

Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies

\$89.5
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹

DISCRETIONARY

Reduce Funding for the EPA’s Atmospheric Protection Program

The EPA’s Research and Technology budget supports science, technology, monitoring, research, contracts and grants, intergovernmental agreements, and purchases of scientific equipment. The science and technology account for the Air Protection Program supports the EPA’s fuel economy and greenhouse gas vehicle emissions standards, which

duplicate the Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification program. The Environmental Program and Management portion of EPA’s budget for the Atmospheric Protection Program should also be reduced to eliminate the ENERGY Star program, which can be maintained effectively as an independent nonprofit organization.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.
- Salim Furth and David W. Kreutzer, “Fuel Economy Standards Are a Costly Mistake,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3096, March 4, 2016, <http://thf-reports.s3.amazonaws.com/2016/BG3096.pdf>.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

\$17
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS²

DISCRETIONARY

Eliminate the EPA’s Radon and Indoor Air Programs

The most pressing indoor air issues relate to asthma, which should be addressed by state public health departments, not by the EPA. Federal bureaucrats hardly possess sufficient information and expertise to impose controls on hundreds, if not thousands, of dissimilar locations across the 50 states. States and individual property owners are better equipped to

customize policies to meet local conditions. A less centralized regime would also mean more direct accountability: Taxpayers could more easily identify the officials responsible for environmental policies, and the people making those regulatory decisions would have to live with the consequences.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

\$94.2
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS³

DISCRETIONARY

Eliminate Federal Vehicle and Fuels Standards and Certification

This program involves a variety of activities to develop, test, implement, and enforce pollution emissions standards. In addition to pollution control, this program administers the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS), fuel economy standards, and greenhouse gas emissions. The RFS is costly, is ineffective, and needlessly interferes in fuel supply. Fuel economy is the statutory responsibility of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Congress ultimately should retire vehicle fuel economy standards and clarify that the Clean Air Act does not cover greenhouse gases. This reduction in spending is contingent on policy reform that eliminates CAFE, RFS, and regulation of greenhouse gases.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.
- Salim Furth and David Kreutzer, “Fuel Economy Standards Are a Costly Mistake,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3096, March 4, 2016, <http://thf-reports.s3.amazonaws.com/2016/BG3096.pdf>.

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | PARTIALLY INCLUDED | Reduces spending. |

INT/ENV

DISCRETIONARY

\$17.1
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS⁴

Reduce Funding for the EPA’s Air and Energy Research Program

The EPA’s Research and Technology budget supports science, technology, monitoring, research, contracts and grants, intergovernmental agreements, and purchases of scientific equipment. The Air and Energy Research program should

be reduced to eliminate climate change research, which duplicates work being done at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. EPA’s research portfolio should be refocused on the EPA’s core missions of air pollution and human health.

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.
- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- Katie Tubb and Nicolas Loris, “Climate Budget Cuts Are Smart Management, Not an Attack on Science,” *The Daily Signal*, May 25, 2017.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

DISCRETIONARY

\$17.6
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS⁵

Reduce Funding for the EPA’s Sustainable and Healthy Communities Research Program

The Sustainable and Healthy Communities research program has expanded beyond the EPA’s core responsibilities. Issues addressed by the program include managing municipal waste, storm water runoff, and trade-offs in community planning for greenspace, schools, and public facilities that are

appropriately addressed at the state and local levels. Activities and funds should be reduced to meeting the needs of federal contaminated sites, toxicology, chemical and pesticide research, and hazardous materials management.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Jack Spencer, ed., *Environmental Conservation: Eight Principles of the American Conservation Ethic*, The Heritage Foundation, 2012.
- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

DISCRETIONARY

\$8.7
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS⁶

Eliminate the EPA’s Stratospheric Ozone Multilateral Fund

The EPA’s Stratospheric Ozone Multilateral 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. Only 45.14 percent of financial pledges were made in 2018 by partnering nations, and the U.S. has long paid a disproportionate share of the funding.⁷

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.
- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- Nicolas D. Loris and Brett D. Schaefer, “The Kigali Amendment Offers Little Benefit to the Climate, Great Cost to the U.S. Economy,” Heritage Foundation, *Backgrounder* No. 3309, April 30, 2018.
- Ben Lieberman, “Ozone: The Hole Truth,” Heritage Foundation *Commentary*, September 14, 2007.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

DISCRETIONARY

\$12.8
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS⁸

Reduce the EPA’s Compliance Monitoring Program

The EPA’s compliance monitoring program manages compliance with environmental laws, regulations, permits, and reporting requirements through inspections, investigations, and monitoring. It is inefficient for both the federal government and states to conduct compliance monitoring. Funding should be reduced to eliminate redundancies with

state and local monitoring in recognition that states are better positioned to detect local violations and determine the infrastructure necessary for monitoring. The compliance monitoring program should focus only on truly national and interstate environmental issues.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Jack Spencer, ed., *Environmental Conservation: Eight Principles of the American Conservation Ethic*, The Heritage Foundation, 2012.
- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

\$7.5
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS⁹

DISCRETIONARY

Eliminate the EPA’s Environmental Justice Programs

Regulatory priorities should be set by states on the basis of risks to human health and the environment, not social factors. The EPA’s “environmental justice” programs were originally designed to protect low-income communities from environmental harm, but the EPA too often goes beyond this purpose to prevent job-creating businesses from developing in low-income communities, thus blocking the economic opportunity that these communities need.

Environmental justice programs also 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 and education on urban gardening, composting, and the negative effects of urban sprawl and automobile dependence. Congress should eliminate these programs.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | PARTIALLY INCLUDED | Reduces spending. |

\$413.6
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁰

DISCRETIONARY

Eliminate the EPA’s Geographic Programs

EPA funds a number of local environmental initiatives: the Chesapeake Bay, the Gulf of Mexico, Lake Champlain, Long Island Sound, Puget Sound, San Francisco Bay, South Florida, the Great Lakes, the U.S.–Mexico border, Lake Pontchartrain Basin, the Northwest Forest Program, and the Southeast New England Coastal Watershed Restoration Program. Coordination, protection, restoration, and enhancement of these regions should be the

responsibility of states, regional partnerships, and the private sector.

Federal funding should be eliminated or reduced to the minimum required by existing legal settlements. States could implement and expand user fees so that the people who are using a resource are the ones that benefit from its maintenance and protection.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

DISCRETIONARY

\$8.7
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹¹

Eliminate the EPA’s Environmental Education Program

The Environmental Education program provides financial, training, and curriculum support to schools, nonprofits, and local governments. Curriculum content should be set by parents and local

school districts. A number of research studies have found that educational products produced by the agency are politicized and fail to emphasize scientific principles.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

DISCRETIONARY

\$1.6
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹²

Eliminate the EPA’s Small Minority Business Assistance Program

The Small Minority Business Assistance program duplicates services available to all small businesses through the Small Business Ombudsman program for advocacy, regulatory analysis, technical and

contracting assistance, and informational services. The EPA should not condition services or reward or deny contracts based on race or gender.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

DISCRETIONARY

\$6.5
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹³

Eliminate the EPA’s Children and Other Sensitive Populations Coordination Program

The Children and Other Sensitive Populations Coordination program assists in regulations, risk assessments, policy implementation, and monitoring with a particular focus on the health of children. This program essentially duplicates work that the

EPA already incorporates into research, risk assessments, and regulation related to at-risk populations as part of its mission to protect human health and the environment.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | PARTIALLY INCLUDED | Reduces spending. |

\$5.5
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁴

DISCRETIONARY

Eliminate the EPA’s Trade and Governance Program

The EPA contributes policy advice to the U.S. Trade Representative “to ensure that agreements have strong environmental provisions.”¹⁵ There is a highly positive correlation between a country’s environmental performance and its economic freedom, of which free trade is a critical component as demonstrated by The Heritage Foundation’s annual *Index of Economic Freedom*. International

environmental objectives should be considered and implemented independently, not as a part of trade negotiations. Too often, countries use poorly substantiated environmental concerns as an excuse to shirk their obligations under the World Trade Organization and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.
- Jack Spencer, ed., *Environmental Conservation: Eight Principles of the American Conservation Ethic*, The Heritage Foundation, 2012.
- Ben Lieberman, “A Free Economy Is a Clean Economy: How Free Markets Improve the Environment,” Chapter 4 in Terry Miller and Kim R. Holmes, *2011 Index of Economic Freedom* (Washington: The Heritage Foundation and Dow Jones & Company, Inc., 2011), pp. 53–60.

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

\$0.3
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁶

DISCRETIONARY

Reduce the EPA’s Civil Rights Program

The Civil Rights Program ensures compliance with civil rights and anti-discrimination laws in EPA employment opportunities, financial and technical assistance, and workforce complaint resolution.

Program funding should be reduced to eliminate state and local-level programs such as the State Empowerment Initiative, which should remain local priorities.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|---|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | PARTIALLY INCLUDED | Reduces spending but maintains state guidance |

DISCRETIONARY

\$9.5
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁷

Eliminate the EPA’s Waste Minimization and Recycling Program

The waste minimization program intends to help companies find ways to improve efficiency and reuse waste products for productive purposes. The free market rewards efficiency without government intervention. Supply, demand, competition, and the powerful incentive for families and businesses to get the biggest bang for their buck all work together to drive down prices, get better performance, and provide greater efficiency.

These programs do not contribute to actual cleanup of hazardous waste; instead, they focus on promoting recycling and other activities that are best dealt with at the state and local levels. EPA’s efforts should focus on its core responsibilities under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act to clean up federal remediation sites.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

\$2
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁸

DISCRETIONARY

Eliminate the EPA’s Beach and Fish Programs

These programs provide information and guidance on the human health risks of local fish consumption and swimming. These are essentially local issues for which states, local governments, and businesses are better equipped to educate the public. In addition,

these programs duplicate work done by the Food and Drug Administration and U.S. Department of Agriculture to inform consumers about sea-food products.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

\$29.3
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS¹⁹

DISCRETIONARY

Reduce the EPA’s Surface Water Protection Program

Funding for the Surface Water Protection program should be reduced to focus only on federal jurisdictional waters. While the federal role in protecting water is important, the Clean Water Act was never envisioned as a tool for the federal government to regulate almost every body of water. The Clean

Water Act is clear that states, not the federal government, are supposed to play the leading role in water regulation. States should manage bodies of water like lakes, rivers, and streams that fall within their boundaries.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Diane Katz, “An Environmental Policy Primer for the Next President,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3079, December 14, 2015.
- “Environmental Protection Agency,” in The Heritage Foundation, *Blueprint for Reform: A Comprehensive Policy Agenda for a New Administration in 2017*, Mandate for Leadership Series, 2016, pp. 94–98.
- Daren Bakst, “Three Key Reforms for Federal Water Policy,” Heritage Foundation, *Issue Brief* No. 4633, November 23, 2016.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | INCLUDED | |

\$21.6
SAVINGS IN BILLIONS²⁰

MANDATORY

(ONE-TIME)

Eliminate the Land and Water Conservation Fund

The LWCF, established by Congress in 1965 and part of the U.S. Department of the Interior, allows the federal government to use royalties from offshore energy development to buy private land and turn it into public parks and other public recreation areas. Of the \$40.0 billion credited to the fund, less than half (\$18.4 billion) has been spent, leaving a credit of \$21.6 billion.²¹ Congress should rescind the remaining balance, generating a one-time savings of \$21.6 billion in FY 2020.

The federal government owns some 640 million acres of land: nearly 30 percent of the 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. Congress also uses the fund for a matching state grant program, although in practice the LWCF has chiefly funded federal objectives. The federal government cannot effectively manage the lands it already owns, and Congress should not enable further land acquisition.

ADDITIONAL READING

- Nicolas D. Loris and Katie Tubb, “Permanent Reauthorization of Land and Water Conservation Fund Opens Door to Permanent Land Grabs,” Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 4934, January 22, 2019.

INT/ENV

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

DISCRETIONARY

\$155
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS²²

Eliminate the National Endowment for the Humanities

The NEH, created on September 29, 1965, by President Lyndon Johnson through the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act, received an appropriation of approximately \$153 million for FY 2018.²³ In its annual report for 2015, the agency reported that it had “awarded more than \$5.6 billion for humanities projects through more than 64,000 grants” during the preceding 50 years.²⁴ Private giving dwarfs these funds.

Charitable donations to the arts, culture, and humanities topped \$19.5 billion in 2017, demonstrating that the humanities are flourishing without federal funding.²⁵ Federal taxpayers should be free to contribute to the humanities in accordance with their own views and of their own volition.

Funding for cultural productions and activities relating to the humanities as carried out by the NEH is outside the proper scope of the federal government.

INT/ENH

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | REJECTED | |

\$155
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS²⁶

DISCRETIONARY

Eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts

The NEA was created on September 29, 1965, by President Lyndon Johnson through the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act. In its annual report for 2015, the NEA reported that it had awarded more than \$5 billion for the arts during the preceding 50 years.²⁷ Taxpayer assistance for the arts is neither necessary nor prudent.

The NEA received an appropriation of approximate \$155 million in FY 2019.²⁸ However, private contributions to the arts and humanities vastly exceed the amount provided by the NEA. Charitable donations to the arts, culture, and humanities topped \$19.5 billion in 2017, demonstrating that the arts are flourishing without federal funding.²⁹ Even that vast amount fails to account for ticket sales, private art purchases, and other ways in which Americans are consuming and supporting the arts.

In addition, federally funded arts programs are susceptible to cultural cronyism whereby special interests promoting a social agenda receive government favor to promote their causes.³⁰

In the words of Citizens Against Government Waste, “[a]ctors, 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.”³¹

Funding for art productions and activities as is carried out by the NEA is outside the proper scope of the federal government.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | REJECTED | |

\$12
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS³²

DISCRETIONARY

Eliminate Funding for the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

The Wilson Center was created by the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 and serves both as the official memorial to President Woodrow Wilson and as a nonpartisan policy forum and independent research institution. The Wilson Center regularly publishes research about global policy and hosts events to facilitate “open dialogue” about “actionable ideas.”³³

In FY 2018, the Wilson Center received a \$12 million appropriation from Congress.³⁴ About one-third of the center’s budget comes from annual appropriations, with the remaining funds provided by private donations. There is a wide range of privately funded organizations that maintain programs that are very similar to the work of the Wilson Center.

The Wilson Center has a plan, readily available on its website, specifying how it 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.”³⁵ The Wilson Center can thus clearly operate without federal funds.

Funding the operations of a general think tank that engages in independent research is outside the proper scope of the federal government.

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------|
| President’s Budget (FY2020) | REJECTED | |

DISCRETIONARY

\$41.3
SAVINGS IN MILLIONS³⁶

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

The Kennedy Center opened in 1971 and serves as the National Center for the Performing Arts and the federal memorial to President John F. Kennedy.³⁷

In FY 2018, Congress appropriated \$40.5 million for the operation, restoration, and maintenance of the Kennedy Center.³⁸ Even assuming that the Kennedy Center is a national treasure, legislators should still ask whether using federal taxpayer money to support the arts, culture, and humanities is appropriate.

Charitable donations to the arts, culture, and humanities topped \$19.5 billion in 2017, and even that large amount does not account for the personal spending of individuals every year on entertainment provided by arts institutions like the Kennedy Center.³⁹

The Kennedy Center should be and can be fully funded by private donations and robust ticket sales. It does not need and should not receive tax dollars paid by Americans, many of whom may never experience the music and theater for which they are paying.

It is not appropriate for the federal government to be subsidizing a performing arts center, nor are these subsidies necessary, as the performing arts are thriving in the Washington, D.C., area—one of the wealthiest regions of the country.

Funding for the performing arts is outside the scope of constitutional federal government obligations.

INT/ENV

| PROPOSAL | STATUS | EXPLANATION |
|-----------------------------|----------|--|
| President's Budget (FY2020) | REJECTED | Maintains funding at \$40 million for FY 2020. |

POLICY RIDERS

Prohibit federal efforts to regulate, either directly or indirectly, nonpoint sources of water pollution. The EPA's efforts to address water quality in the Chesapeake Bay are particularly problematic. The agency is effectively seeking to regulate agricultural runoff and other nonpoint sources of pollution (pollution coming from multiple sources over a wide area, as opposed to pollution from a point source that is specific and identifiable).⁴⁰ There is even concern that the EPA could determine where farming should be allowed.⁴¹ This type of regulatory scheme could very well be used on a national level as well.⁴²

Prohibit retroactive vetoes of Section 404 permits. Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, property owners sometimes have to secure dredge-and-fill permits.⁴³ The EPA has decided that it can retroactively revoke a Section 404 permit that the Army Corps of Engineers has issued, regardless of whether the permit holder is in full compliance with permit conditions.⁴⁴ In a 2013 case, *Mingo Logan Coal Co. v. EPA*, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals held that the EPA could retroactively veto such permits; the EPA's veto was exercised four years after the Corps issued the permit.⁴⁵ Fortunately, on June 26, 2018, the Trump Administration's EPA issued a memo explaining that the agency would prohibit such actions through new regulatory changes.⁴⁶ As of this writing, these new proposed regulations had not been published, but Congress should still use its power of the purse to ensure that retroactive vetoes do not occur.

Rein in the EPA's ozone standard. The Environmental Protection Agency finalized a new ozone standard of 70 parts per billion (ppb) in October 2015. This drastic action was premature. States are just now starting to meet the current 75 ppb standard. According to the Congressional Research Service, as of June 2018, 107 million people (one-third of the U.S. population) lived in "nonattainment areas" that have not met the 75 ppb ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards set by EPA in 2008.⁴⁷ When a third 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.⁴⁸ The ozone standard has grown 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, especially the poor. 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.

Advance the *Environmental Policy Guide*. Written in collaboration with six other organizations, The Heritage Foundation's *Environmental Policy Guide* includes over 100 specific appropriations and legislative recommendations for reforming environmental policy. Topics include the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, National Environmental Policy Act, regulatory process and accountability reform, and toxicology.⁴⁹

Repeal the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS). By requiring fuel blenders to use biofuels regardless of the cost, the RFS has made most Americans worse off by leading to higher food and fuel expenses. The higher costs paid by American families benefit a select group of special interests that produce renewable fuels. Tinkering around the edges will not fix this unworkable policy. Moreover, the federal government should not mandate which type of fuel drivers use in the first place. Congress should repeal the RFS.⁵⁰

Prohibit the regulation of greenhouse gases and withdraw the endangerment finding. The Obama Administration proposed and implemented a series of climate change regulations in an effort to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles, heavy-duty trucks, airplanes, hydraulic fracturing, and new and existing power plants. Since conventional carbon-based fuels provide more than 80 percent of America's energy, these restrictions on the use of abundant, affordable energy sources will only inflict economic pain on households and businesses. They will produce no discernible climate benefit while causing hundreds

of thousands of jobs and trillions of dollars of gross domestic product to be lost.⁵¹ Even though the Trump Administration has taken positive steps to reverse the previous Administration’s climate agenda, Congress should prohibit all federal agencies from regulating greenhouse gas emissions. Congress also should order the Environmental Protection Agency to withdraw its endangerment finding on greenhouse gas emissions, recognizing that greenhouse gas emissions are affecting the climate but that no credible evidence suggests that the Earth is heading toward catastrophic warming.⁵²

Prohibit the use of the social cost of carbon in any cost-benefit analysis or environmental impact statement. The EPA is using three statistical models, known as integrated assessment models, to estimate the value of the social cost of carbon, defined as the economic damage that one ton of carbon dioxide (CO₂) emitted today will cause over the next 300 years. However, these models arbitrarily derive a value for the social cost of carbon. Subjecting the models to reasonable inputs for climate sensitivity and discount rates dramatically lowers the estimated figure for the social cost of carbon. Artificially increasing the estimates boosts the projected benefits of climate-related regulations in agency cost-benefit analyses. By placing a significantly high arbitrary price on a ton of carbon dioxide emitted into the atmosphere, the EPA can inflate the benefits of regulation or inflate the costs of a new project, claiming that the project will emit *X* tons of CO₂ over its lifetime and inflict *Y* damage on the environment.⁵³ Congress should prohibit all federal agencies from using the social cost of carbon for any purpose, especially regulatory rulemaking.

Prohibit the net acquisition of land and shift federal land holdings to states and the private sector. The federal government’s land holdings are greater than the areas of France, Spain, Germany, Poland, Italy, the United Kingdom, Austria, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Belgium combined—almost a third of the U.S. land mass, including Alaska and Hawaii. Only a fraction of this land is composed of national parks. Federal agencies cannot adequately manage these lands and the natural resources on them. Congress should prohibit land acquisitions that result in a net gain in the size of the federal estate. Congress also should dispose of excess Bureau of Land Management lands, shrink the federal estate, and reauthorize the Federal Lands Transaction Facilitation Act, stipulating that funds generated from land sales will address the Department of the Interior’s maintenance backlog.⁵⁴

Repeal or reform the Antiquities Act. National monument designations have stripped economic opportunities from communities. Whether the issue is logging, recreation, conservation, or energy development, these decisions should be made at the local level, not from Washington. For more than a century, the President has had the power to designate land as a national monument unilaterally, without input from Congress or affected states. Although the law states that the President must limit such a designation to the “smallest area compatible with proper care and management of the objects to be protected,” Presidents from both parties have ignored that language. For far too long, monument designations have exceeded their statutory limitations. Congress should recognize what Wyoming recognized in 1943 and what the 81st Congress recognized in 1950: The President should not have the ability to declare national monuments unilaterally and arbitrarily and take economic and environmental decisions away from the states and local organizations. Congress should eliminate the President’s authority to do so, either by repealing the Antiquities Act altogether or by requiring congressional and state approval for any designation.⁵⁵

Prohibit the EPA from abusing cost-benefit analysis to justify costly air regulations (co-benefits abuse). When the EPA issues a rule to reduce emissions of a certain air pollutant, the direct benefits of reducing those emissions should exceed the costs. However, for years, the EPA has found an improper end run around this commonsense requirement. Even when the rule’s stated objective has massive costs and few to no benefits, the EPA points to the “co-benefits” of reducing particulate matter as justification for the rule. This co-benefits abuse has become so egregious that the EPA has issued major rules without even bothering to quantify whether there are benefits associated with their regulatory objectives, instead relying solely or

primarily on particulate matter co-benefits.⁵⁶ Under the Clean Air Act, criteria pollutants such as particulate matter are addressed through their own specific statutory scheme and should not be addressed through other means such as unrelated air regulations developed under other sections of the CAA.⁵⁷

ENDNOTES

1. Savings of \$89.5 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriations reported in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, March 2019, pp. 57 and 159, <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2019-03/documents/fy-2020-congressional-justification-all-tabs.pdf> (accessed March 26, 2019). Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
2. Savings of \$17.0 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriations reported in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, pp. 66, 71, 220, and 225. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
3. Savings of \$94.2 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriations reported in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 60. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
4. Savings of \$17.1 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriations reported in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 1010. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
5. Savings of \$17.6 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriations reported in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 126. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
6. Savings of \$8.74 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 appropriations reported in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 176. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
7. United Nations Environment Programme, Executive Committee of the Multilateral Fund for the Implementation of the Montreal Protocol, *Report of the Eighty-First Meeting of the Executive Committee*, June 22, 2018, <http://www.multilateralfund.org/81/English/1/8158.pdf> (accessed March 26, 2019).
8. Savings of \$12.8 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 annualized spending level as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 182. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
9. Savings of \$7.54 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 annualized spending level as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, pp. 192 and 423. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
10. Savings of \$413.59 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 annualized spending level as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, pp. 197–208 and 259. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
11. Savings of \$8.7 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 annualized spending level as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 230. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
12. Savings of \$1.6 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 annualized spending level as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 242. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
13. Savings of \$6.5 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 annualized spending level as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 227. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
14. Savings of \$5.5 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 annualized spending level as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 257. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 237.
16. Savings of \$0.3 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 annualized spending level as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 272. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
17. Savings of \$9.5 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 annualized spending level as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 338. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
18. Savings of \$2.0 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 annualized spending level as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 365. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
19. Savings of \$29.3 million for FY 2020 are based on the FY 2019 annualized spending level as found in U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *United States Environmental Protection Agency Fiscal Year 2020 Justification of Appropriation Estimates for the Committee on Appropriations*, p. 376. Heritage experts assume that spending for FY 2019 remains constant in FY 2020.
20. Savings of \$21.6 billion for FY 2020 equals the last reported remaining LWCF balance of \$21.6 billion as found in Carol Hardy Vincent, “Land and Water Conservation Fund: Overview, History, and Issues,” Congressional Research Service *Report for Members and Committees of Congress*, August 17, 2018, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL33531.pdf> (accessed March 26, 2019).

21. Ibid.
22. Estimated savings of \$155 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 26, 2019). Heritage experts assume that FY 2019 spending remains constant in FY 2020.
23. H.R. 244, Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017, Public Law 115-31, 115th Cong., May 5, 2017, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/244> (accessed March 26, 2019).
24. National Endowment for the Humanities, *Annual Report 2015*, p. 2, https://www.neh.gov/sites/default/files/inline-files/neh_2015_annual_report_final.pdf (accessed March 26, 2019).
25. Charity Navigator, “Giving Statistics,” https://www.neh.gov/sites/default/files/inline-files/neh_2015_annual_report_final.pdf (accessed March 26, 2019).
26. Savings of \$155 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.
27. National Endowment for the Arts, *2015 Annual Report*, p. 2, <https://www.arts.gov/sites/default/files/2015%20Annual%20Report.pdf> (accessed March 26, 2019).
28. Table 1, “Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: FY2018–FY2019 Appropriations,” in Carol Hardy Vincent, “Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: Overview of FY2019 Appropriations,” Congressional Research Service, updated January 30, 2019, p. 16, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R44934.pdf> (accessed March 26, 2019).
29. Charity Navigator, “Giving Statistics.”
30. Elizabeth Harrington, “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 March 26, 2019).
31. Citizens Against Government Waste, *Prime Cuts Summary*, April 2015, p. 34, <http://cagw.org/sites/default/files/PrimeCuts2015.pdf> (accessed March 26, 2019).
32. Savings of \$12 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.
33. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, “About the Wilson Center,” <https://www.wilsoncenter.org/about-the-wilson-center> (accessed March 27, 2019).
34. Table 1, “Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: FY2018–FY2019 Appropriations,” in Vincent, “Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: Overview of FY2019 Appropriations,” p. 16.
35. Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, “Plan for Federal Funding Hiatus,” revised August 2015, p. 3, https://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/wilson_center_plan_for_possible_lapse_in_federal_appropriation_revised_august_2015.pdf (accessed March 26, 2019). Emphasis in original.
36. Savings of \$41.3 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. Savings include \$24.49 million in operations and maintenance and \$16.800 million in capital repair and restoration.
37. John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, “Kennedy Center Plan for Federal Government Shutdown,” revised September 26, 2013, http://www.kennedy-center.org/legal/130927_fed_govt_shutdown.pdf (accessed March 26, 2019).
38. Table 1, “Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: FY2018–FY2019 Appropriations,” in Vincent, “Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: Overview of FY2019 Appropriations,” p. 16.
39. Charity Navigator, “Giving Statistics.”
40. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Polluted Runoff: Nonpoint Source (NPS) Pollution: Basic Information About Nonpoint Source (NPS) Pollution” last updated August 10, 2018, <http://www.epa.gov/polluted-runoff-nonpoint-source-pollution/what-nonpoint-source> (accessed March 26, 2019); U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, “Water Resources of the United States: Water Basics Glossary,” last modified June 17, 2013, https://water.usgs.gov/water-basics_glossary.html (accessed March 26, 2019).
41. See, for example, H. Sterling Burnett, “Farm Bureau Fights Federal Land Grab in Chesapeake Bay Region,” Heartland Institute, February 11, 2016, <https://www.heartland.org/news-opinion/news/farm-bureau-fights-federal-land-grab-in-chesapeake-bay-region> (accessed March 26, 2019), and Gary Baise, “Counties Attack EPA’s TMDL Regulations,” *Jefferson Policy Journal*, March 2, 2016, <http://www.jeffersonpolicyjournal.com/counties-attack-epas-tmdl-regulations/> (accessed March 26, 2019).
42. To learn more about this federal overreach, see Daren Bakst, “Eliminating and Reducing Regulatory Obstacles in Agriculture,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3135, June 28, 2016, <https://www.heritage.org/government-regulation/report/eliminating-and-reducing-regulatory-obstacles-agriculture>.
43. “Discharge of dredged material” refers to material excavated or dredged from waters of the U.S., and “discharge of fill material” refers to “material placed in waters such that dry land replaces water—or a portion thereof—or the water’s bottom elevation changes.” U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, Office of Compliance, *Managing Your Environmental Responsibilities: A Planning Guide for Construction and Development*, April 2005, p. 25, <https://archive.epa.gov/compliance/resources/publications/assistance/sectors/web/pdf/myerguide.pdf> (accessed March 26, 2019). See also the EPA regulations at 33 U.S. Code §323.2, <http://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/33/323.2> (accessed March 26, 2019). The regulations provide more specific definitions of dredged material, fill material, and discharge of dredged or fill material. The precise definitions of terms such as “fill material” are a matter of controversy. See Claudia Copeland, “Controversies over Redefining ‘Fill Material’ Under the Clean Water Act,” Congressional Research Service *Report for Congress*, August 21, 2013, <http://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL31411.pdf> (accessed March 26, 2019).
44. Robert Gordon and Diane Katz, eds., *Environmental Policy Guide: 167 Recommendations for Environmental Policy Reform*, The Heritage Foundation, 2015, p. 8, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2015/03/environmental-policy-guide>.

45. *Mingo Logan Coal Co. v. EPA*, 714 F.3d 608 (D.C. Cir. 2013), https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=16285162805472090807&q=mingo+logan+coal+v.+epa+714+f.3d+608&hl=en&as_sdt=40000006&as_vis=1 (accessed March 26, 2019).
46. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “Section 404 of the Clean Water Act: Memo: Updating the EPA’s Regulations Implementing Clean Water Act Section 404(c).” Environmental Protection Agency, last updated February 13, 2019, <https://www.epa.gov/cwa-404/memo-updating-epas-regulations-implementing-clean-water-act-section-404c> (accessed March 26, 2019).
47. James E. McCarthy and Kate C. Shouse, “Implementing EPA’s 2015 Ozone Air Quality Standards,” Congressional Research Service *Report for Members and Committees of Congress*, August 16, 2018, <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R43092.pdf> (accessed March 26, 2019).
48. 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 March 26, 2019).
49. Gordon and Katz, eds., *Environmental Policy Guide: 167 Recommendations for Environmental Policy Reform*.
50. Nicolas Loris, “Examining the Renewable Fuel Standard,” testimony before the Subcommittee on the Interior and Subcommittee on Healthcare, Benefits, and Administrative Rules, Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, U.S. House of Representatives, March 17, 2016, <https://www.heritage.org/testimony/examining-the-renewable-fuel-standard>.
51. Nicolas D. Loris, “Four Big Problems with the Obama Administration’s Climate Change Regulations,” Heritage Foundation *Issue Brief* No. 4454, August 14, 2015, http://thf_media.s3.amazonaws.com/2015/pdf/IB4454.pdf.
52. David Kreutzer, Nicolas D. Loris, Katie Tubb, and Kevin Dayaratna, “The State of Climate Science: No Justification for Extreme Policies,” Heritage Foundation *Backgrounder* No. 3119, April 16, 2016, <https://www.heritage.org/environment/report/the-state-climate-science-no-justification-extreme-policies>.
53. Kevin D. Dayaratna, “Methods and Parameters Used to Establish the Social Cost of Carbon,” testimony before the Subcommittee on Environment and Oversight, Committee on Science and Technology, U.S. House of Representatives, February 24, 2017, <https://docs.house.gov/meetings/SY/SY18/20170228/105632/HHRG-115-SY18-Wstate-DayaratnaK-20170228.pdf>.
54. Nicolas Loris, “Transforming the Department of the Interior for the 21st Century,” testimony before the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Committee on Natural Resources, U.S. House of Representatives, December 7, 2017, <http://docs.house.gov/meetings/II/II15/20171207/106700/HHRG-115-II15-Wstate-LorisN-20171207.pdf>.
55. Katie Tubb, “Why Trump’s Upcoming Decision on Federal Lands Matters,” Heritage Foundation *Commentary*, August 28, 2017, <https://www.heritage.org/environment/commentary/why-trumps-upcoming-decision-federal-lands-matters>.
56. Anne E. Smith, *An Evaluation of the PM2.5 Health Benefits Estimates in Regulatory Impact Analyses for Recent Air Regulations*, Final Report Prepared for the Utility Air Regulatory Group, NERA Economic Consulting, December 2011, http://www.nera.com/content/dam/nera/publications/archive2/PUB_RIA_Critique_Final_Report_1211.pdf (accessed March 26, 2019). See also Marlo Lewis, “EPA’s PM2.5 Co-Benefits PR Trick Exposed,” GlobalWarming.org, June 15, 2016, <http://www.globalwarming.org/2016/06/15/epas-pm2-5-co-benefits-pr-trick-exposed-2/> (accessed March 26, 2019).
57. See, for example, C. Boyden Gray, “EPA’s Use of Co-Benefits,” *Engage*, Vol. 16, Issue 2 (July 2015), pp. 31–33, <https://fedsoc-cms-public.s3.amazonaws.com/update/pdf/9JP5LCu5cyJfBZG6qzOBvUfwJu7ILZO3bbePOiNh.pdf> (accessed March 26, 2019), and *Murray Energy v. United States Environmental Protection Agency*, Brief of *Amicus Curiae* Cato Institute in Support of Petitioners, November 25, 2016, <https://www.scribd.com/document/332581815/Murray-Energy-Corp-v-EPA> (accessed March 26, 2019). Other CAA statutory sections arguably preclude consideration of criteria pollutants.