time.

- Department of Commerce
 - Some programs under the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) would be zeroed out with more than \$262 million in cuts to coastal and marine management, research, and educational grant programs, like the National Estuarine Research Reserve System.
 - NOAA would lose \$27 million in funds for the National Marine Fisheries Service, which manages and conserves marine resources, such as fish stocks.

- Environmental Protection Agency
 - All geographic programs would be eliminated (\$427 million to zero), including the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and the Chesapeake Bay Program, which would bring clean water work in iconic American waters to a complete halt, jeopardizing years of progress and forcing huge new expenditures on to already cash-strapped states.
 - \$482 million reduction in categorical grants, which help states implement and enforce the Clean Water Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act.

- Army Corps of Engineers
 - The agency's budget would be reduced by \$1 billion to a total of \$5 billion, significantly reducing the Army Corps' abilities to provide critical engineering, flood protection, and coastal restoration projects for communities nationwide.