

Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

Eliminate Nine Climate Programs

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate nine climate-related programs. This proposal saves \$3.566 billion in FY 2018.

RATIONALE

When the Clean Air Act was passed in 1963, Congress never intended or envisioned that carbon dioxide (CO₂), an invisible and odorless gas required for life on earth, would be covered under the law. The economic implications of CO₂ regulation are staggering, and its effect on everyday life could be unprecedented, without offering any measurable environmental benefit. For these reasons, Congress, and not the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) or other federal agencies, should decide whether carbon dioxide should be regulated or considered in environmental permit reviews. Congress should expressly prohibit agency regulation of CO₂ and other so-called greenhouse gases (GHGs), deny funding of agency efforts to reduce GHGs, and repeal any agency actions that serve either directly or indirectly to develop CO₂ regulations, such as the EPA's endangerment finding.

Whether carbon dioxide and other GHG emissions have or have not affected climate, the actual climate data do not indicate that the earth is heading toward catastrophic warming with dire consequences for human health and public welfare. Nor do the data indicate that the dominant driving force

behind climate change is human-induced greenhouse gas emissions. Theories about catastrophic warming fail to account for the major inconsistencies in climate models that underlie regulations. There is no need for the EPA to impose costly and onerous regulations intended to limit Americans' energy use.

Congress should eliminate funding for:

- Regulation of GHG emissions from vehicles (as well as non-road equipment, locomotives, aircraft, and transportation fuels);
- Regulation of CO₂ emissions from power plants, factory boilers, and other stationary sources;
- The Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program;
- The Global Methane Initiative;
- The Climate Resilience Fund;
- The Climate Resilience Evaluation Awareness Tool;
- The Green Infrastructure Program;
- The Climate Ready Water Utilities Initiative; and
- Climate research funding for the Office of Research and Development.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Kevin D. Dayaratna, Nicolas Loris, and David W. Kreutzer, "Consequences of Paris Protocol: Devastating Economic Costs, Essentially Zero Environmental Benefits," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3080, April 13, 2016.
- David W. Kreutzer, Nicolas Loris, Katie Tubb, and Kevin D. Dayaratna, "The State of Climate Science: No Justification for Extreme Policies," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3119, April 22, 2016.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are expressed as budget authority for FY 2018, including the categories of "Science and Technology" (\$775 million) and "Environmental Programs and Management" (\$2.791 billion) according to the Congressional Budget Office's (CBO's) most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections.

Eliminate Funding for Two EPA Research Programs

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate funding for two EPA research programs. This proposal saves \$245 million in FY 2018.

RATIONALE

- The Air, Climate, and Energy research program has repeatedly violated data-quality standards, and has relied on deeply flawed research to craft global warming regulations. This proposal saves \$92 million in FY 2018.
- The Sustainable and Healthy Communities research program does not address environmental priorities, and it is inappropriate for the federal government to control local projects. This proposal saves \$153 million in FY 2017.

ADDITIONAL READING

- The Heritage Foundation, “Eight Principles of the American Conservation Ethic,” 2012.
- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- Nicolas Loris, “EPA Is Desperately in Need of Budget Cuts. Here’s a Few Places to Start,” The Daily Signal, July 10, 2014.

CALCULATIONS

Savings estimates are based on FY 2016 enacted budget authority as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Fiscal Year 2017 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations,” February 2017, pp. 1094 and 1100, <https://www.epa.gov/planandbudget/fy-2017-justification-appropriation-estimates-committee-appropriations> (accessed February 3, 2017). This estimate assumes that the FY 2016 spending levels will hold constant in FY 2017 and will then decrease at the same rate as discretionary spending growth (–0.32 percent) for FY 2018, according to the CBO’s most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections.

Reduce EPA Infrastructure Needs

RECOMMENDATION

Reduce EPA facilities and IT operation needs. Estimated savings are \$49 million in FY 2018.

RATIONALE

Congress should reduce by 10 percent the estimated \$489 million in FY 2018 funding for the EPA's Facilities Infrastructure and Operations (savings of \$49 million). Reductions in agency programs and responsibilities should lower overhead costs.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, "An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- Nicolas D. Loris, "EPA Is Desperately in Need of Budget Cuts. Here's a Few Places to Start," *The Daily Signal*, July 10, 2014.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are based on FY 2016 enacted budget authority as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Fiscal Year 2017 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations," February 2016, pp. 1094–1100, <https://www.epa.gov/planandbudget/fy-2017-justification-appropriation-estimates-committee-appropriations> (accessed December 20, 2016). This estimate assumes that the enacted FY 2016 spending level of \$491 million for Facilities and Infrastructure Operations will hold steady in FY 2017 and decrease at the same rate as discretionary spending growth (–0.32 percent) in FY 2018, according to the CBO's August 2016 baseline spending projections. A 10 percent reduction equals \$49 million in savings for FY 2018.

Eliminate Six Redundant EPA Programs

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate the (1) National Estuary/Coastal Waterways, (2) Integrated Environmental Strategies, (3) Pollution Prevention, (4) Surface Water Protection, (5) Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification, and (6) Waste Minimization and Recycling programs. This proposal saves \$353 million in FY 2018.¹

RATIONALE

Congress should eliminate:

- The National Estuary/Coastal Waterways program. Restoration and protection of estuaries and coastal areas are best managed by states and private property owners, not the federal government. (Saves \$27 million.)
- Integrated Environmental Strategies programs. Promoting “sustainability,” “smart growth,” and similar social engineering is not a proper function of the federal government. (Saves \$11 million.)
- The Pollution Prevention program. This program does not contribute to remediation of existing pollution problems, and engages in activities that are better carried out by the private sector. (Saves \$13 million.)
- The Surface Water Protection program. States, not the federal government, should manage bodies of water that fall within their boundaries (lakes, rivers, streams). State management would increase accountability, transparency, and efficiency. (Saves \$200 million.)
- The Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification program. Government-mandated emissions standards are unnecessary in light of consumer demand for fuel efficiency. The Renewable Fuel Standard unnecessarily increases food and energy prices in order to benefit a small set of special interests. (Saves \$93 million.)
- Waste Minimization and Recycling programs under the EPA-developed Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. These programs do not contribute to actual cleanup of hazardous waste, and instead focus on promoting recycling and other unnecessary activities. (Saves \$9 million.)

ADDITIONAL READING

- The Heritage Foundation, “Eight Principles of the American Conservation Ethic,” 2012.
- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- Nicolas Loris, “EPA Is Desperately in Need of Budget Cuts. Here’s a Few Places to Start,” The Daily Signal, July 10, 2014.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are based on enacted budget authority for FY 2016 as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Fiscal Year 2017 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations,” February 2016, pp. 1093–1102, <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-02/documents/fy17-congressional-justification.pdf> (accessed January 31, 2017). The requested FY 2016 levels were assumed to hold constant in FY 2017 and to decline slightly (–0.32 percent) in FY 2018 in accordance with an overall projected decline in discretionary spending according to the CBO’s most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections.

Reduce Funding for the EPA's Civil Enforcement Program

RECOMMENDATION

Reduce funding for the Civil Enforcement program by 30 percent. This proposal saves \$52 million in FY 2018.

RATIONALE

Congress should reduce the \$174 million in estimated FY 2018 funding for the Civil Enforcement program by 30 percent. The program litigates and settles administrative and civil judicial cases against serious violators of environmental laws. However, the EPA engages in unnecessary and excessive legal actions. Therefore, a reduction in funding should impose an element of discipline to force the agency

to be more careful about inviting legal challenges to regulatory and enforcement activities. The EPA should also be prohibited from using resources to garnish wages without a court order to collect fines or other penalties, and from referring such cases to the Treasury Department for wage garnishment without a court order.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Robert Gordon and Andrew Kloster, "Wage Garnishment Without a Court Order: Not a Good Idea," Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 4275, September 29, 2014.
- John G. Malcolm, "Civil Asset Forfeiture: A System in Need of Reform," Heritage Foundation *Testimony on Legal Issues* before the Oklahoma State Senate, September 28, 2015.
- Diane Katz, "An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are based on the FY 2016 enacted budget authority of \$174 million as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Fiscal Year 2017 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations," February 2016, p. 725. This estimate assumes that the enacted spending level for FY 2016 will hold constant in FY 2017, and decrease at the same rate (-0.32 percent) as discretionary spending growth in FY 2018, according to CBO's most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections. A 30 percent cut in that funding equals \$52 million.

Reduce Funding for the EPA's External Civil Rights Compliance Office/Title VI

RECOMMENDATION

Reduce Funding for the EPA's External Civil Rights Compliance Office (ECRCO)/Title VI. This proposal saves \$5 million in FY 2018.

RATIONALE

Congress should reduce the \$10 million in estimated FY 2018 funding for the Civil Rights/Title VI Compliance Office by 50 percent. The program provides the agency policy direction and guidance

on civil rights and equal opportunity in employment. However, the office also undertakes a variety of other "outreach" and non-essential functions.

ADDITIONAL READING

- The Heritage Foundation, "Eight Principles of the American Conservation Ethic," 2012.
- Diane Katz, "An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- Nicolas Loris, "EPA Is Desperately in Need of Budget Cuts. Here's a Few Places to Start," The Daily Signal, July 10, 2014.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are based on the FY 2016 enacted budget authority of \$10.1 million found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Fiscal Year 2017 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations," February 2016, p. 408, <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-02/documents/fy17-congressional-justification.pdf> (accessed February 3, 2017). This estimate assumes the FY 2016 appropriation will hold steady in FY 2017 and will decrease at the same rate (-0.32 percent) as discretionary spending growth in FY 2018, according to the CBO's most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections.

Reduce the EPA's Legal Advice on Environmental Programs

RECOMMENDATION

Reduce the EPA's legal advice programs by 50 percent. This proposal saves \$25 million in FY 2018.

RATIONALE

Congress should reduce the \$49 million in estimated FY 2018 funding for the EPA's legal advice on environmental programs by 50 percent. This program provides legal representational services, legal counseling, and legal support for all of the EPA's

environmental activities. A significant amount of the agency's regulatory activity is excessive. Therefore, a reduction in funding for legal representation should impose discipline on the agency's regulatory and enforcement activities.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Robert Gordon and Andrew Kloster, "Wage Garnishment Without a Court Order: Not a Good Idea," Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 4275, September 29, 2014.
- John G. Malcolm, "Civil Asset Forfeiture: A System in Need of Reform," Heritage Foundation *Testimony on Legal Issues* before the Oklahoma State Senate, September 28, 2015.
- Diane Katz, "An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are based on the FY 2016 enacted budget authority level of \$49 million as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Fiscal Year 2017 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations," February 2016, p. 414, <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-02/documents/fy17-congressional-justification.pdf> (accessed February 3, 2017). This estimate assumes the FY 2016 spending level will hold steady in FY 2017 and will decrease at the same rate (-0.32 percent) as discretionary spending growth in FY 2018, according to the CBO's most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections. A 50 percent reduction in estimated FY 2018 spending of \$49 million equals \$24.49 million.

Eliminate the EPA's Stratospheric Ozone Multilateral Fund

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate the EPA's Stratospheric Ozone Multilateral Fund. This proposal saves \$9 million in FY 2018.

RATIONALE

Congress should eliminate the estimated \$9 million in FY 2018 funding for the Stratospheric Ozone Multilateral Fund. The fund was created by parties to the 1987 Montreal Protocol to support efforts by developing countries to phase out the use of stratospheric ozone-depleting substances. The current

evidence shows that ozone depletion was an exaggerated threat; no ecosystem or species were ever shown to be seriously harmed by ozone depletion. As it is, the U.S. has long paid a disproportionate share of the funding.

ADDITIONAL READING

- The Heritage Foundation, "Eight Principles of the American Conservation Ethic," 2012.
- Ben Lieberman, "Ozone: The Hole Truth," Heritage Foundation *Commentary*, September 14, 2007.
- Diane Katz, "An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are based on the FY 2016 enacted budget authority of \$8.9 million as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Fiscal Year 2017 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations," February 2016, p. 247, <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-02/documents/fy17-congressional-justification.pdf> (accessed February 3, 2017). This estimate assumes the FY 2016 spending level will hold steady in FY 2017 and will decrease at the same rate (-0.32 percent) as discretionary spending growth in FY 2018, according to the CBO's most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections.

Eliminate the EPA's Information Exchange/Outreach Programs

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate the EPA's information exchange/outreach programs. This proposal saves \$126 million in FY 2018.

RATIONALE

The EPA has allocated taxpayer money to projects that educate and increase awareness of stewardship, children's health, and environmental education (EE) through grants, curricula, and other materials for public education. Grants go to nonprofit groups, schools, and government agencies with the most popular topics being biodiversity, water issues, and general "environmental literacy." EE has also produced controversial classroom material on

global warming that ignores the broader scientific debate about the nature of climate change. Since 1992, the EPA has granted more than \$68.7 million to these programs.² While some of these projects might be worthwhile, they are far beyond the appropriate scope of the federal government. Such projects should be funded at the local level or by private companies.

ADDITIONAL READING

- The Heritage Foundation, "Eight Principles of the American Conservation Ethic," 2012.
- Diane Katz, "An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- Nicolas Loris, "EPA Is Desperately in Need of Budget Cuts. Here's a Few Places to Start," The Daily Signal, July 10, 2014.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are expressed as budget authority and were calculated by using the FY 2016 enacted level of \$126 million as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Fiscal Year 2017: Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations," February 2016, p. 1096, <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-02/documents/fy17-congressional-justification.pdf> (accessed February 3, 2017). This estimate assumes that the requested FY 2016 spending level will hold constant in FY 2017 and will decrease at the same rate (-0.32 percent) as discretionary spending growth in FY 2018, according to the CBO's most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections.

Eliminate the Land and Water Conservation Fund

RECOMMENDATION

Allow the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) to expire permanently. This proposal saves \$20.5 billion in FY 2018.

RATIONALE

Congress enacted the LWCF in 1965, to allow the federal government to use royalties from offshore energy development to purchase private land and turn it into public parks and other public recreation areas. Of the \$38.0 billion credited to the fund, less than half—\$17.5 billion—has been spent, leaving a credit of \$20.5 billion.³ Congress should rescind the remaining balance, generating a one-time savings of \$20.5 billion in FY 2018.

The federal government owns some 640 million acres of land throughout the country—nearly 30 percent of the entire country, and nearly half of the western United States. The LWCF is the primary vehicle for land purchases by the four major federal land-management agencies: (1) the Forest Service

(FS), (2) the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), (3) the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and the (4) National Park Service (NPS). Congress also uses the fund for a matching state grant program, though it has become a minor part of the LWCF, which now chiefly funds federal objectives. This massive amount of federal ownership has resulted in land mismanagement, stifled opportunities for recreation and resource production, and poor environmental management. Rather than placing more decisions under Washington's control, Congress should empower the states and local communities to protect their environments, maximize the value of the land, and create new opportunities for economic development.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Katie Tubb and Nicolas D. Loris, "Five Reasons to Sunset the Land and Water Conservation Fund," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3165, November 16, 2016.

CALCULATIONS

Savings equal the remaining LWCF balance of \$20.5 billion as reported in Carol Hardy Vincent, "Land and Water Conservation Fund: Appropriations for "Other Purposes," September 1, 2016.

Eliminate the National Clean Diesel Campaign

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate the National Clean Diesel Campaign (NCDC), commonly called the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act (DERA) grant program. This proposal saves \$50 million in FY 2018.

RATIONALE

The government has spent hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars over the years to develop more than 60,000 pieces of clean diesel technology, such as “emissions and idle control devices, aerodynamic equipment, engine and vehicle replacements, and alternative fuel options.”⁴ Diesel Emissions Reduction Act grants have been used to pay for new or retrofitted tractors and cherry pickers in Utah, electrified parking spaces at a Delaware truck stop,

a new engine and generators for a 1950s locomotive in Pennsylvania, school buses in San Diego County, and new equipment engines for farmers in the San Joaquin Valley.⁵

Federal taxpayers should not have to pay for projects that should be undertaken by private investors or state and local groups.

ADDITIONAL READING

- The Heritage Foundation, “Eight Principles of the American Conservation Ethic,” 2012.
- Nicolas Loris, “EPA Is Desperately in Need of Budget Cuts. Here’s a Few Places to Start,” The Daily Signal, July 10, 2014
- Katrina Trinko, “Heritage Experts Weigh in on Massive Omnibus Spending Bill,” The Daily Signal, January 13, 2014.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are expressed as budget authority and were calculated by using the FY 2016 enacted level of \$50 million as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Fiscal Year 2017: Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations,” February 2016, p. 860, <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-02/documents/fy17-congressional-justification.pdf> (accessed February 3, 2017). This estimate assumes that the FY 2016 spending level holds constant in FY 2017 and decreases at the same rate as discretionary spending (–0.32 percent) in FY 2018, according to the CBO’s most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections.

Eliminate Environmental Justice Programs

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate all “environmental justice” programs. This proposal saves \$7 million in FY 2018.

RATIONALE

The EPA’s “environmental justice” programs were originally designed to protect low-income communities from environmental harm. However, the EPA now too often goes beyond this purpose to prevent job-creating businesses from developing in low-income communities, thus blocking the very economic opportunity that the communities need.

Further, environmental justice programs have expanded to subsidize state and local projects that federal taxpayers should not be forced to fund. For

example, the Environmental Justice Small Grants Program has funded neighborhood litter cleanups; education on urban gardening, composting, and the negative effects of urban sprawl and automobile dependence; and a pilot program to reach California’s nail salon community in order to increase “knowledge of healthy/green nail salon concepts and practices.”⁶ Congress should eliminate these programs, which have been co-opted by political agendas and do not merit taxpayer resources.

ADDITIONAL READING

- The Heritage Foundation, “Eight Principles of the American Conservation Ethic,” 2012.
- Nicolas Loris, “EPA Is Desperately in Need of Budget Cuts. Here’s a Few Places to Start,” *The Daily Signal*, July 10, 2014.
- James Rust, “‘Environmental Justice’ Injustice (EPA Elitism, Exploitation),” *Master Resource*, August 13, 2014.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are expressed as budget authority and were calculated using the FY 2016 enacted level of \$6.7 million as found on page 1,095 of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Fiscal Year 2017: Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations,” February 2016, p. 1095, <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-02/documents/fy17-congressional-justification.pdf> (accessed February 3, 2017). This estimate assumes that FY 2016 spending holds steady in FY 2017 and decreases at the same rate (–0.32 percent) as discretionary spending for FY 2018, according to the CBO’s most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections.

Eliminate the National Endowment for the Humanities

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate federal funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). This proposal saves \$154 million in FY 2018.⁷

RATIONALE

The NEH was created on September 29, 1965, by President Lyndon Johnson through the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act. The agency is subject to the annual appropriations process, and it is up to Congress to determine if it is worthy of continued funding.

Private individuals and organizations should be able to donate at their own discretion to humanities organizations and programs as they wish; government should not use its coercive power of taxation to compel taxpayers to support cultural organizations and activities.

The NEH received a \$147.9 million appropriation for FY 2017.⁸ The NEH has awarded “more than 63,000 grants totaling \$5.3 billion, and leveraged an additional \$2.5 billion in matching funds.”⁹ These funds dwarf private giving.

Americans gave \$373.3 billion in charitable contributions in 2015, an increase of 4 percent from 2014. Charitable giving as a whole increased 4 percent from 2014, and giving for arts, culture, and the humanities experienced an increase of 6.8 percent from 2014.¹⁰ The NEH is neither a necessary nor proper activity of the federal government.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are expressed as budget authority as projected for FY 2018 in the CBO's most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections.

Eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate federal funding for the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). This proposal saves \$154 million in FY 2018.¹¹

RATIONALE

The NEA was created on September 29, 1965, by President Lyndon Johnson through the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act. Since its founding, the NEA has awarded more than \$5 billion for arts participation.¹² Taxpayer assistance of the arts is neither necessary nor prudent.

The NEA received a \$148 million appropriation in FY 2016.¹³ However, private contributions to the arts and humanities vastly exceed the amount provided by the NEA. Americans made \$373.3 *billion* in charitable contributions in 2015.¹⁴ Arts, culture, and the humanities experienced a substantial increase, receiving 6.8 percent more than the previous year.

Further, federally funded arts programs are susceptible to cultural cronyism, where special interests promoting a social agenda receive government favor to promote their causes.¹⁵ It is just as concerning when art funding promotes politically correct art.

Taxpayers should not be forced to pay for plays, paintings, pageants, and scholarly journals, regardless of the works' attraction or merit. In the words of Citizens Against Government Waste, "actors, artists, and academics are no more deserving of subsidies than their counterparts in other fields; the federal government should refrain from funding all of them."¹⁶

CALCULATIONS

Savings are expressed as budget authority as projected for FY 2018 in the Congressional Budget Office's most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections.

Eliminate Funding for Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate funding for Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. This proposal will save \$12 million in FY 2018.

RATIONALE

The Wilson Center was founded by the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968. The Wilson Center serves as both the official memorial to President Woodrow Wilson and as a non-partisan policy forum. The Wilson Center regularly publishes research about global policy and hosts events to facilitate “open dialogue” about “actionable ideas.”

In FY 2016, the Wilson center received a \$10.5 million appropriation from Congress to carry out the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968.¹⁷

Funding for the Wilson center should be eliminated because it is not the proper role for government to

pay for independent research when there is currently a breadth of organizations that do this with private funding.

Additionally, the Wilson Center has a plan, readily available on its website, for how the organization would continue to be funded without appropriations: “If there is a lapse in Federal funding as a result of failure to pass an appropriation bill, the Wilson Center will not close.”¹⁸ The Wilson Center can operate without federal funds and the federal government should not spend taxpayer dollars supporting an institution that, by its own admission, does not need assistance.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are expressed as budget authority as projected for FY 2018 in the CBO’s most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections.

Rein in the EPA’s Ozone Standard

RECOMMENDATION

Rein in the EPA’s ozone standard. There are no estimated savings included for this proposal.

RATIONALE

The EPA finalized a new ozone standard of 70 parts per billion (ppb) in October 2015. The standard is currently being litigated in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. This drastic action by the EPA is premature. States are just now starting to meet the current 75 ppb standard set in 2008. According to the Congressional Research Service, 123 million people live in areas that have not attained the current standards. In fact, 105 million people live in areas that are still at “nonattainment” for the less-stringent 1997 ozone standard. When nearly 40 percent of the nation’s population lives in areas that have not met the current standard, adopting an even more stringent standard is—at best—premature.¹⁹

The ozone standard has only become more controversial as it becomes increasingly expensive to meet tighter standards with smaller margins of tangible benefits. The EPA is increasingly setting American *economic* policy as it sets *environmental* policy, enjoying nearly unfettered power to set ozone standards and, indirectly, economic activity and land use. This has restricted opportunity, and compliance costs are passed on to Americans, impacting the poor the most. Far from being a question of whether or not to have clean, healthy air, the new standard goes well beyond what Congress intended in the Clean Air Act.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Daren Bakst, “Statement Regarding Proposed Ozone Standards,” testimony before the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, January 29, 2015.
- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.

CALCULATIONS

Although this proposal will almost certainly generate significant savings both for the federal government as well as individuals and businesses, there are no reliable estimates for those savings and thus no specific savings are included here.

Allow Development of Natural Resources

RECOMMENDATION

Allow natural resource development. Although this proposal would likely generate savings, the level of savings depends on a number of unknown factors. We do not include any estimated savings for FY 2018.

RATIONALE

Congress should open all federal waters and all non-wilderness, non-federal-monument lands to exploration and production of America's natural resources. Congress should require the Department of the Interior to conduct lease sales if a commercial interest exists (whether for offshore oil or for offshore wind), and to use its flexibility under its current authority (whether streamlining of red tape or lower royalties) to attract interest to federal lands.

A Heritage Foundation analysis of opening access to oil and gas resources on federal lands would have profoundly positive economic impacts. Modeling shows that by 2035, the average American family would enjoy a total gain of more than \$40,000 in personal income. In terms of aggregate GDP, these gains translate into almost \$3.7 trillion of increased aggregate GDP through 2035.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Nicolas D. Loris, "Free Markets Supply Affordable Energy and a Clean Environment," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 2966, October 31, 2014.
- Kevin D. Dayaratna, David W. Kreutzer, and Nicolas Loris, "Time to Unlock America's Vast Oil and Gas Resources," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3148, September 1, 2016.

Prohibit a Net Increase of Federal Lands

RECOMMENDATION

Prohibit a net increase of federal lands. While this recommendation does not save money, it prevents additional strain on the federal budget.

RATIONALE

The federal estate is massive, consisting of some 640 million acres. The effective footprint is even larger because limitations on federal lands often affect the use of adjacent state and private lands, since government agencies lock up lands through informal designations and study areas. Regulatory pushes threaten to put almost all of the United States under some form of federal jurisdiction. Federal ownership and federal regulation of public

lands restrict economic activity, and, in many instances, have created environmental problems due to mismanaged lands and lack of a proper incentive structure to maintain the properties.²⁰ The Department of Interior estimates a backlog of deferred maintenance totaling \$16.13 billion. Rather than acquiring more lands which the federal government cannot afford or maintain, Congress should prohibit any federal land acquisition.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Katie Tubb and Nicholas D. Loris, "The Federal Lands Freedom Act: Empowering States to Control Their Own Energy Futures," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 2992, February 18, 2015.
- U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Natural Resources, "Federal Footprint Map," 2015.

Eliminate Funding for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

RECOMMENDATION

Eliminate funding for the operations and maintenance, and capital repair and restoration, of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. This will save the \$39 million dollars in FY 2018.²¹

RATIONALE

The Kennedy Center was conceptualized in 1958 as a National Cultural Center. After opening in 1971, it has served as both the National Center for Performing Arts and the federal memorial to President John F. Kennedy.²²

In 2016, Congress appropriated \$21.6 million dollars for the operation and maintenance of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. Lawmakers also appropriated an additional \$14.7 million for capital repair and restoration of the arts center.²³

Even after receiving funds from the federal government, subscriptions for Kennedy Center

performances cost \$120 to \$500.²⁴ Private donations to the arts, culture, and humanities increased by 6.8 percent from 2014 to 2015.²⁵ The Kennedy Center could be funded by these private donations and the robust ticket sales rather than with taxpayer dollars of everyday Americans who may never experience the music and theater for which they are paying.

The federal government does not have a responsibility to provide cultural experiences for citizens. Spending taxpayer dollars to fund performing arts is outside the scope of federal government obligations.

CALCULATIONS

Savings are expressed as budget authority as projected for FY 2018 in the CBO's most recent August 2016 baseline spending projections.

ENDNOTES

1. Totals below may not add due to rounding.
2. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Education: Environmental Education (EE) Grants," <https://www.epa.gov/education/environmental-education-ee-grants> (accessed December 20, 2016).
3. Carol Hardy Vincent, "Land and Water Conservation Fund: Appropriations for "Other Purposes,"" Congressional Research Service, September 1, 2016, <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R44121.pdf> (accessed January 13, 2016).
4. Metropolitan Energy Center, "Clean Cities: Grants & Rebates," <http://www.metroenergy.org/index.php/clean-transportation/transportation-grants/> (accessed November 20, 2015).
5. Environmental Protection Agency, "Clean Diesel: Clean Diesel National Grants, Awarded Grants (2012–2015)," <https://www.epa.gov/cleandiesel/clean-diesel-national-grants> (accessed December 20, 2016).
6. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, "Environmental Justice Small Grants; FY2013 Summaries by Region," September 11, 2013, <http://www.epa.gov/compliance/environmentaljustice/resources/publications/grants/ejsmgrants-recipients-2013.pdf> (accessed December 11, 2014).
7. Congressional Budget Office, "An Update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: 2016 to 2026," August 23, 2016, <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/51908> (accessed February 1, 2017).
8. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, H.R. 2029.
9. National Endowment for the Humanities, *Annual Report 2015*, https://www.neh.gov/files/neh_2015_annual_report_final.pdf (accessed December 4, 2016).
10. Giving USA, "Giving USA: 2015 Was America's Most Generous Year Ever," June 13, 2016, <https://givingusa.org/giving-usa-2016/> (accessed March 7, 2017).
11. Congressional Budget Office, "An Update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: 2016 to 2026."
12. National Endowment for the Arts, *2015 Annual Report*, <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/2015%20Annual%20Report.pdf> (accessed December 4, 2016).
13. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, H.R. 2029.
14. Giving USA, "Giving USA: 2015 Was America's Most Generous Year Ever."
15. "The National Endowment for the Arts Funds Political Propaganda," *The Federalist*, February 23, 2016, <http://thefederalist.com/2016/02/23/the-national-endowment-of-the-arts-funds-political-propaganda/> (accessed December 5, 2016).
16. Citizens Against Government Waste, "Prime Cuts Summary," 2015, <http://cagw.org/sites/default/files/PrimeCuts2015.pdf> (accessed January 11, 2016).
17. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, H.R. 2029.
18. "Plan for Possible Lapse in Federal Appropriations," August, 2015, https://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/wilson_center_plan_for_possible_lapse_in_federal_appropriation_revised_august_2015.pdf (accessed, December 6, 2016).
19. Daren Bakst, "Statement Regarding Proposed Ozone Standards," testimony before the Environmental Protection Agency, January 29, 2015, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/255666438/Bakst-Testimony-Ozone-Standards> (accessed November 17, 2015).
20. Katie Tubb and Nicholas D. Loris, "The Federal Lands Freedom Act: Empowering States to Control Their Own Energy Futures," Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 2992, February 18, 2015, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2015/02/the-federal-lands-freedom-act-empowering-states-to-control-their-own-energy-futures>.
21. Congressional Budget Office, "An Update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: 2016 to 2026."
22. "Kennedy Center Plan for Federal Government Shutdown," September 23, 2013, http://www.kennedy-center.org/legal/130927_fed_govt_shutdown.pdf (accessed December 6, 2016).
23. Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, H.R. 2029.
24. Michael Gaynor, "How to see Hamilton in DC," *The Washingtonian*, July 7 2017, <https://www.washingtonian.com/2016/07/07/hamilton-tickets-kennedy-center-how-to-see-hamilton-in-dc/> (accessed December 7, 2016).
25. Giving USA, "Giving USA: 2015 Was America's Most Generous Year Ever."