

Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies

DISCRETIONARY

\$304
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹

Eliminate the Justice Department’s Office of Community Oriented Policing Services

Created in 1994, COPS promised to put 100,000 new state and local law enforcement officers on America’s streets by 2000. It failed to add 100,000 officers and failed to reduce crime.

In *Federalist* No. 45, James Madison wrote that “[t]he powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the federal government are few and defined. Those which are to remain in the State governments are numerous and indefinite.” When Congress funds the routine, day-to-day operations of local police departments in this manner, it effectively reassigns to the federal government the powers and responsibilities that fall squarely within the expertise, historical control, and constitutional authority of state and local governments. The responsibility to combat ordinary crime at the local level belongs almost wholly, if not exclusively, to state and

local governments. According to former Attorney General Jeff Sessions, during the Obama Administration, the COPS program was also diverted to “expensive wide-ranging investigative assessments” that included attempts to “reform” law enforcement agencies and institute requirements such as “inherent bias” training based on flawed and unproven social science.²

The COPS program has a demonstrated record of poor performance and should be eliminated. The resources provided by the program are spread thin across many law enforcement agencies and are not well targeted toward achieving favorable public safety outcomes. COPS grants also unnecessarily fund functions that are the responsibility of state and local governments.

ADDITIONAL READING

- David B. Muhlhausen, “Byrne JAG and COPS Grant Funding Will Not Stimulate the Economy,” testimony before the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, May 12, 2009.
- David B. Muhlhausen, “Impact Evaluation of COPS Grants in Large Cities,” Heritage Foundation *Center for Data Analysis Report* No. CDA06-03, May 26, 2006.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	Merges with the Office of Justice and cuts all but \$99 million in spending.

DISCRETIONARY

\$1.8
SAVINGS IN BILLIONS³

CJS

Eliminate Grants Within the Justice Department’s Office of Justice Programs

The majority of the programs under the OJP umbrella deal with problems or functions within the jurisdiction of state and local governments. OJP grants are given to state and local governments for many criminal justice purposes, including local police officers’ salaries, state corrections, court programs, and juvenile justice programs.

In addressing criminal activity appropriately, the federal government should limit itself to handling tasks that state and local governments cannot perform by themselves and that the Constitution commits to the federal government. For example, juvenile delinquency is a problem common to all states, but the crimes that delinquents commit

are almost entirely and inherently local in nature and are therefore regulated by state criminal law, state law enforcement, and state courts. The fact that thefts by juveniles occur in all states does not mean that these thefts require action by the federal government.

State and local officials, not the federal government, are responsible for funding the state and local criminal justice system. The OJP subsidizes the routine, day-to-day functions of state and local criminal justice programs. The responsibility to combat ordinary crime at the local level belongs almost wholly, if not exclusively, to state and local governments.

.....

ADDITIONAL READING

- David B. Muhlhausen, “Get Out of Jail Free: Taxpayer-Funded Grants Place Criminals on the Street Without Posting Bail,” Heritage Foundation *WebMemo* No. 3361, September 12, 2011.
- David B. Muhlhausen, “Where the Justice Department Can Find \$2.6 Billion for its Anti-Terrorism Efforts,” Heritage Foundation *Background* No. 1486, October 5, 2001.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	PARTIALLY INCLUDED	Eliminates \$244 million from OJP-administered State Criminal Alien Assistance Program.

DISCRETIONARY

\$498
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS⁴

Eliminate Violence Against Women Act Programs and Grants

VAWA programs, created in 1994, exist principally to mitigate, reduce, or prevent the effects and occurrence of domestic violence. However, grant programs under the VAWA have not undergone nationally representative, scientifically rigorous experimental evaluations of their effectiveness. The U.S. General Accounting (now Government Accountability) Office concluded that previous evaluations of VAWA programs “demonstrated a variety of methodological limitations, raising concerns as to whether the evaluations will produce definitive results.”⁵ In addition, the evaluations were not representative of the types of programs funded nationally by the VAWA.

The services funded by VAWA programs and grants are properly funded and implemented locally. Using federal agencies to fund the routine operations of domestic violence programs that state and local governments could provide is a misuse of federal resources and distracts attention from concerns that *are* the province of the federal government. Moreover, the administrative cost of funneling state resources back to the states through the federal government actually reduces the overall level of available resources.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Paul J. Larkin, Jr., “Send in the Lawyers: The House Passes the Senate’s Violence Against Women Act,” *The Daily Signal*, March 1, 2013.
- David B. Muhlhausen and Christina Villegas, “Violence Against Women Act: Reauthorization Fundamentally Flawed,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 2673, March 29, 2012.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	REJECTED	Maintains funding at FY 2019 levels.

DISCRETIONARY

\$415
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS⁶

CIS

Eliminate the Legal Services Corporation

The LSC was created by the Legal Services Act of 1974 to provide civil legal assistance to indigent clients. It does this by distributing federal grant funds to service areas throughout the United States and its territories in award increments of one to three years; 93 percent of LSC funding is distributed to 133 nonprofit legal aid programs. The annual appropriations legislation specifies the types of activities for which the funds may be used and prohibits the use of funds for such purposes as political activity, advocacy, demonstrations, strikes, class-action lawsuits, and cases involving abortion, partisan redistricting, and welfare reform.

Although LSC grants do help to provide high-quality civil legal assistance to some low-income Americans, the Congressional Budget Office regularly includes LSC funding among its options for decreasing the deficit, observing that many recipient programs already receive resources from state and local governments and private entities. State and local governments, supplemented by donations from other outside sources, are better equipped to address the needs of those in their communities who rely on these free services. Giving local entities sole responsibility for indigent legal defense would allow funds to be targeted in the most efficient manner and remove this burden from the federal deficit.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Congressional Budget Office, *Budget Options: Volume 2*, August 2009.
- Ken Boehm, Chairman, National Legal and Policy Center, “What the Legal Services Corporation Doesn’t Want Congress to Know,” testimony submitted to the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, March 22, 2012.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	

DISCRETIONARY

\$49
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS⁷

Reduce Funding for the Justice Department’s Civil Rights Division

A 2013 report by the Justice Department Inspector General described the Civil Rights Division as having a “dysfunctional management chain” and being torn by “polarization and mistrust.”⁸ The division has undermined election integrity and has filed abusive lawsuits intended to enforce progressive social ideology in areas ranging from public hiring to public education.

At a time when there is less discrimination than ever before in our society, the division is at its largest—far larger than it was in the 1960s when it was fighting crucial civil rights battles. It has far more employees than vigorous enforcement of our civil rights and voting rights laws requires, and its budget can be cut significantly without sacrificing the division’s efficiency and ability to protect the public from discrimination.

ADDITIONAL READING

- J. Christian Adams, *Injustice: Exposing the Racial Agenda of the Obama Justice Department* (Washington: Regnery Publishing, 2011).
- John Fund and Hans von Spakovsky, *Obama’s Enforcer: Eric Holder’s Justice Department* (New York: HarperCollins/Broadside, 2014).

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	REJECTED	Absorbs the Community Relations Service, thereby augmenting the division.

DISCRETIONARY

\$35
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS⁹

CIS

Reduce Funding for the Justice Department’s Environmental and Natural Resources Division

The Justice Department’s ENR Division has suffered an embarrassing string of defeats in the courts because it has taken radical positions on environmental issues far outside the legal mainstream. One federal court of appeals accused ENR Division lawyers of making legal arguments in court that were “so thin as to border on the frivolous.”¹⁰ It has also colluded in “sue and settle” lawsuits with extremist environmental groups that take environmental

lawmaking out of the hands of Congress and put it in the hands of agencies, private interests, and federal judges.

Significantly reducing its budget would encourage the ENR Division to concentrate on its core functions of defending the environmental laws of the United States in a reasonable and common-sense manner.

.....

ADDITIONAL READING

- Paul J. Larkin, Jr., “Justice Department Giving Away the Public’s Money to Third-Party Interests,” Heritage Foundation *Commentary*, March 11, 2015.
- Andrew M. Grossman, “Regulation Through Sham Litigation: The Sue and Settle Phenomenon,” Heritage Foundation *Legal Memorandum* No. 110, February 25, 2014.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	REJECTED	No change is requested.

DISCRETIONARY

\$15.5
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹¹

Eliminate the Justice Department’s Community Relations Service

The CRS budget should be entirely eliminated. Rather than fulfilling its mandate of trying to be the peacemaker in community conflicts, the CRS has raised tensions in local communities. In both the Zimmerman case in Sanford, Florida, and the Wilson case in Ferguson, Missouri, for example, the CRS helped to organize and manage rallies and

protests against George Zimmerman and Darren Wilson. Other employees inside the CRS have cited a culture of incompetence, political decision-making, and gross mismanagement that has led them to send a letter of complaint to the Attorney General of the United States.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Hans von Spakovsky, “Corruption, Incompetence Scandal at DOJ’s Ferguson Unit Widens,” PJ Media, April 18, 2016.
- John Fund and Hans von Spakovsky, *Obama’s Enforcer: Eric Holder’s Justice Department* (New York: HarperCollins/Broadside, 2014).

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	PARTIALLY INCLUDED	Eliminates the Community Relations Service but transfers its functions to the Civil Rights Division.

MANDATORY

(ONE-TIME)

\$12.0
SAVINGS IN BILLIONS¹²

CIS

Rescind Unobligated Balances from the Justice Department’s Crime Victims Fund

The CVF is contained within the Department of Justice and provides money to victims and survivors of crime, provides support services, and seeks to improve response to crime victim’s needs. Annual payments from the fund are capped each year at a level set by Congress.

The CVF carries a large unobligated balance that Congress uses as a budget gimmick for new spending. Congress delays mandatory spending from the fund and then uses the savings to allow for more discretionary spending. In reality, however, the

“savings” were never going to be spent. In the FY 2018 Consolidated Appropriations Act, Congress used phony savings from the CVF to increase unrelated discretionary spending by over \$10 billion.

To stop the abuse of the CVF, Congress should rescind any balances above the obligation limitation, as it did in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, so that unspent funding can go toward deficit reduction instead of being used as a budget gimmick for new spending. This would produce one-time savings of over \$12 billion.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Justin Bogie, “Budget Gimmicks Increase Federal Spending and Mask True Costs of Legislation,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3234, July 26, 2017.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	NOT ADDRESSED	

\$666
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹³

MANDATORY (ONE-TIME)

Rescind Unobligated Balances from the Justice Department’s Asset Forfeiture Fund

The Department of Justice’s Asset Forfeiture Fund is a repository for cash or property forfeited pursuant to a law administered by the Department of Justice. The fund is used to pay expenses of state and local law enforcement agencies associated with forfeitures.

Increasingly, however, the Assets Forfeiture Fund is being used as another tool to increase unrelated discretionary spending. Between the Bipartisan Budget

Acts of 2013 and 2015, over \$1.4 billion was taken from the Asset Forfeiture Fund to pay for unrelated spending increases. In addition to the budget deal, since FY 2015, annual appropriations bills have rescinded several hundred million dollars from the fund each year.

If the Assets Forfeiture Fund has excess funding, it should be used to reduce the deficit, not to pay for other spending.

.....

ADDITIONAL READING

- Justin Bogie, “Budget Gimmicks Increase Federal Spending and Mask True Costs of Legislation,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3234, July 26, 2017.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	NOT ADDRESSED	

DISCRETIONARY

\$140
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁴

CIS

Eliminate the Commerce Department’s Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership

The Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership is a federally funded management consulting operation directed at manufacturers. It is managed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) of the U.S. Department of Commerce. The Hollings Partnership provides subsidies to consultants, manufacturers, and business advisers with the goal of bettering the business practices of small and medium-size businesses.

The government should not be playing a role in the development of business. Federal involvement distorts market outcomes and picks winners and losers among businesses. The Hollings Partnership is nothing more than corporate welfare, and it should be ended.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	

DISCRETIONARY

\$495
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁵

Eliminate the Commerce Department’s International Trade Administration

The ITA serves as a sales department for certain businesses and promotes investment in the U.S., offering taxpayer-funded subsidies for businesses that promote their products overseas. Promoting U.S. exports is also a task carried out by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of State, rendering the ITA’s efforts redundant. The ITA’s protectionist policies, including antidumping and countervailing duty laws, interfere with free trade and drive up costs for both consumers and businesses.

One ITA program is the International Buyer Program (IBP), which “recruits thousands of qualified foreign buyers, sales representatives, and business partners to U.S. trade shows each year, giving your exhibitors excellent opportunities to expand business globally.”¹⁶ Private companies should facilitate their own business meetings or do so through voluntary trade associations, not on the taxpayer’s dime.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Michael Sargent, Romina Boccia, Emily J. Goff, David B. Muhlhausen, and Hans A. von Spakovsky, “Cutting the Commerce, Justice, and Science Spending Bill by \$2.6 Billion: A Starting Point,” Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 4220, May 12, 2014.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	REJECTED	Maintains funding at FY 2019 levels.

DISCRETIONARY

\$265
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁷

CIS

Eliminate the Commerce Department’s Economic Development Administration

The EDA provides taxpayer money and technical assistance to economically distressed areas in the form of “grants” and “investments” for local projects, including the private sector. The EDA uses taxpayer dollars to target local political pet projects with a very narrow benefit—in many cases, just one particular company or small segment of the

population. The EDA is just one of about 180 federal economic development programs, including (among others) the Small Business Administration’s disaster assistance loans and the Department of Agriculture’s rural development programs, that Congress should eliminate.

.....

ADDITIONAL READING

- U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Economic Development Administration: Documentation of Award Selection Decisions Could Be Improved*, GAO-14-131, February 2014.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	

DISCRETIONARY

\$40
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁸

Eliminate the Commerce Department’s Minority Business Development Agency

The MBDA hands out grants and runs federally funded management consulting operations called business centers in over 40 locations. Part of the Department of Commerce, the agency reported that its business centers assisted eligible businesses with 1,108 financings and contracts worth over \$3.9 billion in FY 2011.¹⁹

The MBDA helps businesses identify and respond to federal procurement opportunities and, by targeting certain racial and ethnic groups for special government assistance, is a key component of the federal government’s affirmative action approach. The federal government should not provide special assistance to businesses to procure federal contracts; nor should it target such assistance based on racial or ethnic considerations.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	PARTIALLY INCLUDED	Reforms the agency and reduces funding by nearly 75%.

DISCRETIONARY

\$6.2
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS²⁰

Eliminate Census Bureau Funding for the Annual Supplemental Poverty Measure Report

The Census Bureau’s annual Supplemental Poverty Measure is a relative measure; rather than determining whether a household is poor based on its income, as the official U.S. poverty measure does,

the SPM determines a household’s poverty status by comparing its income to the income of other households. The SPM undergirds a “spread-the-wealth” agenda and should be eliminated.

.....

ADDITIONAL READING

- Rachel Sheffield and Robert Rector, “Obama’s New Poverty Measure ‘Spreads the Wealth,’” *Heritage Foundation Commentary*, November 9, 2011.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	NOT ADDRESSED	

DISCRETIONARY

Eliminate NASA’s Office of STEM Engagement

Formerly known as the NASA Office of Education, the Office of STEM²² Engagement seeks to create opportunities for students and the public to participate in NASA’s work, encourage students to engage in STEM careers through learning experiences with NASA, and strengthen public understanding of NASA’s mission and work.

The activities undertaken by the Office of STEM Engagement duplicate those of other NASA

programs. In 2018, former NASA Acting Director Robert Lightfoot Jr. assured lawmakers that even if the STEM programs were eliminated, the agency’s focus on education would not change and that many educational programs were funded through other offices and would not be affected. Additionally, the overall impact of the Office of STEM Engagement cannot be gauged because there are not enough available data on its effectiveness to serve as a basis for judgment.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	

DISCRETIONARY

\$105
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS²³

CJS

Eliminate NASA’s WFIRST Space Telescope

The Wide Field Infrared Survey Telescope (WFIRST) is a planned NASA observatory designed to conduct research in the areas of dark energy, exoplanets, and astrophysics. The project was approved for development in 2016 and is scheduled to launch in the mid-2020s. It comes on the heels of the James Webb Space Telescope, which after two decades still has not launched and so far has cost taxpayers \$10 billion.

WFIRST has a budget of \$3.2 billion, but that number could soar, and the launch date could be delayed. Given that the Webb telescope has not even launched yet, Congress should redirect these funds to other priorities instead of building another space telescope.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	

DISCRETIONARY

\$273
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS²⁴

Eliminate National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Grants and Education Programs

Congress should eliminate funding for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Grants and Education programs, which cost American taxpayers millions of dollars a year. These grants are awarded on a competitive basis to public school districts and are used to support environmental and climate-related instruction and activities.

Federal grants are often poorly targeted and are not likely to have a significant impact on meaningful oceanic research. Taxpayers should be insulated from costly programs that lack constitutional or practical justification and are easily leveraged for political purposes.

PROPOSAL	STATUS	EXPLANATION
President’s Budget (FY2020)	INCLUDED	

ENDNOTES

1. Estimated savings of \$304 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriated level as specified in H.J.Res. 31, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019, Public Law 116-6, 116th Cong., February 15, 2019, <https://www.congress.gov/116/bills/hjres31/BILLS-116hjres31enr.pdf> (accessed March 23, 2019). Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
2. Alan Neuhauser, "Justice Department Ends COPS Office Review of Police," *U.S. News & World Report*, September 15, 2017, <https://www.usnews.com/news/national-news/articles/2017-09-15/justice-department-ends-cops-office-review-of-local-police> (accessed March 23, 2019).
3. Estimated savings of \$1.77 billion for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriated level as specified in H.J.Res. 31, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020. Savings include \$1.486 billion for State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance and \$287 million for Juvenile Justice Programs.
4. Estimated savings of \$498 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriated level as specified in H.J.Res. 31, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
5. U.S. General Accounting Office, *Justice Impact Evaluations: One Byrne Evaluation Was Rigorous: All Reviewed Violence Against Women Office Evaluations Were Problematic*, GAO-02-309, March 2002, p. 10, <https://www.gao.gov/assets/240/233527.pdf> (accessed March 22, 2019).
6. Estimated savings of \$415 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriated level as specified in H.J.Res. 31, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
7. Estimated savings of \$49 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 DOJ requested level of \$148 million as reported in Table, "U.S. Department of Justice: Summary of Budget Authority by Appropriation," in U.S. Department of Justice, *FY 2019 Budget and Performance Summary, Part Two: Summary Information by Appropriation*, updated March 15, 2018, <https://www.justice.gov/doj/fy-2019-budget-and-performance-summary> (accessed March 23, 2019). Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020. Savings equal a 33 percent reduction in FY 2020 spending.
8. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of the Inspector General, Oversight and Review Division, *A Review of the Operations of the Voting Section of the Civil Rights Division*, March 2013, p. 257, <https://oig.justice.gov/reports/2013/sl303.pdf> (accessed March 23, 2019).
9. Estimated savings of \$35 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 DOJ requested level of \$106 million as reported in Table, "U.S. Department of Justice: Summary of Budget Authority by Appropriation," in U.S. Department of Justice, *FY 2019 Budget and Performance Summary, Part Two: Summary Information by Appropriation*. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020. Savings equal a 33 percent reduction in FY 2020 spending.
10. *Evans v. U.S.*, 694 F.3d 1377, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2012).
11. Estimated savings of \$15.5 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriated level as specified in H.J.Res. 31, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
12. Estimated savings of \$12 billion for FY 2020 come from the DOJ Office of Justice Programs Crime Victims Fund web site, which lists "over \$12 billion" in unobligated money in the fund as of 2018. See U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime, "About OVC: Crime Victims Fund," <https://www.ovc.gov/about/victimsfund.html> (accessed March 23, 2019). All \$12 billion represents one-time savings.
13. Estimated savings of \$666 million represents the estimated FY 2019 unobligated balance as reported in U.S. Department of Justice, Asset Forfeiture Program, *FY 2019 Performance Budget: Congressional Justification*, <https://www.justice.gov/jmd/page/file/1034336/download> (accessed March 23, 2019). All \$666 million represents one-time savings.
14. Estimated savings of \$140 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriated level as specified in H.J.Res. 31, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
15. Estimated savings of \$495 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriated level as specified in H.J.Res. 31, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
16. U.S. Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration, "The International Buyer Program," <https://www.trade.gov/cs/ibp.asp> (accessed March 23, 2019).
17. Estimated savings of \$265 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriated level as specified in H.J.Res. 31, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
18. Estimated savings of \$40 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriated level as specified in H.J.Res. 31, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
19. U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Government Contracting: Federal Efforts to Assist Small Minority Owned Businesses*, GAO-12-873, September 2012, <http://www.gao.gov/assets/650/648985.pdf> (accessed March 23, 2019).
20. Estimated savings of \$6.2 million for FY 2020 are based on the estimated base FY 2019 level of \$62 million as specified in Exhibit 10, "Department of Commerce, U.S. Census Bureau, Current Surveys and Programs—Discretionary BA, Program and Performance: Direct Obligations," in U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau, *U.S. Census Bureau's Budget: Fiscal Year 2019, As Presented to the Congress, February 2018*, p. CEN-19, <https://www2.census.gov/about/budget/FY-2019-Congressional-Budget-Submission.pdf> (accessed March 23, 2019). Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020 and estimate that the annual supplemental poverty measure uses 10 percent of the household survey appropriations.
21. Estimated savings of \$100 million for FY 2020 are based on Office of Management and Budget, *Fiscal 2019 Budget of the United States Government: 2019 Major Savings and Reforms*, p. 91, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/msar-fy2019.pdf> (accessed March 23, 2019). Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 savings remain constant in FY 2020.
22. Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

23. Estimated savings of \$105 million for FY 2020 are based on Office of Management and Budget, *Fiscal 2019 Budget of the United States Government: 2019 Major Savings and Reforms*, p. 92. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 savings remain constant in FY 2020.
24. Estimated savings of \$273 million for FY 2020 are based on Office of Management and Budget, *Fiscal 2019 Budget of the United States Government: 2019 Major Savings and Reforms*, p. 21. Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 savings remain constant in FY 2020.