



*Green*

**BUDGET**

**2010**



© Roy Mathis



© iStockphoto/Andrew Parfenov



**GREEN BUDGET**  
**FISCAL YEAR 2010**

DECEMBER 2009



INTRODUCTION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

# GREEN BUDGET

## INTRODUCTION

This report, referred to as the *Green Budget*, highlights the environmental communities' Fiscal Year 2010 National Funding Priorities. The Green Budget, prepared annually by a coalition of national environmental and conservation organizations,<sup>1</sup> illustrates how an infusion of federal money can help meet the environmental challenges of climate change and sustain our nation's lands, waters and other natural resources.

Use this document when developing and considering federal budget and appropriations proposals. This report includes a short background on the benefits and challenges for dozens of important environmental programs. Following each program description is a recommended funding level for Fiscal Year 2010. As stewards of our surroundings we have a responsibility to act now and sufficiently fund the programs that help ensure the water we drink is clean, the air we breathe is pure, and the wild landscapes and wildlife we care about are protected for the enjoyment of countless Americans today and in the future.

***Please note that all funding increases are based on the Fiscal Year 2008 enacted figures. To date, the Fiscal Year 2009 appropriations process remains unfinished.***

ALASKA WILDERNESS LEAGUE - AMERICAN LANDS ALLIANCE - AMERICAN RIVERS  
AUDUBON - CLEAN WATER ACTION - CHESAPEAKE BAY FOUNDATION  
COASTAL STATES ORGANIZATION - CONSERVATION LAW FOUNDATION  
DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE - ENDANGERED SPECIES COALITION  
ENVIRONMENT AMERICA - ENVIRONMENTAL DEFENSE FUND - FRIENDS OF THE EARTH  
LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS - MARINE CONSERVATION BIOLOGY INSTITUTE  
MARINE FISH CONSERVATION NETWORK - NATIONAL PARKS CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION  
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL - NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION  
NATIONAL TRIBAL ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL - NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION  
OCEANA - OCEAN CONSERVANCY - PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY  
SAVE OUR WILD SALMON - THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY - THE WORLD WILDLIFE FUND

---

<sup>1</sup> *The organizations listed on the back cover do not necessarily endorse or have expertise on every recommendation in this report. Please refer to the Program Contacts at the end of this document for more information on a particular program.*

# A CHANGE IS NEEDED

When President-elect Obama takes office in January, he faces the daunting challenges of an unpredictable economy, an outdated and unbalanced energy policy, glaring national infrastructure needs, and a world facing the real threat of unchecked global warming. There is hope that new leadership will present enormous opportunities for progress on all of these issues, including environmental programs too often slashed, marginalized or ignored in the past eight years.

Many of the challenges faced by the U.S. during the Great Depression are similar to those today, including a tumbling stock market and rising unemployment. The solutions to our country's current recession will require economic reforms and the creation of new jobs. Our antiquated energy policies and accelerated global warming add additional challenges. However, they also provide a way out. A sounder, cleaner energy policy that includes a meaningful cap and trade program, will not only generate revenue and produce healthier communities, but will also create millions of well-paying jobs that provide for our people and help get our economy back on track.

In this economic downturn, green energy investments offer governments a prime opportunity to stimulate growth. In a report entitled *Invest in Climate Change 2009: Necessity and Opportunity in Turbulent Times*, Mark Fulton of Deutsche Bank's Asset Management Division says,

"Governments have before them a historic opportunity to 'climate-proof' their economies as they upgrade infrastructure in response to an economic downturn. Encouraging investment in renewable energy is a key focus. Infrastructure stimulus can be tied directly to climate-sensitive sectors such as power grids, water, buildings, and public transport, which present a vast field for the creation of new technologies and jobs."

Solutions must be audacious and beneficial to all. One bold plan, put together by the Center for American Progress (CAP) would create 2 million jobs in the next two years by investing up to \$100 billion (approximately the same amount spent on the April 2008 consumer spending stimulus checks) in public building retrofits, public transportation and freight rail, smart grid systems, expanded renewables, and other public infrastructure. Not only would this plan revolutionize our energy future and jump start our economy, but the investment would pay for itself through lower energy bills in the long term. In fact, just one plank of the CAP proposal – retrofitting public buildings – would cost \$26 billion in the short-term, but would have an average payback period of just five years. The CAP plan, paired with a meaningful cap-and-trade system, would help to address our immediate crisis and help to avoid our next national emergency.

In addition to a visionary new plan, the government must take care of existing programs. The environmental community's priority accounts have been cut drastically in the last eight years. These devastating cuts must now be reversed to provide necessary environmental protections.

## ENERGY

Throughout the 2008 election season, candidates from both parties called for more investments in clean energy. Now that the last ballot has been cast, it is time to put those new spending priorities in place and reverse the staggering declines in funding of the past eight years.

- The **Industrial Technologies Program** has fallen from \$175 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 2001 to just \$64.4 million in FY 2008, despite Department of Energy (DOE) modeling that suggests the Industrial Technologies Program could contribute to a 14.9 percent reduction in energy intensity in these industries between 2003 and 2015.
- Other programs have barely kept up with inflation, much less with the potential for technology growth. The **Wind Energy Program** was appropriated just \$49.5 million in FY 2008 compared to \$40.3 million in FY 2001. Meanwhile, the industry is investing heavily in expanding capacity to scale up facilities and

# A CHANGE IS NEEDED

improve the efficiency of manufacturing. The government must follow suit by increasing funding for wind infrastructure, RD&D for new technologies such as new blades and test facilities, and for offshore wind development that is sensitive to the surrounding natural resources.

- The **Weatherization program** reduces heating bills for the average family by 31 percent and overall energy bills by \$274 per year. During the last 27 years, the Weatherization Assistance program has provided weatherization services to more than 5 million low-income families. Despite being called one of the most successful federal programs in history by the Bush Administration, it was eliminated in the current Administration's FY 2009 request.

## HEALTH, AIR & WATER

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has arguably suffered severe cuts in funding. President Bush's FY 2009 request was just \$7.1 billion for the EPA. When adjusted for inflation, this is a \$1.8 billion DECREASE in the last eight years. Not only is this unacceptable, it is dangerous to our public health and environment. For example:

- The agency's **Enforcement Program** is charged with ensuring that companies are not polluting our waters or air. As Congress works to pass meaningful climate change legislation, our current laws must be enforced, a difficult feat when the account is barely keeping up with inflation. President Bush only asked for \$185.5 million in FY 2009 – only \$13.4 million above FY 2001 when adjusted for inflation.
- The **Clean Water State Revolving Fund (SRF)** funds critical clean water infrastructure across the country and supports at least 400,000 jobs annually. The clean water industry and the Bush Administration have identified a shortfall of at least \$17 billion in recent years. Yet, the fund has been repeatedly cut to levels well below FY 2001. The 111th Congress and the new Administration should not only increase this fund but also prioritize nonstructural projects that reduce non-point source pollution, protect estuaries, prevent contamination of drinking source waters, and reduce polluted runoff by protecting natural areas and other "green infrastructure."
- President-Elect Obama has said that he wants the EPA to get to work on addressing climate change immediately. Rules and regulations will need to be studied, drafted, and finalized. Therefore, it is vital that the **Clean Air Program** receive a significant federal appropriation to jumpstart this process.

## LAND

The Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the U.S. Forest Service have been marginalized to a critical point during the past eight years. Funding for individual programs is very low, and cuts in staff have made it increasingly difficult for the agencies to achieve their mission on the ground. The incoming Obama Administration has a unique opportunity to jump start these critical agencies by providing job opportunities during difficult economic times and addressing the impact of climate change on the landscape. For example:

- The **Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)** creates parks and open space, protects wilderness, wetlands and refuges, preserves wildlife habitat, and enhances recreational opportunities from two complementary programs: a federal program and a state matching grants program. Funded by royalties from offshore drilling, the LWCF is authorized at \$900 million annually, however, the program has been seriously underfunded and reached a low when the President's FY 2006 budget zeroed out the stateside program. The final FY 2006 appropriation was the lowest funding level for LWCF in a decade. From 2001 to 2008, funding for LWCF was cut 75 percent. President-elect Obama has indicated a strong interest in the LWCF, and the 111<sup>th</sup> Congress should fully fund this vital program to help mitigate the effects of global

# A CHANGE IS NEEDED

warming and allow the land management agencies to manage their lands more efficiently, ensuring that recreational and conservation opportunities are available nationwide.

- **The National Landscape Conservation System** is comprised of congressionally and presidentially designated conservation areas managed by the Bureau of Land Management, including National Monuments, National Conservation Areas, National Historic Trails and Wild and Scenic Rivers. The Conservation System was established by the Clinton administration in 2000, but was chronically underfunded by the Bush administration despite numerous statements of support for the System. Since its inception, the Conservation System has consistently received less than 4 percent of BLM's funding, though it contains 10 percent of BLM's lands. With only a modest investment, the new administration has an historic opportunity to restore vision to this outstanding lands system by protecting and restoring our nationally significant scientific and cultural treasures.
- **Wildfire suppression costs are spiraling out of control** and crippling the Forest Service's ability to provide an array of programs and services that Americans expect. The culprit is the antiquated method used to determine the annual suppression budget – a process based on outdated costs. The 111<sup>th</sup> Congress must adopt a 21<sup>st</sup> century approach to solving the suppression crisis by creating a separate source of funding – and one that is based on modern-day economic realities. That new resource would give firefighters the muscle they need to extinguish fires that must be suppressed and terminate the annual need for the Forest Service to raid non-fire budgets to fund suppression costs.

## WILDLIFE

Wildlife conservation programs are a wise investment for our nation. Americans value wildlife and the places they live for many reasons – they are part and parcel of our American character and experience; they are important to our economy; they generate many recreational opportunities; and they are vital to healthy natural systems that provide us with clean air and water, food, medicines and other products we all need to live healthy lives. Our nation also has traditionally realized the importance of working to conserve the astounding array of wildlife and habitat in foreign lands. Yet threats to wildlife and habitat are greater than ever before, with the devastating impacts of climate change now topping the list. At the same time, federal conservation programs that support wildlife conservation, always chronically underfunded, have suffered even greater funding shortfalls over the past eight years.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, our nation's premier wildlife conservation agency, is in danger of failing at programs critical to its mission and being unable to meet its federal obligations for both domestic and international wildlife conservation. The agency has lost approximately 800 staff positions from 2004-2008 and failure to meet fixed costs has led to severe erosion of programs.

- With staffing at 30 percent below the level needed to properly implement the Endangered Species Act and 200 candidates awaiting protection under the Act as of the beginning of 2008, the Endangered Species Program has fallen far behind in listing and recovering species, ensuring compliance with the law, and helping private landowners who wish to take voluntarily actions to conserve listed species.
- Despite the proliferation of criminal activities affecting wildlife domestically and abroad, the number of special agents in the FWS Office of Law Enforcement plunged to a 30-year low in 2008.
- The Migratory Bird Program lacks the resources to develop and implement plans to conserve 139 species of birds deemed in critical conservation need.
- In the face of emerging and intensifying threats to wildlife globally, the meager International Affairs program receives almost no funding to implement most international agreements or treaties.

# A CHANGE IS NEEDED

In addition to the National Wildlife Refuge System with the challenges we have described, our multiple-use federal lands, the Bureau of Land Management and the National Forest System, also are becoming increasingly important to wildlife conservation. About 425 species listed under the Endangered Species Act and an additional 3,250 at-risk species are found on our national forests and grasslands and the diverse habitats managed by BLM support over 3,000 species of wildlife, more than 300 federally proposed or listed species and more than 800 special status species. Yet Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service programs that support wildlife such as Wildlife and Fisheries Habitat Management, Land Management Planning, Inventory and Monitoring, and Challenge Cost Share are faced with dire funding shortfalls. At the same time, BLM wildlife program resources have been diverted to support ever-growing energy development on its lands.

Conservation programs within the Farm Bill are crucial to wildlife conservation on private lands. Because roughly 70 percent of lands in the contiguous U.S. are in private ownership and because more than 65 percent of threatened and endangered species exist on private lands, how farmers, ranchers, and other private landowners manage their lands has a huge impact on the future of wildlife. The 2008 Farm Bill, while providing increased funding for some working lands programs like the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, left traditional conservation programs like the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program funded at the same level as the 2002 Farm Bill. These programs must all be funded at no less than the levels mandated in the 2008 Farm Bill, which are still below the levels needed to meet our nation's many conservation challenges. In addition, funding and staff should be provided to support new tax deductions for private landowners who undertake voluntary measures to recover threatened and endangered species on their property.

Our nation's 2,000 mile border with Mexico encompasses a spectacular array of wildlife and habitats severely impacted in recent years by illegal immigration and related enforcement with little funding forthcoming to address needs such as resource protection, habitat restoration, and monitoring. Most damaging are large scale construction projects including hundreds of miles of border walls and roads deemed not subject to federal environmental laws through a broadly opposed waiver invoked by the Secretary of Homeland Security that necessitate substantial sums of money to mitigate extensive adverse impacts on wildlife and habitat.

Finally, sound scientific information is crucial to proper stewardship of our nation's lands and wildlife, yet biological science programs have also been on the chopping block. The United States Geological Survey's Biological Research Discipline has seen an inflation-adjusted 12 percent decline in funding for Biological Research and Monitoring over the last decade and its Cooperative Research Units have lost one-fifth of their scientist positions since FY 2001. A new National Climate Change and Wildlife Science Center was created by the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress to address the lack of scientific capacity for helping wildlife and habitat adapt to global warming, but it will need significant funding to accomplish its mission.

## CONCLUSION

President-elect Obama and the 111th Congress have a long list of urgent actions to address the deteriorating economy and threats to the environment. Fortunately, our challenges can be addressed with policies that will put the environment and energy future back on the right track. This report is intended to serve as a guide towards achieving further progress. It outlines the most critical needs for many environmental programs and agencies, and provides a recommendation of the funding needed to satisfy those needs. The decisions to provide sufficient funding for our important environmental priorities will have significant implications in improving air quality, cleaning up our water resources, enhancing public health levels, protecting our diverse wildlife, and maintaining our unique landscape. Investments in these priorities now can help to halt and reverse the degradation that is happening to our exceptional wildlife and lands. We owe it to the future generations of Americans to make the necessary investments now to preserve our natural heritage, public health, clean air, and water.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## INTRODUCTION

<b>Green Budget Introduction</b> .....	iii
<b>A Change Is Needed</b> .....	iv
<b>Table of Contents</b> .....	viii

## FEDERAL AGENCY

<b>Army Corps of Engineers</b> .....	1-1
<b>Department of Agriculture</b> .....	2-1
Farm Bill Conservation Programs .....	2-1
Forest Service .....	2-3
<b>Department of Energy</b> .....	3-1
Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy .....	3-1
<b>Department of Homeland Security</b> .....	4-1
Federal Emergency Management Agency .....	4-1
<b>Department of State</b> .....	4-3
International Organizations & Programs (IO&P) .....	4-3
<b>U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)</b> .....	4-5
<b>Department of the Interior</b> .....	5-1
Bureau of Land Management .....	5-1
Bureau of Reclamation .....	5-5
Fish and Wildlife Service .....	5-7
Land and Water Conservation Fund .....	5-16
National Park Service .....	5-18
U.S. Geological Survey .....	5-20
<b>Department of Transportation</b> .....	6-1
Federal Highway Administration .....	6-1
Federal Transit Administration .....	6-2
Federal Railway Administration .....	6-3
<b>Department of Treasury</b> .....	6-4

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Environmental Protection Agency</b> .....	7-1
Science and Technology .....	7-1
Environmental Programs and Management .....	7-2
Superfund.....	7-4
Leaking Underground Storage Tan Program .....	7-5
State and Tribal Assistance Program .....	7-6
Environmental Education.....	7-12
<b>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</b> .....	8-1
National Marine Fisheries Service .....	8-2
National Ocean Service .....	8-7
Office of Education .....	8-11
<b>Department of Labor/HHS</b> .....	9-1
Corporation for National and Community Service .....	9-1
<b>Department of Education</b> .....	9-2
<b>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</b> .....	9-3
 <b><u>ADDITIONAL SECTIONS</u></b>	
<b>Cross Cutting Programs</b> .....	10-1
National Environmental Policy Act .....	10-1
National Strategy to Address Impacts of Global Warming & Ocean Acidification .....	10-5
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation .....	10-6
Borderlands Environment Protection .....	10-7
Wild and Scenic River Management .....	10-8
Coastal Louisiana Restoration .....	10-9
Everglades Ecosystem Restoration .....	10-10
Open Rivers Initiative .....	10-12
Penobscot River Restoration Project .....	10-13
FERC Hydropower Relicensing .....	10-14
Long Island Sound Restoration .....	10-15
Chesapeake Bay Restoration .....	10-16
Lacey Act Amendment .....	10-17
Green Jobs .....	10-18
Great Lakes Ecosystem Restoration Projects .....	10-20

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A: Funding Summary Table** ..... A-1  
**Appendix B: Program Contacts** ..... B-1

# ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

# U.S. ARMY CORPS of ENGINEERS

## **Project Modification for Improvement of the Environment**

The Project Modification for Improvement of the Environment program (Section 1135) allows the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) to restore river systems degraded by existing Corps projects. Under Section 1135, the Corps can modify existing dams and flood control projects to increase habitat for fish and wildlife, and restore areas affected by Corps projects. Non-federal interests must provide for 25 percent of project costs, and modifications must not interfere with a project's original purpose.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Project Modification for Improvement of the Environment - \$25.0 million

*Fully funded at its authorized level but a decrease of \$4.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$29.5 million*

## **Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration**

A more recent addition to the Corps' environmental restoration arsenal is Section 206, the Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration program, established in 1996. Section 206 allows the Corps to undertake small-scale projects to restore aquatic habitat, even in areas not directly harmed by past Corps projects. Projects carried out under this program must improve the quality of the environment, be in the public interest, and be cost-effective. Individual projects may not exceed \$5 million, and non-federal interests must contribute 35 percent of project costs.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration - \$25.0 million

*Fully funded at its authorized level but a decrease of \$4.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$29.5 million*

## **Flood Hazard Mitigation and Riverine Restoration (Challenge 21)**

Escalating flood losses are a national concern. Over the past 25 years, the federal government has spent more than \$140 billion for traditional structural flood control projects and flood damage recovery. Flooded communities are increasingly seeking and implementing non-structural solutions to reduce flooding. In addition to reducing flood losses, non-structural projects help meet many other goals of riverside communities, including improving water quality, increasing opportunities for recreation, and improving and restoring wildlife habitat. Challenge 21, a flood damage reduction program authorized in 1999, is designed to help support non-structural flood control solutions. Challenge 21 allows the Corps to relocate vulnerable homes and businesses in smaller communities, restore floodplain wetlands, increase opportunities for riverside recreation, and improve quality of life in riverside communities. Challenge 21 also authorizes the Corps to work with other federal agencies to help local governments reduce flood damages and conserve, restore, and manage riverine and floodplain resources with local communities providing 35 percent of project costs.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Flood Hazard Mitigation and Riverine Restoration Program - \$500,000

*An increase of \$500,000 over the FY 08 enacted level of \$0*

# U.S. ARMY CORPS of ENGINEERS

## **National Levee Safety Program**

The National Levee Safety Program (NLSP) was established by the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 with two primary requirements: form a Committee on Levee Safety to develop recommendations and an implementation plan for a National Levee Safety Program, and inventory and inspect federal and non-federal levees across the nation. There are thousands of miles of levees across the U.S. that were constructed and are maintained in a haphazard way by all levels of government and private entities. Millions of people live and work in the flood risk areas behind these levees and have the right to know the condition of the structures they rely on. The Corps has been gathering data on the levees under its jurisdiction but significant work remains to be done for the NLSP to adequately protect communities.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Levee Safety Program - \$20.0 million

*A new program that would increase the overall Army Corps of Engineers budget by \$20.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level*

## **Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Recovery Project: IA, NE, KS & MO**

The Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Recovery Project is the primary habitat restoration program for the lower Missouri River between Sioux City and St. Louis. Congress established it in 1986, primarily to help reverse the long-term impact on habitat due to the federally sponsored channelization and stabilization projects of the Pick-Sloan era. Supporting the Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Recovery Project will help reverse the decline of river wildlife by restoring historic chutes, side channels, wetlands, backwaters, and other habitat that fish and wildlife need to survive.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Recovery Project - \$85.0 million

*An increase of \$35.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$50.0 million*

## **Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program (NESP)**

The Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program is a long term plan to balance navigation needs and ecological restoration in the Upper Mississippi River System. It will tackle many of the cumulative environmental impacts incurred from operating the river as a navigation system. The Corps will have a wide range of options from flood plain restoration and dam removal to land acquisition through easements to accomplish its restoration goals. Projects developed under this program will undergo independent analysis and will be monitored to assure that project goals are met and taxpayer dollars are used wisely. The NESP was authorized as part of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 and works in concert with the Upper Mississippi River and Illinois Waterway System.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program - \$50.0 million of which \$10.4 million is for monitoring

*A new program that would increase the overall Army Corps of Engineers budget by \$50.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level*

# U.S. ARMY CORPS of ENGINEERS

## **Upper Mississippi Environmental Management Program: IL, IA, MN, MO, & WI**

More than half of the fish and wildlife habitat created by the Mississippi River's backwaters and side channels could be lost by 2035 if the management of the river does not improve. This would lead to a catastrophic collapse of the nation's most productive and diverse inland fishery. Loss of river habitat also threatens a \$1.2 billion river-recreation industry, which supports 18,000 jobs. The Upper Mississippi River Environmental Management Program (EMP), the primary habitat restoration and monitoring program on the Upper Mississippi, has a goal of restoring more than 97,000 acres of habitat. The Army Corps reports that EMP has restored or created 28,000 acres of habitat.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Environmental Management Program - \$20.0 million

An increase of \$3.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$16.8 million

## **Lower Mississippi River Resource Assessment**

For more than 10 years, the states along the lower Mississippi River have joined together through the Lower Mississippi River Conservation Committee to work toward cooperative management of the lower Mississippi River. The Lower Mississippi River Resource Assessment (LMRRA) was authorized by Congress in section 402 of the Water Resources Development Act of 2000.

Conducting the Lower Mississippi River Resource Assessment is the first step in consolidating all information about the current status of aquatic habitat in the 954-mile-long Lower Mississippi River into one region-wide assessment. It would cover specific habitat development/enhancement opportunities to restore the river ecosystem, and recreational needs. This stretch of the river has pumped more than \$50 billion cumulatively into the annual economies of Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee through river-related tourism and wildlife-associated recreation.

The LMRRA could greatly aid the Corps' congressionally mandated environmental mission in the lower Mississippi River alluvial valley, and the Department of the Interior's missions related to management of fisheries, national wildlife refuges and parks, migratory birds, and endangered species.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Lower Mississippi River Resource Assessment - \$1.5 million

An increase of \$1.25 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$250,000

## **Lower Columbia River Ecosystem Restoration OR & WA**

Coastal estuaries in the Pacific Northwest play a vital role in supporting healthy stocks of wild salmon, steelhead trout and other species while improving the quality of life of countless communities. They provide critical habitat for other fish and wildlife, offer abundant recreational opportunities, and improve water quality by filtering out toxic contaminants, sediments, and other pollutants. The Northwest Coastal Estuary Program, run by the Corps, is a stakeholder driven program that offers a great opportunity to enhance fish and wildlife habitat on the Lower Columbia River and Tillamook Bay. The program is designed to restore more than 16,000 acres of critical fish and wildlife habitat, augment existing monitoring efforts, and help citizens protect

# U.S. ARMY CORPS of ENGINEERS

and manage resources by bringing together local governments, state and federal agencies, environmental groups, ports, and citizens.

## **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Lower Columbia River Ecosystem Restoration - \$1.7 million

*Same as the FY 08 enacted level*

## **Individual Dam Removal River Restoration Projects**

Over the past 110 years, the United States has led the world in dam building for a variety of uses, including hydropower, irrigation, flood control and water storage. While they can provide benefits to society, numerous dams have outlived their intended purpose and no longer make sense. Many are old, unsafe, and threaten river ecosystems. Individual dam removal projects initiated by the Corps need federal appropriations to move forward. These projects will restore natural river functions and restore access to migratory fish habitat, and provide economic benefits to neighboring communities. Each of these projects has been endorsed by a wide range of stakeholders and approved for federal action.

## **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Matilija Dam Removal - \$1.0 million for construction

*An increase of \$0.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$0.8 million*

Rindge Dam Removal - \$595,000

*An increase of \$440,000 over the FY 08 enacted level of \$155,000*

## **Rio Grande Environmental Management Program**

The Rio Grande River Basin and its tributaries provide key environmental services including flood control, clean drinking water, reduction in fire risk, and wildlife species habitat. A healthy and functioning river ecosystem helps sustain the economy and quality of life for millions of people living in the southwest US, provides improved recreational opportunities, and supports local and regional tourism.

The Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-114), enacted in November 2007, authorized the development of a Rio Grande Environmental Management Plan (RGEMP referred to Section 5056). Under this law, the Army Corps is required to create a program for 1) the planning, construction, and evaluation of measures for fish and wildlife habitat rehabilitation and enhancement and for 2) long-term monitoring, computerized data inventory and analysis, applied research, and adaptive management within the Rio Grande River Basin. The Act authorizes an appropriation of \$15 million to carry out this effort for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2011 but has never been funded.

## **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Rio Grand Environmental Management Program - \$15.0 million

*A new program that would increase the overall Army Corps of Engineers budget by \$15.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level*

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FARM BILL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

### Natural Resources Conservation Service

In the summer of 2008 Congress reauthorized the Farm Bill, calling it the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008. There are several small changes that affect how some of the private lands programs are implemented by the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Finding adequate funds for the Conservation Title proved to be a real challenge for Congress. The new Farm Bill authorizes \$7.9 billion in new conservation spending. The funds predominately go to working lands programs like the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) and leave the traditional conservation programs like the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP) funded at the same level as the 2002 Farm Bill. The Farm Bill also created a new program authorized at \$438 million over 5 years in new resources to protect and restore the Chesapeake Bay Region. The FY 2010 budget should fully fund these programs at their newly-authorized amounts in order to maximize the conservation benefits they are able to offer to the private land owner.

The conservation programs within the Farm Bill are more important than ever given longstanding backlogs of qualified applicants for these programs, increased pressure on farmland from the biofuels boom, sprawling development, and the ongoing problems of wildlife habitat decline and water quality. The Farm Bill conservation programs include: the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP), which provides farmers with cost-share assistance and easements to restore wetlands that have been degraded by agriculture; the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP), which provides assistance to producers to improve and protect wildlife habitat; the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), which provides incentives to producers to help address a wide range of natural resource issues and to comply with environmental laws; the Conservation Security Program (CSP), which provides income support to producers who implement and maintain stewardship practices on their working lands; the Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP), which offers farmers payments for easements to keep their land in agricultural usage; the Grasslands Reserve Program (GRP), intended to restore and protect up to 2 million acres of grasslands focusing on grazing lands, grasslands threatened with conversion, and native prairie; and the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), which provides farmers with incentives to restore and protect highly erodible farmland, farmed wetlands, and riparian buffers.

### FY 10 Recommendation:

Fully fund all of the Farm Bill conservation programs at the funding levels mandated in the 2008 Farm Bill.

Agriculture Management Assistance Program - \$20 million  
Conservation Reserve Program - 32 million acres  
Conservation Security Program - \$895 million  
Environmental Quality Incentives Program - \$1.45 billion  
Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program - \$150 million  
Grasslands Reserve Program - 305,000 acres  
Ground and Surface Water Conservation Program - \$60 million  
Wetlands Reserve Program - 300,000 acres  
Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program - \$85 million  
Chesapeake Bay Region Watershed Program - \$43 million

**TOTAL: \$4.733 billion**

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FARM BILL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

### **Access to Local Foods and School Gardens**

The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act (PL 108-625, Title I, Section 122) authorizes a grant program for schools to receive grants of up to \$100,000 to cover start-up costs for a farm-to-cafeteria project. These competitive, one-time grants will allow schools to purchase adequate equipment to store and prepare fresh foods, develop vendor relationships with nearby farmers, plan seasonal menus and promotional materials, start a school garden, and develop hands-on nutrition education demonstrating the importance of nutrition and agriculture. Use of local produce in school meals and educational activities provide a new direct market for farmers in the area and mitigate environmental impacts of transporting food long distances. At the same time, the program helps children understand where their food comes from and how their food choices impact their bodies, the environment, and their communities at large.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Access to Local Foods and School Gardens - \$10.0 million

*An increase of \$10.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$0*

### **Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education**

The Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) program (authorized in USC Title 7, Chapter 88, Subchapter I) is the flagship research and education program for sustainable agriculture administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service. SARE is a competitive grant program providing grants to researchers, agricultural educators, farmers, ranchers, and students in the United States. Education grants range from \$30,000 to \$150,000 and fund projects that usually involve scientists, producers, and others in an interdisciplinary approach. SARE's strength is based on unique features of cost-effective and equitable regional administration, combined with strong farmer participation, practical and outcome-oriented research results, and top-rated public outreach.

SARE's Professional Development Program (PDP) grants provide information and training on sustainable systems to a wide array of USDA personnel, extension agents, and others who provide technical assistance to farmers and ranchers. PDP provides sustainable agriculture education and outreach strategies for Cooperative Extension agents, Natural Resources Conservation Service staff, and other agricultural educators who work directly with farmers and ranchers. PDP funds have been used for both state-specific planning and competitive grants for learning opportunities.

SARE and its PDP program received a total appropriation of \$19 million in FY 2008. Increasing this amount to \$25 million will allow funds to be used for an authorized federal-state matching grants program that would integrate campus education with the research and extension work currently underway.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education - \$25.0 million

*An increase of \$6.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$19.0 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

### **USDA Forest Service Introduction**

Federal fire suppression costs have increased significantly in recent years, exceeding \$1 billion every year since 2000, and to an all-time high in FY 2008. This increase is due to a number of factors, including explosive population growth in the wildland-urban interface, fuels build-up resulting from decades of fire suppression, and changing climate patterns, which together promise longer fire seasons. Today, wildland fire (the biggest portion of which is suppression) now accounts for close to 50 percent of the budget. These increased fire suppression costs are overwhelming the agencies' other mission areas and experts are predicting that a changing climate will only increase the length of the fire season. As suppression activities continue to increase, so does suppression funding since it is based on a rolling average for the previous 10 years. Because the agencies' budgets are essentially flat year to year, the ability to offset increased funding for critical programs has been significantly reduced. The result is a diminishing capacity to deliver core agency duties and programs, which, additionally, is harmful to long-term prospects for reducing wildfire costs.

Appropriated dollars for suppression have fallen far short in recent years. To make up the difference, the Forest Service has depended on Congress to provide additional emergency funding through supplemental appropriations and has had to transfer money from other programs, often those very programs – like community assistance – that represent the best hope of bringing down the costs associated with wildland fire. Recognizing that past borrowing from other agency programs for wildland fire suppression caused project cancellations, strained relationships with partners, and disruptions in management, Congress has provided funding for a suppression reserve account for both the Forest Service (FS) and the Department of the Interior. While this account has helped stave off large transfers from other agency programs, a long-term solution to dealing with this problem is needed.

As a first step in addressing this problem, Congress must fix the suppression funding structure. A new suppression funding structure should include the creation of a separate emergency fund for unanticipated large fire events from the already constrained federal wildland firefighting budgets so the necessary funds are freed up to be invested into the goals of the National Fire Plan and the 10-Year Comprehensive Strategy. This fund must be closely tied to appropriate sideboards and cost containment controls.

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

### **Forest Inventory and Analysis Program (including Carbon Accounting and Research)**

Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) surveys conducted by the Forest Service provide the only consistent nationwide data on the state of U.S. forests. Climate change will increase both stresses on our forests and demands to manage them for carbon sequestration, biomass fuels and other outputs. Timely, complete, and accurate information about the state of our nation's forests, both private and public, is critically important. The FIA program must receive adequate funding to support the frequent re-sampling (ideally 20 percent of plots each year nationwide) necessary to track changes in forest health due to climate stresses and changes in management, and to increase sampling of soil carbon. As the U.S. moves toward binding commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, it is critical that we make realistic assumptions about how our forests can contribute to offsetting other sources. The USDA's Carbon Accounting and Research program, recently transferred to FIA, needs adequate funding to develop a complete and accurate nation-wide monitoring system for terrestrial carbon. Inconsistency of land use and land cover data among agencies is a major source of uncertainty about terrestrial carbon stores and changes over time. The USDA should also be charged with coordinating land use and land cover data collected by all federal agencies.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Forest Inventory and Analysis Program - \$77.9 million (\$8.0 million for field inventory; \$5.0 million for climate – specific research including \$2.0 million for carbon accounting and research, \$0.5 million for coordinating land cover data among federal agencies and \$2.5 million for soil sampling to better monitor soil carbon reserves and climate impacts on forest soils.)

*An increase of \$13.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$64.9 million*

### **Forest & Rangeland Research**

*Global Change Research Program* - Forest Service research is critical to helping forest managers understand the likely impacts of climate change on forests, how forests can contribute to mitigating changes, and what adaptive management strategies might help forests survive increasing stresses. In order for forest management strategies to be truly effective in mitigating climate change, we need better information about the full life-cycle impacts of specific management choices, including more complete understanding of net carbon storage in wood products, non-carbon dioxide effects, and the effects of albedo and transpiration on warming. General information about predicted climate changes need to be scaled down to project the impacts on forest composition, productivity, and disturbance and carbon stocks for specific regions and forest types, and management options must that integrate adaptation with mitigation must be provided. A better understanding of the social drivers of land-use change and land management choices is critical to the maintenance and increase of forest carbon stores by “keeping forests as forests.” RPA reports should include an analysis of biofuels, carbon storage, carbon offsets, and projections of commodity supply and demand, to provide decision-makers with information about future carbon sequestration potential.

*Fish and Wildlife Research and Development* - To support science-based planning, to add legitimacy to decision-making, and to enhance the application of policy-relevant information and knowledge to critical complex issue areas such as climate change and biodiversity management, it is necessary to make strategic investments in Forest Service Research and Development (R&D) personnel and programs. The Fish and Wildlife R&D program develops usable knowledge and tools to support science-based fish and wildlife management of National Forest System lands. With sufficient capacity, the Fish and Wildlife R&D program can provide on-the-ground forest managers with decision-support tools that enable effective and efficient fish and wildlife management, including state-of-the-art conservation, monitoring, and adaptive-management planning tools. Fish and Wildlife R&D plays a critical role in transferring information and tools from emerging areas of research; for example, FS R&D can

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

provide managers with policy-relevant information concerning the relationship between ecosystem and species-levels of diversity for forest planning purposes. Forest Service managers desperately need these tools to effectively respond to the significant management challenges presented by climate change.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Forest & Rangeland Research - \$260.8 million<sup>1</sup> (\$30.25 million for Global Change Research – specific research including \$5.0 million for full life-cycle accounting of climate effects of forest management strategies; \$10.0 million for social science research on land use change and management; \$15.0 million to project impacts of climate change on future forest condition and develop recommended management responses; \$0.25 million for expanded RPA – and \$35.5 million for Fish and Wildlife R&D.

*An increase of \$35.25 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$225.6 million*

### **Forest Legacy Program**

The U.S. Forest Service's Forest Legacy Program, authorized in the 1990 Farm Bill, provides matching funds to assist states in conserving private working forests – those that provide an array of environmental services and products. These include clean air, clean water, carbon sequestration, a variety of critical fish and wildlife habitats, recreational opportunities, and timber and other forest products. Since its inception, the Forest Legacy Program has provided over \$380 million in matching funds to conserve nearly 1.7 million acres of forests valued at more than \$865 million.

Currently, 48 states and territories are active in the program and another three states are in the final planning stages. In recent years, the identified demand from participating states has exceeded \$200 million annually, and the program has grown rapidly as new states have joined the program. In fact, for FY 2009, states submitted projects totaling over 388,000 acres, yet at current funding levels only a fraction will be conserved. This leaves thousands of acres of valuable forestland at risk of development and fragmentation. The recent FS "Forests on the Edge" report projected that, due to increased populations and expanding urban center demands on our forests, over 44 million acres of private forests are likely to see increased conversion pressure over the next three decades. With ownership of large forested properties changing hands frequently, a concerted effort to keep forests intact is needed and the Forest Legacy Program is the nation's premier program dedicated to that end.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Forest Legacy Programs - \$125.0 million

*An increase of \$72.8 million over the FY08 enacted level of \$52.2 million*

### **Community Forest and Open Space Program**

Over 44 million acres are expected to be converted from forestlands to developments by 2030, and the top 15 watersheds in the nation that are projected for development will have significant impacts on eastern forests. Unfortunately, few communities have the necessary capacity to conserve forestlands that protect their water supply, support a timber-based economy, or enhance recreational opportunities, scenic beauty and quality of life for local residents. The Community Forest and Open Space Program will enable communities to acquire forest areas that are economically, culturally, and environmentally important to that locality and that are threatened by conversion to non-forest uses. The Forest Service will be undergoing rulemaking for this program in FY 2009; the FY 2010 recommendation will provide the agency with the necessary funds to implement the program.

---

<sup>1</sup> Does not include the recommended increase proposed for the Forest Inventory Analysis program.

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Community Forest and Open Space Program - \$75.0 million

*A new program that would increase the overall Forest Service budget by \$75.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level*

### **International Program**

The Forest Service's International Programs (USFS/IP) are uniquely positioned to promote forest conservation around the globe by drawing on the agency's diverse workforce of scientists, resource managers, international specialists, conservation biologists, and other experts. USFS/IP responds to natural disasters and humanitarian crises, advances US forestry interests in the international policy arena and provides technical assistance to partners overseas.

Around the globe, forested lands and grasslands are being lost to agricultural clearing, catastrophic fires, poor land management and destructive logging purposes. The cutting and burning of these carbon-rich landscapes is also a significant driver of climate change. USFS/IP is working to take advantage of the tremendous opportunities to mitigate climate change and reduce global greenhouse gas emissions by slowing deforestation, curbing land degradation, increasing carbon storage, and using forests as an alternative and sustainable energy source, efforts which at the same time protect precious biodiversity and habitat.

USFS/IP is engaged around the world in a variety of ecosystems to conserve biodiversity and migratory species, advance protected area management, assist with landscape level planning, provide wildfire management expertise, prevent illegal logging, promote forest certification, and reduce the impacts of extractive forestry. Forest Service engagement overseas has a tremendous impact on its own workforce, diversifying experiences and offering opportunities for its experts to contribute overseas while also bringing lessons back home.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

International Program - \$14.0 million

*An increase of \$6.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$7.5 million*

### **Land Management Planning Program**

Given the enormous land management challenges of the coming decades — including the complex natural resource dilemmas associated with climate change (i.e. species adaptation, extreme variability in natural processes)—it is imperative to support science-based planning, analysis and decision-making processes on National Forest System lands. Well constructed Land and Resource Management Plans (LRMPs) support high-quality, legitimate, effective and efficient resource management decisions. Of critical importance will be Forest Service programs associated with data collection and analysis, comprehensive multi-jurisdictional land and resource management planning, and robust monitoring geared towards meaningful and rigorous adaptive ecosystem management. The Forest Service must be directed and enabled through appropriations to link data collection, analysis, planning, and decision-making processes in meaningful and cost-efficient manners. The agency should be discouraged from promoting initiatives that do not contribute to effective and efficient planning and science-based decision-making.

Funding for Forest Service Land Management Planning must also be coordinated with policy changes in the National Forest Management Act regulations. Current (2008) national forest planning regulations are insufficient to guide the science-based, standards-based planning that is needed. To ensure effective and efficient implementation of the wildlife planning requirements found in regulation under the National Forest Management

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

Act – under interim implementation of the 1982 regulations, as well as under new implementing regulations for wildlife viability legislation – National Forest System Land Management Planning should be granted adequate resources to successfully implement wildlife viability policies as well as other priority programs that are necessary for the fulfillment of a comprehensive land management policy agenda. In addition, given the potential for policy changes associated with new wildlife planning requirements, in FY 2010 it may be necessary to revise, amend, correct, or adjust plans associated with the 2008 regulations (38 plans are revising under the 2008 regulations in 2009), which requires a significant investment in revision activities. Significant investments should not be made supporting activities associated with insufficient 2008 LRMPs. The Forest Service expects that 33 units will be starting revisions in FY 2010.

Science-based planning is fundamental to effectively conserving ecosystems including fish and wildlife on National Forest System lands. This program must maintain its capacity to conduct planning efforts in accordance with relevant statutes and regulations and to effectively implement the wildlife policy reforms outlined in this white paper. To realize the planning efficiencies inherent in the policies, it will be necessary to link and coordinate funding of Forest Service planning efforts at the landscape scale. At the very least, the Forest Service should be directed, and enabled through appropriations, to cooperatively link species and ecosystem data collection, analysis, planning, and decision-making processes in meaningful and cost-efficient manners.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Land Management Planning Program - \$58.8 million

*An increase of \$10.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$48.8 million*

### **Inventory and Monitoring**

Consistent implementation of science-based planning, analysis, and decision-making requires dedicated funding for monitoring and science-based adaptive management processes. The Forest Service Inventory and Monitoring program funds the collection and analysis of data to be used in land management planning. Monitoring of fish and wildlife populations, along with habitat assessment and monitoring, is fundamental for effective planning and high-quality decision-making under a sound National Forest Management Act regulatory framework. The Inventory and Monitoring program should make targeted investments in key objectives that support policy relevant, science-based planning, including “enhancing scientific understanding of ecosystems” and “providing data, information, and analyses to decision makers.”<sup>2</sup> Strategic investments in planning must be matched with comparable investments in species and ecosystem assessment, analysis, and monitoring – indeed, the hallmark of intelligent land management is the use of comprehensive biological monitoring information to inform adaptive shifts in agency decisions and actions.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Inventory and Monitoring - \$175.0 million

*An increase of \$8.4 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$166.6 million*

### **Recreation, Heritage & Wilderness Program**

The Recreation, Heritage & Wilderness program makes up the largest of the forest uses, and demand for outdoor recreation is fast growing. Therefore, it is critical that the Forest Service encourage recreation that is environmentally sound and devote more institutional focus to meeting the challenge of projected increases in

---

<sup>2</sup> FY2009 USDA Forest Service Budget Justification, p. 8-10.

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

recreational use (e.g., emphasize rigorous recreation planning and implementation, on-the-ground management, and restoration). Furthermore, with the imminent threat of climate change, actions will be necessary to help Americans adapt to a more climate-responsible method of recreation. For instance, the Forest Service should emphasize providing recreational opportunities close to where people live, and emphasize muscle-powered forms of recreation over those that expend fossil fuels.

*Travel Management*, the process of planning and managing dispersed outdoor recreation, is a major priority for the Forest Service. In 2005, the Forest Service promulgated the “travel management rule” and appropriately established a firm deadline for the completion of motorized road and trail designations for all Forest Service administered lands by December 2009. Although the Forest Service has fallen behind schedule, it is still striving to meet the established December 2009 deadline. Once the designations are completed, the Forest Service will need funds to implement the designations and manage visitor access on an on-going basis – both to ensure adequate environmental protection and quality recreational experiences. The Forest Service has not received additional funding in this budget line – despite the enormity and importance of the task – to support the travel planning and implementation efforts related to the 2005 regulation. The annual estimated cost of implementing travel and management plans under the Recreation Program will amount to \$75.7 million for map publications and visitor education. The agency will need an additional \$8.4 million in FY 2010 to support travel planning in the approximately seven forest units that chose to delay planning beyond the deadline. These estimates do not include recommendations for the funding required to enforce, maintain, manage, and decommission road and trail networks designated under the travel management rule. These are addressed respectively in separate sections of this document.<sup>3</sup>

*Wilderness and Wild & Scenic Rivers* represent large blocks of protected and connected landscapes, and will play an important role in forests’ ability to adapt to and overcome the effects of climate change. Additionally, wilderness areas make up 20 percent of National Forest lands, and therefore deserve a budget line item separate from Recreation and Heritage. Wilderness and management may seem to be contradictory terms, but without some sort of management to monitor and control the use of wilderness, many outstanding areas would lose the very values they were established to preserve. To bring all 410 wilderness areas to standard, as identified in the 10-Year Wilderness Stewardship Challenge, the Forest Service will need at least a \$30 million increase funding level to Wilderness and Wild and Scenic Rivers program (allocated to bring 80 wilderness areas and 32 Wild & Scenic Rivers up to the standards).

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Recreation, Heritage & Wilderness Program - \$377.1 million (\$84.1 million for travel management and \$30.0 million Wilderness and Wild & Scenic Rivers)

*An increase of \$114.1 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$263.0 million*

### **Wildlife and Fisheries Habitat Management Program**

Our national forests and grasslands play an essential role in the conservation of our nation’s wildlife and habitat. About 425 species listed under the Endangered Species Act and an additional 3,250 at-risk species are found on Forest Service lands. These lands encompass an amazing array of habitats, from alpine tundra to tropical rainforest, deciduous and evergreen forests, native grasslands, wetlands and various size streams, lakes, and marshes.

---

<sup>3</sup> For additional costs associated with travel management planning and implementation, see sections titled Law Enforcement Operations Program, Roads Maintenance Program, Deferred Maintenance Program, Legacy Roads and Trails Remediation Program and Trails Program.

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

National forests often contain significant headwaters and stream reaches important to freshwater creatures like fish, mussels and crayfish, a higher percentage of which are considered at-risk than other species. Many of the larger animals in the U.S. such as grizzly bear, wolverine, elk, Canada lynx, and bighorn sheep persist because of Forest Service lands. Since national forests often represent intact connected habitat, they become obvious places for recovery and reintroduction of rare creatures and form the backbone of many large-scale conservation plans. Fish and wildlife on our national forests are important to people all across the nation— about 40 million visits per year are primarily for hunting, fishing or wildlife viewing.

The Forest Service Wildlife and Fisheries Habitat Management program works with partners to inventory and monitor, manage, and restore habitat on national forests and grasslands in four program areas: 1) Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species; 2) Wildlife; 3) Fisheries; and 4) NatureWatch (wildlife viewing and education). Despite the broad array of species and habitat on Forest Service lands that require maintenance and restoration, the budget for this program has been flat at approximately \$130 million over the last eight years. Inflation during this period has substantially eroded the effectiveness of this funding level and the program has declined in a number of areas, including habitat restoration and maintenance, recovery efforts for threatened and endangered species, work with partners and states, inventory and monitoring of species and habitat, and public education and outreach. In addition, any work done by biologists and botanists on projects for program areas outside the Wildlife and Fish Habitat Management program is supposed to be charged to the benefitting function, e.g. grazing, forest products, and energy, rather than the Wildlife and Fish program, but this is not always the case. The extent of this accountability problem is not known.

The FY 2007 appropriation of \$131.7 million for this program helped to generate an additional \$50.4 million in partner contributions, and accomplished more than 4700 projects with and without partners. However, the Forest Service has estimated that it could spend two times that amount or \$260 million in projects that are ready to go with existing staffing. Early in the new administration, the budget for this program should be increased to at least the level of full capacity for projects with existing staffing, \$260 million. The administration also should assess the program for expansion beyond this level, with a goal of increased staffing and needed projects at field levels where there are substantial gaps and heavy workloads. The administration also should review accounting practices to ensure that the program is not being charged for projects under other program areas. For FY 2010, at least half of the current needed increase, or \$65 million should be provided.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Wildlife and Fisheries Habitat Management - \$197.4 million

*An increase of \$65.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$132.4 million*

### **Vegetation & Watershed Management Program**

The Forest Service was established, in part, to help secure the nation's water supply, protecting watersheds that supply drinking water to millions of Americans and numerous cities and communities. Eighteen percent of the nation's water supply originates from national forests. Healthy watersheds are crucial, vibrant components of the healthy ecosystems needed to support both people and wildlife, yet the Forest Service does not have a complete inventory and national database for watershed conditions. It is estimated that watershed improvements are needed in approximately two-thirds of watersheds on National Forest System lands. Two examples of needed improvements include projects that connect stream channels, floodplains, and shallow ground water in valley bottoms, and restoring aquatic and terrestrial conditions and processes to support beneficial uses of aquatic ecosystems. The administration should complete an inventory for watershed condition on Forest Service lands and should develop and fund a plan for making the needed improvements.

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Vegetation and Watershed Management Program - \$184.0 million  
*Increases as of \$5.0 million over the enacted level of \$177.4 million*

### **Law Enforcement Operations Program**

In July 2004, former Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth identified unmanaged recreation – especially unmanaged motorized recreation – as one of the top four threats to America’s forests and proposed a rule change governing off-road vehicle (ORV) use on Forest Service land. The rule, adopted in November 2005, requires all National Forests to designate travel routes for ORVs. Previously, use in the 155 national forests and 21 grasslands was managed at the discretion of the unit and cross-country travel was permitted. Once travel plans have been completed in 2010, most ORV use must take place on a road or motorized trail. While designated ORV routes are a major step forward, there is little evidence to indicate the Forest Service will have the capacity to enforce the travel plans once they are completed, leading to a continuation of current resource damage and conflicts with other land users. According to the Forest Service, there were over 12,400 ORV-related offenses in National Forests in 2007, accounting for roughly 13% of all crime. Law Enforcement Officers (LEOs) logged 44,000 hours addressing ORV issues during the same period.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Law Enforcement Program - \$186.9 million (\$55.0 million increase for Travel Planning enforcement)  
*An increase of \$55.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$131.9 million*

### **Roads Maintenance Program**

Ongoing logging and mineral extraction has not only led to the gradual creation of an enormous and unsustainable road system in the national forests but also to forest fragmentation and widespread unmanaged off-road vehicle driving and related damage. The Forest Service reports that it can only maintain about 20 percent of its roads to standard. The Forest Service needs to transform its currently oversized, decaying, and obsolete road system to a streamlined system that will meet the nation’s needs in the 21<sup>st</sup> century in a fiscally responsible way. To do this, the Forest Service must accomplish widespread decommissioning and restoration of the roads that are no longer needed, and to properly maintain those roads that are needed. Road decommissioning and maintenance of necessary high clearance and closed roads could significantly decrease the direct impacts on fish and wildlife and recreation and benefit the health of forest ecosystems. This will aid in the creation of a healthier and more resilient forest system, which is all the more important under climate change conditions. The Forest Service requires at least \$649 million to meet its annual road maintenance needs.<sup>4</sup> Over several years, Forest Service funding should gradually increase to \$650 million to keep up with annual maintenance needs. In the first year, 50 percent of that goal, or \$325 million should be allocated to roads maintenance in forests that have completed a roads analysis for *all* roads (maintenance levels 1-5) as required by regulation, thereby identifying the unnecessary and problematic roads that should be decommissioned.<sup>5</sup> Finally, no new taxpayer subsidies should be allocated to build new logging roads.

---

<sup>4</sup> FY2009 USDA Forest Service Budget Justification, p. 17-24.

<sup>5</sup> Most forests have completed a roads analysis as required in regulation, but because of fiscal constraints they only looked at roads accommodating passenger vehicles (maintenance level 3-5 roads). In many cases, it is the high clearance backcountry roads (maintenance level 1 and 2 roads) that are problematic in terms of management and environmental impact, and hence should be prioritized for decommissioning.

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Roads Maintenance Program - \$325 million

*An increase of \$194.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$131.0 million*

### **Trails Program**

The Forest Service trails system serves Americans with over 50 million visitor days of cross-country skiing, hiking, horseback riding, mountain biking, and off-road vehicle use each year. The National Forest System is responsible for all 140,000 miles of trails, but only 38 percent are currently maintained to standard. The trails maintenance backlog has reached \$234 million as of FY 2007. This program's purpose is to ensure public safety and backcountry access through the operation, maintenance, rehabilitation, and improvement of the National Forest System trail systems, including promoting ecosystem health by 1) protecting soil, vegetation, and water quality; 2) clearing encroaching vegetation and fallen trees; and 3) repairing or improving trail signs, treadways, water drainage, and bridges. Additionally, as travel management plans reach completion in 2010, the trails program will require increased funds for proper implementation. Much off-road vehicle (ORV) use will take place on motorized trails that require appropriate signage, trailhead and trail maintenance and restoration of resource damage associated with ORV use.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Trails Program - \$136.4 million (geared toward implementation of Travel Management Planning)

*An increase of \$60.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$76.4 million*

### **Deferred Maintenance**

The Forest Service should address its \$10 billion road maintenance backlog by focusing on roads that are in immediate need of attention and where ecological benefits will be greatest. An increase of \$16.1 million over the FY 2008 enacted level would only begin to address the backlog.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Deferred Maintenance Program - \$25 million

*An increase of \$16.1 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$8.9 million*

### **Legacy Roads and Trails Remediation Program**

Road decommissioning and other remediation activities will significantly improve water quality and fish habitat, reduce fragmentation of wildlife habitat, and aid in restoring stability and resilience to watersheds and large tracts of forests. The Forest Service is required by regulation to identify its minimum necessary road system along with a list of roads that should be decommissioned to protect land and water resources, or to reduce the fiscal burden of road maintenance. The Forest Service should first prioritize decommissioning roads that are not in use and/or that are causing the most serious environmental problems, such as stream degradation and forest fragmentation. The new Legacy Road and Trail Remediation Program is a vehicle for accomplishing the above priorities.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Legacy Roads and Trail Remediation Program - \$100.0 million

*An increase of \$60.6 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$39.4 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

### **Accounting Program**

For decades the Forest Service has had a history of fiscal and accountability problems. To further its overall mission and restore public confidence, it is imperative that the Forest Service improve its budgetary transparency and accountability. Although the Forest Service has moved to improve its accounting practices, continued improvements should take place. Multiple Government Accountability Office and Office of Inspector General reports have found glaring lapses in data collection and recurrent problems with long-term planning based on measurable goals. For example, current reporting is ineffective for basic activities like evaluating the cost-effectiveness of timber sales and documenting the location and effectiveness of hazardous fuels treatments. Accounting activities would provide the Forest Service a better grasp of its funding needs.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Forest Products Program- accounting monies should be allocated from the timber program

### **State, Tribal and Local Fire Assistance**

State foresters conservatively estimate that 45,000 communities adjacent to federal lands that are at risk from wildland fire.<sup>6</sup> Experts predict that almost eight million new homes will be built in the wildland-urban interface (WUI) between 2005 and 2010.<sup>7</sup> Increased population in the WUI is one of the primary reasons suppression costs have skyrocketed to over \$1 billion annually since 2000. In addition, because climate change will increase the length of the fire season and potentially the number and size of fires that burn any given year, it is more critical than ever to help these communities prepare for inevitable wildland fires. Communities that are “firesafe” are key to reducing suppression costs – and ultimately restoring functional and fire-resilient wildlands.

State Fire Assistance is the primary federal program that can help communities achieve these goals. It provides funding to help states and communities prepare for and respond to wildland fires, including funding for firefighter training, hazardous fuels reduction near communities, the Firewise program, and Community Wildfire Protection Planning. Congress has directed that State Fire Assistance funds should be used preferentially to support community wildfire protection planning and plan implementation. Many states and communities lack the resources to fully design and implement fire management programs on their own.<sup>8</sup> In fact, skyrocketing suppression expenditures suggest that taxpayers already foot the bill for private landowners who have not taken the necessary steps to protect their properties. Taking proactive steps towards fire preparedness by investing in State Fire Assistance will mean a reduction in these fire suppression costs.

Around 10 percent of the \$14.7 billion appropriated to the National Fire Plan in the last five years has been directed to forest and fire management activities by non-federal partners.<sup>9</sup> To improve the effectiveness and efficiency of fire management, this has to change. No less than 20 percent of the five-year average National Fire Plan

---

<sup>6</sup> Southern Group of State Foresters, *Southern Wildfire Risk Assessment Final Report (2006)*, p. 75.

<sup>7</sup> Forest Service and Department of the Interior “Quadrennial Fire and Fuel Report” (2005).

<sup>8</sup> Mall, A. and Matzner, F. (2007). *Safe at Home: Making the Federal Fire Safety Budget Work for Communities*. Natural Resources Defense Council.

<sup>9</sup> Specifically those line items under the National Fire Plan associated with state and local assistance, including Forest Health Management (Coop Lands), State Fire Assistance and Volunteer Fire Assistance under Wildland Fire Management and Forest Health Management (Coop Lands), State Fire Assistance, Volunteer Fire Assistance and Economic Action Program under State and Private Forestry Appropriations, as well as other State and Private Forestry programs that assist communities in managing forests, including Forest Stewardship, Urban & Community Forestry and Forest Research & Information Analysis (except Forest Legacy, which is also addressed separately in this document). Data source: USFS Budget Justifications 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007 and 2008.

# DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

appropriations should be allocated to State, Tribal and Local Assistance Programs generally, and 50 percent of that should be targeted specifically to State Fire Assistance.<sup>10</sup> This should be done through steady increase over three years. The first year should reflect an 80 percent increase of the approximately \$80 million historical average for State Fire Assistance, resulting in a \$144 million appropriation that would meet the State Forester's projected 2008 needs. In the second year, there should be a 50 percent increase to \$216 million; and in the last year, an approximately 30 percent increase would realize the \$285 million target appropriation. Protecting communities threatened by wildland fire is recognized as the highest priority of federal fire policy, but those words simply cannot be matched by action unless funding backs intention.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

State Fire Assistance Program - \$144.0 million

*An increase of \$63.4 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$80.6 million*

State, Tribal and Local Assistance generally - \$288 million

*An increase of \$73.3 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$214.7 million*

### **Preparedness Program – Appropriate (Strategic) Management Response Training**

In addition to creating a new fund to address the increasing costs of fire suppression, the Forest Service must invest in a 21<sup>st</sup> century fire management force. A robust commitment to new fire management strategies, like Appropriate (Strategic) Management Response is also needed. Appropriate (Strategic) Management Response is an approach to firefighting that treats each fire individually, accounting for threats to lives and property first, but also weighing factors like ecology and landscape and then applying the appropriate response – which can include the full range of tactical responses from monitoring to aggressive attack. This change will lead to healthier landscapes and less costly fire seasons in the future. That means investing in a 21<sup>st</sup> century fire management force – an investment on par with the one made in hazardous fuels reduction. A key aspect of this investment must be funding designated for training and staffing to equip Incident Management Teams to implement the full range of management responses from suppression to capturing resource benefits of fire.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Preparedness Program - \$672.5 million (1% increase for Appropriate (Strategic) Management Response training)

*An increase of \$6.7 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$665.8 million*

---

<sup>10</sup> This does not include Forest Legacy, which is addressed elsewhere in this document.

# DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

# DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

## OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

The Department of Energy (DOE) is home to much of the energy efficiency and renewables research, development, and deployment activities in the country. During a time of economic crisis, the DOE has the opportunity to help forge a stable energy future that supports instead of hinders our economy, make our country safer, and make our environment cleaner.

Clean technology, which should be fostered at DOE, is a good investment for taxpayers. According to Ernst & Young in October 2008, the global "clean technology" market is expected to garner 11 percent of global venture capital investment in 2008, up from only 1.6 percent in 2003. And while the clean technology market attracted \$3 billion in investments in 2007, it attracted \$2.2 billion in just the first half of 2008. Over that 18-month period, the United States accounted for the majority of the venture capital investments, raising a total of \$4.1 billion. While the recent drop of oil prices to below \$70 a barrel has caused some investors to temporarily reconsider their support for some clean energy projects, the underlying drivers of sky-high gas prices and energy security concerns still exist. The federal government does not have the luxury of shortsightedness in addressing our dependence on foreign oil or the need to promote clean energy and efficiency technologies. DOE must step in and be a much better leader on research, development, demonstration, and deployment to ensure that vital private and public sector investment in clean energy continues, and that we continue on the important path to national energy independence.

DOE, however, cannot achieve this goal at its current level of funding. For the past decade, a multitude of experts have called for at least doubling DOE funding for energy research, demonstration, and development (RD&D). DOE RD&D funding for clean energy technologies should be ramped up to this level within five years, if not sooner.

### **Hydrogen Technology Program**

While hydrogen is not a fuel, it is an important energy carrier. The hydrogen program RD&D should focus on utilizing renewable resources, waste heat, and related clean processes to generate hydrogen. Hydrogen RD&D should focus in three prime areas: 1) infrastructure – to transport, store and safely utilize hydrogen, 2) the creation of hydrogen from renewable energy and waste heat utilizing the many options including novel concepts, and 3) the unique conversion of hydrogen to electricity including primarily fuel cells but also heat engines and storage systems.

Important areas for funding increases include Hydrogen Productions (from renewable resources in particular), Hydrogen Storage R&D, and Distributed Energy Fuel Cell Systems that recapture heat for high efficiencies. It is also important to provide dedicated funding to the Market Transformation program authorized under Section 783 of EPACT 2005.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Hydrogen Technology Program - \$199 million

*A decrease of \$14.0 million from the FY 08 enacted level of approximately \$213.0 million*

### **Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D Program**

Biomass power funding should support cleaner combustion, gasification, pyrolyzation, and digestion technologies for electric generation with biomass. A variety of feedstocks should be tested for emissions within these technologies with an emphasis on distributed generation with small biomass systems. Programs should work together to develop a biorefinery or polygeneration plant that can be operated in the U.S. to produce clean fuel, power, and chemicals. The biofuels program should add to the existing biomass options (e.g., corn fiber) with an expanded focus on cellulosic biomass for ethanol as well as biodiesel, but not municipal solid waste. The biofuels

# DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

## OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

program should focus on cost reductions in the production of ethanol through the fermentation of sugars and the gasification or pyrolysis of cellulosic biomass and biomass waste streams for the production of synfuels and their conversion into biofuels bioproducts, and biopower. Appropriations associated with biomass power should be directed towards industry commercialization partnerships.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D Program - \$275 million

*An increase of \$76.8 million over the FY 08 enacted level of approximately \$198.2 million*

### **Solar Energy Technologies Program**

The Solar Energy Technologies program supports research and development on technologies such as solar photovoltaics (PV) and concentrating solar power. The solar program's research continues to bring costs down and performance up, fostering a domestic high-tech manufacturing base. DOE's Million Solar Roofs Initiative, which began in 1997 and concluded in 2006, installed the equivalent of more than 377,000 solar water heating, photovoltaics, and solar pool heating systems, and decreased carbon dioxide emissions by 3.3 million tons.

Advances in solar technology through the RD&D program for electric power generation, absorption cooling, and water and industrial process heating have shown immense promise and should be aggressively pursued. Continued work on solar energy storage for all concentrating solar power technologies, including solar power towers, troughs, and compact linear Fresnel systems should receive greater RD&D attention.

The Solar America Initiative (SAI) continues to provide research funding to university and industry partners, as well as offering grants to local governments to speed the adoption of solar technologies in 25 cities across the country. SAI's primary focus has been on driving cost reductions of all solar technologies, including PV solar and CSP, to achieve cost competitiveness with other renewable technologies by 2015. Another SAI initiative has been its Solar Energy Grid Integration program which concentrates on R&D to enable the high penetration of PV systems into the utility grid. Transformation of the electrical grid to accommodate distributed generation requires new capabilities and hardware well beyond existing approaches. Funding for both of these new initiatives should be provided.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Solar Energy Technologies Program - at least \$251.9 million

*An increase of \$83.4 million over the FY 08 enacted level of approximately \$168.5 million*

### **Wind Energy Program**

Since 2000, wind energy has demonstrated significant expansion and promise as an affordable energy supply, increasing from about 2.5 GW to about 15 GW by the end of 2007. DOE's Wind Energy program is responsible for RD&D efforts to improve wind energy generation technology, enhance domestic economic benefit from development, and to address barriers to the use of wind energy in coordination with stakeholders.

Federal investment is now more important than ever. With the recent financial crisis, wind farm developers have been forced to look for alternative sources of credit. The problems with the markets have been compounded by the recent decline over oil prices from \$147 in July 2008 to just below \$70 in October. Natural gas prices have dropped to under \$8 per million Btu as well. In order for wind energy to remain competitive in this environment industry costs must decrease and wind turbine efficiency must increase. As the Department of Energy's "20

# DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

## OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

percent Wind Energy by 2030” report found, meeting the 20 percent wind energy goal by 2030 requires capital costs to decrease by 10 percent and capacity factors to increase by 15 percent. Technology improvements through federal research and development and programmatic funding to overcome other challenges are crucial to meeting the 20 percent goal.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Wind Energy Program - at least \$75 million

*An increase of \$25.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of approximately \$49.5 million*

### **Geothermal Technology Program**

Geothermal energy holds the promise to produce vast quantities of high quality baseload power. The U.S. urgently needs to develop the technology and resource knowledge necessary to tap its extensive geothermal resources base. The U.S. Geological Survey estimates the accessible geothermal resource base to be huge. Their recently released 2008 report, which is based upon the latest information, estimates that new production from identified geothermal resource could be as much as 16,475 MW, new production from undiscovered resources could reach 73,296 MW, and Enhanced Geothermal Systems (EGS) could some day provide up to 727,900 MW of geothermal power – and this is all just in the Western U.S.

Given the enormous potential of this resource base, a strong research program should be funded. After hearings in the House and Senate, Congress has recently formulated a comprehensive new authorization for geothermal research, which was adopted as part of national energy legislation in 2007. DOE should be directed and funded to implement this new initiative—the “Advanced Geothermal Energy Research and Development Act of 2007.”

This new legislation provides DOE direction to implement a wide-ranging geothermal research program that develops the technology and information needed to tap the potential of geothermal energy across a range of applications. It provides specific direction for research into a series of areas, ranging from developing new exploration technology to enhancing environmental stewardship to EGS technology demonstrations. Congress has authorized \$90 million to be spent in FY 2010 on these initiatives. They should be fully funded at the authorized level.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Geothermal Technology Program - at least \$55.0 million

*An increase of \$35.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of approximately \$19.8 million*

### **Water Energy Program**

There is an enormous amount of interest in new forms of renewable energy from the oceans, such as wave, tidal, ocean current, and ocean thermal energy conversion (OTEC) power. Exploration and development of these sources has been hampered, however, by a lack of baseline monitoring data that can inform environmental analyses. Pilot and demonstration projects can also benefit from federal monitoring and reporting on common impacts among project. DOE should work in conjunction with National Oceanic Atmosphere Administration (NOAA) on baseline research and monitoring that can advance specific pilot and demonstration projects. In addition, there is a need for research and development (R&D) funding on project design that will have minimal effects on marine fish and wildlife. DOE should work in conjunction with NOAA to develop an R&D program for avoidance of fish and wildlife impacts. The exploration and development of ocean renewable power will also benefit from a publicly accessible common library of all available information on such project. DOE should work in conjunction with

# DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

## OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

NOAA to compile and publish such a library.

New investment in existing water energy programs is also essential. Hydropower energy accounted for 7 percent of total U.S. electricity generation and 73 percent of generation from renewables in 2005. Funding for the hydropower program should be directed primarily to DOE's Advanced Hydropower Turbine System (AHTS) program and related activities. The funding should also support broadening the DOE's hydropower program to study other operational and environmental issues related to hydropower production, including the potential of hydrokinetic hydropower (dam-less hydropower) technologies. Funding should also be made available to conduct research and development that will improve the environmental, technical, and societal benefits of hydropower.

Funding for the hydropower program should be directed primarily to DOE's AHTS program and related activities. The funding should also support broadening the DOE's hydropower program to study other operational and environmental issues related to hydropower production, including the potential of hydrokinetic hydropower (dam-less hydropower) technologies. Funding should also be made available to conduct research and development that will improve the environmental, technical, and societal benefits of hydropower.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Ocean Energy - \$39.8 million

Hydropower Program - \$10.2 million

*An increase of \$40.4 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$9.8 million*

### **Vehicle Technologies Program**

Americans paid a record \$4.114 a gallon for a gallon of gas this last July. To help working families reduce their fuel bills, combat global warming, and reduce the U.S.'s dangerous dependence on oil, increasing the fuel economy of motor vehicles is a top priority. Federal research and development on technologies that improve motor vehicle fuel economy are essential to achieving such an increase and are carried out by the DOE Vehicle Technologies program. The technologies covered by the program include advanced lightweight materials, advanced batteries, improved power electronics, electric motors, and advanced combustion engines, storage technologies, fuel blend research and development of solutions to plug in hybrids' implications for grid security and stability.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Vehicle Technologies Program - \$349.3 million

*An increase of \$136.3 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$213.0 million*

### **Building Technologies Program**

Energy use by residential and commercial buildings accounts for over one-third of the nation's total energy consumption, including two-thirds of the electricity generated in the U.S. Residential and commercial building emissions together make up approximately 38 percent of annual U.S. greenhouse gas emissions and are growing twice as fast as the overall average.

Of all the DOE energy efficiency programs, the Building Technologies program continues to yield perhaps the greatest energy savings. A National Research Council study found that just three small buildings research and development programs – in electronic ballasts for fluorescent lamps, refrigerator compressors, and low-e glass for windows – have already achieved cost savings totaling \$30 billion, at a total federal cost of about \$12 million.

# DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

## OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

The DOE Building Technologies Program has recently added solar heating, cooling, and lighting to its portfolio. These technologies are crucial for meeting the goal of Zero-Energy Buildings. As such, support for solar technologies as they relate to reducing the energy consumption from new and retrofit buildings is key.

Funding for this account has not even kept up with inflation. For example, the Building Technology program received \$129 million in FY2000. This chronic underfunding will not help us forge a new energy future. Areas that require additional focus and funding include building codes and standards, Energy Star, equipment standards and analysis, the Commercial Buildings Initiative (CBI), and the Building America Program. Additionally, the DOE should re-invigorate the research and development program on equipment such as heating and cooling, appliances, windows, and building envelope, all of which have been underfunded for several years. The Equipment Standards and Analysis sub-account of this program should receive an additional \$25 million. Federal appliance standards already save an estimated 2.5 percent of all U.S. electricity use; existing and draft standards are expected to save consumers and businesses \$186 billion by 2020. However, a number of standards are many years behind schedule and appear stalled. The DOE recently settled a lawsuit brought against it demanding that it issue long-overdue minimum efficiency standards required by federal law for many energy-using products. Developing standards is a costly process and the DOE needs adequate resources to carry out its responsibilities.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Building Technologies - \$220.0 million, including at least \$40.0 million for the Building America/ Zero Net Energy Homes Program, \$30.0 million for CBI, \$25.0 million for building energy codes, and \$15.0 million for DOE Energy Star.

*An increase of \$111.1 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$108.9 million*

### **Industrial Technologies Program**

The Industrial Technologies Program partners with the most energy-consuming industrial sectors in the U.S. to conduct cost-shared energy saving research and provide technical assistance, tools, and training to improve industrial energy efficiency. DOE modeling suggests that the Industrial Technologies Program could contribute to a 14.9 percent reduction in energy intensity in these industries between 2003 and 2015. But perhaps most significantly, the technology that is developed through this program can be used globally. Just by using DOE's proven technologies and best practices, the Energy Information Administration (EIA) estimates that industries throughout the world could reduce carbon emissions by 19 to 32 percent, equivalent to about 7 to 12 percent of all global emissions. Best of all, these changes save money for businesses. According to DOE, the Industrial Technology Program's Save Energy Now effort conducted 200 plant assessments in 2007 that identified large energy and cost savings for a variety of manufacturers. These savings were equivalent to 5 to 15 percent of plant energy use, which translated to an average cost savings of \$2.5 million per plant annually.

Making energy intensive industries more efficient is one of the fastest, cheapest ways to achieve real global warming reductions in the near future. Funding for this program is necessary to fully realize that potential. Specific attention should be paid to the Industries of the Future program Crosscutting. This area develops new technologies for all industrial processes such as boilers. Emphasis on emissions reductions and significant increases in efficiency are required to ensure that American industries stay on American soil as we move into a climate-constrained world.

Additionally, the Combined Heat and Power and Distributed Generation program has recently been re-constituted in the Industrial program. This includes ALL DG and CHP, for buildings and industrial applications. Funding for this program alone should be at least \$60 million, which would restore FY 2006 funding levels.

# DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

## OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Industrial Technologies Program - \$135.0 million

*An increase of \$70.6 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$64.4 million*

### **Federal Energy Management Program**

The federal government is the single largest energy consumer in the United States. In an effort to cut energy consumption by the federal government, the Federal Energy Management Program (FEMP) has helped worked with federal agencies to cut the federal building's energy waste by 24 percent from 1985 to 2001 – a reduction that now saves federal taxpayers roughly \$1 billion each year in reduced energy costs. The program has also helped DOE obtain nearly 7 percent of its energy use from renewable energy sources, surpassing the federal 2.5 percent goal. However, these reductions are only the start. FEMP has set several new goals including:

- (1) Ensuring that at least 5 percent of federal electricity consumption be generated from renewable sources in the years FY 2010 through FY 2012 and 7.5 percent in FY 2013 and each fiscal year thereafter;
- (2) Improving energy efficiency and reducing greenhouse gas emissions of the agency through reduction of energy intensity by 30 percent from fiscal year 2003 by the end of fiscal year 2015;
- (3) Ensuring that at least half of the statutorily required renewable energy consumed by the agency in a fiscal year comes from new renewable sources, and to the extent feasible, the agency implements renewable energy generation projects on agency property for agency use; and
- (4) Ensuring that agencies reduce their vehicle fleets' total consumption of petroleum products by 2 percent annually through the end of fiscal year 2015, increase the total fuel consumption that is non-petroleum-based by 10 percent annually, and use plug-in hybrid (PIH) vehicles when PIH vehicles are commercially available and cost comparable.

These achievable goals will take a larger federal investment. A relatively small increase will also help the FEMP program demonstrate how to cut energy costs to the private sector.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Federal Energy Management Program - \$33.0 million

*An increase of \$13.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$19.8 million*

### **Weatherization Assistance Program**

The Weatherization Assistance program was eliminated in the President's FY 2009 budget request and funds were redirected to research and development accounts. While we support the federal government's decision to increase their investment in research and development, those increases should not come on the backs of low-income families who are trying to permanently reduce their energy bills.

On average, weatherization reduces heating bills by 31 percent and overall energy bills by \$274 per year. During the last 27 years, the Weatherization Assistance program has provided weatherization services to more than 5 million low-income families. By reducing energy consumption and energy bills, weatherization helps low-income families save money. In tough economic times, it is federal money will spent.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Weatherization Assistance Program - \$500.0 million

# DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

## OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

*An increase of \$272.8 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$227.2 million*

### **State Energy Program**

Traditionally, the State Energy Program (SEP) provides grants to states to address their energy priorities, implement global warming initiatives and fund energy efficiency and renewable energy projects. Recently, much of the program's resources have been shifted from grants to the SEP special projects account, which is charged with market transformation and with finding crosscutting solutions targeted at market sectors. While market transformation is an important new part of the program, its resources should come from additional money, not by reducing funds to the grants program. Since FY 2007, SEP grants have been reduced by \$15.3 million – with the President requesting a further reduction of \$9.2 million in his FY 2009 budget. Funding cuts to the grants program have a dramatic impact since states often combine these grants with funding from other sources to support such projects. According to a 2003 study by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, each dollar of SEP funding results in annual cost savings of \$7.23. By this equation, we can assume the loss of \$110.6 million in cost savings due to the grants program cuts. The SEP should receive new funds for the new, important special projects account while growing the existing grants program.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

State Energy Program - at least \$79.4 million (\$53.2 million of the grants account and \$26.2 million for the special projects account)

*An increase of \$35.3 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$44.1 million*

### **The Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program**

The 2007 energy bill established a new Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program within the DOE, authorized at \$2 billion per year, to be allocated to state and local governments to be used for innovative best practices to reduce fossil fuel emissions and energy use and to achieve greater energy efficiency in the building, transportation and other appropriate sectors. These grants could be used for building and home energy conservation programs, energy audits, fuel conservation programs, planning and zoning to promote energy efficiency, and the use of renewable energy resources for government buildings. In addition, sub-grants could be made to nonprofit organizations and governmental agencies for the purpose of performing energy efficiency retrofits.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

The Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program - \$308.5 million

*A new program that would increase the overall Department of Energy budget by \$308.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level*

### **Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability**

This program works to develop technologies and implement policies that will improve the reliability, energy efficiency, system efficient and security of the Nation's energy delivery system. Superconductivity should be level funded as the development of it is nearing completion; however, the other areas require funding increases. These include Visualization and Controls, which supports grid modernization through development of advanced technologies, tools and techniques to create a more reliability and efficient infrastructure. Energy Storage and Power Electronics needs continued increases in funding as storage devices can provide supplemental generation for peak demand management and reduce transmission congestion, while improving the performance of the grid. And finally, the Renewable and Distributed Systems Integration funding must continue to receive increasing funding so renewable technologies can be integrated into the electric grid more readily (both at the customer and utility side of

# DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

## OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

the meter).

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability - \$174.7 million

*An increase of \$36.1 million from the FY08 enacted level of \$138.6 million*

### **Smart Grid Demonstrations**

EISA Section 1304 authorized a Smart Grid Interoperability Demonstration program that should be funded under the Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability (OEDER). This would co-fund 4-5 regional demonstrations of smart grid technologies that would highlight new technologies such as renewable and distributed energy, highly conducting grid materials, interoperability and communications software to ensure seamless operation of the grid, and the integration of technology on both the customer and utility side of the meter. Regional demonstrations are necessary to serve as models for other utility systems as development of whole systems is a wholly new endeavor.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Smart Grid Demonstration - \$40.0 million

*A new program that would increase the overall Department of Energy budget by \$40.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level*

### **Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund**

The uranium enrichment decommissioning and decontamination fund (the Fund) was established in the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to clean up three uranium enrichment facilities located at Oak Ridge, Tennessee; Paducah, Kentucky; and Portsmouth, Ohio; and old mill tailings sites. Revenue for the Fund is generated by taxpayers and previously, by the nuclear industry, which used the plants starting in 1964 to enrich uranium for commercial reactor fuel at electric utility power plants. In 2007, the authorization for the taxpayer and industry fee expired, despite a \$12 billion shortfall in the estimated fund amount required to complete the cleanup. Congress should reauthorize this fee and continue to make the polluters pay for cleanup using the fairly distributed formula from the past program. In addition, the sale of any surplus material on site should be attributed to the government's share of the cleanup. While Congress considers reauthorization of the fee, it is imperative that expenditures from the fund continue so that these sites can be cleaned up and the surrounding communities protected.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund - \$663.9 million (in addition to the existing \$4.1 billion balance)

*An increase of \$46.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$617.9 million*

### **Defense Environmental Cleanup**

The Defense Environmental Cleanup (DEC) budget provides for the cleanup and risk reduction of former nuclear weapons production complex sites including all closure sites, Idaho National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Hanford, Savannah River, Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, NNSA Sites, Federal Contribution to the Uranium Enrichment D&D Fund, Program Direction, Program Support, Technology Development and Deployment, and Safeguards and Security.

# DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

## OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

The DEC program is the world's largest and most expensive cleanup program at \$5.3 billion this year. The DEC program has the responsibility to clean up the toxic and radioactive legacy of Cold War nuclear weapons production at more than 130 sites around the country. The Bush Administration has claimed that "accelerating cleanup" at some sites would still result in adequate funding for cleanup up of the most contaminated sites. It seems that this will not be the case. At dozens of sites around the country, DOE's "accelerated cleanup plan" consists of "isolating" radioactive and toxic waste from the environment by simply piling dirt on top of it. Radioactive materials also continue to be dumped into unlined soil ditches that do not even meet the basic requirements for municipal landfills. DOE is attempting to shirk its responsibility to clean up the 239 underground tanks containing approximately 90 million gallons of high-level waste. Over the last two years the DOE recommended withholding millions of cleanup dollars until affected states agree to accept lower cleanup standards for high-level waste-standards that would be inadequate to protect important water resources, such as the Snake River Aquifer, the Tuscaloosa Aquifer, and the Columbia River. Additionally, much of DEC's budget does not go to real clean-up work.. The DOE has used the cover of environmental programs to fund billions of dollars of maintenance for the weapons complex. For example, DEC pays for reprocessing at the Savannah River site, even though that activity increases the stockpile of separated plutonium while generating even more highly radioactive liquid wastes.

Congress must ensure adequate funding to meet all health, safety and environmental requirements and to comply with legal mandates. Money for work unrelated to cleanup, such as reprocessing, should be stripped from the budget.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Defense Environmental Cleanup Program - \$6.3 billion

*An increase of \$1 billion over the FY 08 enacted level of \$5.3 billion*

### **Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup**

Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup appropriation provides funding to complete the safe cleanup and risk reduction of the environmental legacy at sites contaminated as a result of civilian nuclear research and fuel production/reprocessing activities. Specifically, money from this account is spent on four programs: (1) Gaseous Diffusion Plants; (2) Fast Flux Test Reactor Facility Decontamination and Decommissioning; (3) West Valley Demonstration Project; and (4) Small Sites including the Argonne National Laboratory, Atlas (Moab) Site, Brookhaven National Laboratory, Closure Sites Administration and Program Support, Energy Technology Engineering Center, Idaho National Laboratory, Inhalation Toxicology Laboratory, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Laboratory for Energy-Related Health Research, Oakland Sites, and Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. As the cleanup of these sites progresses, the risk and hazard to human health and the environment is greatly reduced.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup Program - \$296.3 million

*An increase of \$114.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$182.3 million*

### **Loan Guarantee Authority**

In the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2008, Congress directed the DOE to provide loan guarantees to the energy industry for nuclear power, coal, and renewables, including transmission and distribution. In FY 2008 and FY 2009, Congress authorized \$18.5 billion to guarantee the private debt component of new nuclear reactors (each will cost more than \$7 billion), another \$2 billion for a new centrifuge enrichment technology of uncertain

# DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

## OFFICE OF ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND RENEWABLE ENERGY

reliability at commercial scale, and \$10 billion for: (1) renewables; (2) energy efficient systems and manufacturing; (3) distributed energy generation; and (4) transmission and distribution. Given that the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) is predicting a default rate of 50 percent for new reactors, the nuclear loan guarantees represent a particularly huge liability for U.S. taxpayers. All of these authorizations will expire at the end of FY 2009.

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has made it clear that DOE is not ready to give out any loan guarantees. Congress should refrain from extending or increasing current authorizations until an independent review determines that DOE is able to effectively manage the program. DOE needs to show that it has a sound, comprehensive and transparent methodology for determining subsidy and administrative costs and assure that fees to loan guarantee recipients reflect these costs. DOE also needs to amend the application guidance to provide the necessary detail to accurately assess project feasibility, including the financial risk factors associated with applications from asset-less Limited Liability Corporations. All loan guarantees should pass a rigorous and impartial cost-effectiveness test.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Nuclear Power Facilities and “Front-End Activities” - \$0

*A decrease of \$20.5 billion under the FY 08 authorized level of \$20.5 billion*

Coal-Based Power Generation & Industrial Gasification Activities - \$0

*A decrease of \$6.0 billion under the FY 08 authorized level of \$6.0 billion*

Advanced Coal Gasification - \$0

*A decrease of \$2.0 billion under the FY 08 authorized level of \$2.0 billion*

Renewables and Efficiency - \$0

*A decrease of \$10.0 billion under the FY 08 authorized level of \$10.0 billion*

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

USAID

# DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

## FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

### **Flood Mitigation Assistance Program**

Although few real reforms to flood plain management were implemented after the Great Midwest Flood of 1993, one positive change was the creation of the Flood Mitigation Assistance Program (FMA). Enacted as part of the 1994 Flood Insurance Reform Act, this program aims to reduce or eliminate insurance claims under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Funding through this program is targeted at nonstructural pre-disaster flood reduction solutions that save lives and taxpayer money, including elevation, acquisition, and relocation of NFIP-insured structures. The program can also assist communities through technical assistance and aiding them in the updating of Flood Mitigation Plans. Funding is provided at a 75% federal cost share; participating communities must be NFIP-participating communities.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Flood Mitigation Assistance Program - \$35.0 million

*An increase of \$1.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$34.0 million*

### **Hazard Mitigation Grant Program**

The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) provides grants to state and local governments, or communities on behalf of individuals, after a presidential disaster declaration in the wake of a significant disaster to implement long-term hazard mitigation measures. The HMGP enables mitigation measures to reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and to enable mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery from a disaster. Projects are required to provide long-term and cost-effective solutions to a problem. Funding is provided at a 75% federal cost share. Funds under this program are a primary source of financing for voluntary buy-outs of flood-prone properties—particularly repetitive loss properties—and relocations out of the floodplain to higher ground. To date the program has provided more than \$1.1 billion in mitigation funding for projects including acquisition and relocation of structures from hazard-prone areas, drainage improvement projects, and elevation of flood-prone structures.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Hazard Mitigation Grant Program - 15% of funding should be dedicated to relocating families and communities out of hazardous locations.

### **National Dam Safety Program**

There are more than 78,000 dams in the United States, many of which were built more than 50 years ago and are reaching the end of their expected lifespan. The National Dam Safety Program was established to improve safety and security around dams. About 95% of the nation's dams are monitored and inspected by state dam safety officials, including over 10,000 high hazard dams (meaning that failure will likely result in loss of life) and over 3,000 dams that are considered "unsafe." The national program provides funding to states to run their regulatory program, research funding to enhance technical expertise, and training sessions for dam safety inspectors. Often the costs of maintaining safe dams outweigh the benefits the dams provide and communities will choose to remove their obsolete dams. Additionally, the National Dam Safety Program is charged with educating the public, including dam owners, about their responsibility to maintain safe dams and therefore keep their communities out of harm's way.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Dam Safety Program - \$11.7 million

*An increase of \$6.8 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$5.9 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

## FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

### **Repetitive Flood Claims & Severe Repetitive Loss Program**

The Repetitive Flood Claims (RFC) grant program and the Severe Repetitive Loss Program (SRL) were established in 2004 to reduce or eliminate recurring flood insurance claims from NFIP-insured structures. The Repetitive Flood Claims program serves as a backstop for communities that cannot raise the non-Federal cost-share requirement of the Flood Mitigation Assistance program. Properties qualifying for the SRL program are structures with: four or more flood insurance claims payments that each exceeded \$5,000, with at least two of those payments occurring in a 10-year period, and with the total claims paid exceeding \$20,000 or two or more flood insurance claims payments that together exceeded the value of the property. Under these programs, priority has been given to cost-saving approaches such as relocating flood-prone structures and deed-restricting vacated land for open space uses in perpetuity.

#### **FY 10 Funding Recommendation:**

Repetitive Flood Claims - \$20.0 million

Severe Repetitive Loss Program - \$80.0 million

*(The Repetitive Flood Claims program and the Severe Repetitive Loss program are included in larger program requests and do not have separate line requests in the President's Budget.)*

### **National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund**

Poorly planned floodplain development has put countless people in danger and eroded natural flood protections. The Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program (PDM), run by FEMA and administered by each state, helps communities dramatically reduce disruption and loss caused by floods and other natural disasters. The goal of the program is to reduce risks to people and structures, thereby minimizing reliance on federal relief in the event of a catastrophe. Under the program, priority should be given to those projects that provide funding for relocation and acquisition of flood-prone properties to move communities out of harm's way. Communities applying for PDM funding for the purpose of flood damage mitigation must be participating members of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund & Grant Programs - \$150.0 million

*An increase of \$36.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$114.0 million*

### **Flood Hazard Identification Map Modernization**

Obsolete, almost antiquated, maps pose one of the greatest challenges to protecting communities from repeated flooding and maintaining solvency of the National Flood Insurance Program. Recently, FEMA has been engaged in a multiyear initiative to modernize the Nation's flood hazard identification maps in cooperation with local, regional, or State agencies. These maps are critical as they are used to assign flood insurance rates. They are also now widely recognized as an essential tool for keeping people out of harms way and management of natural resources.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Map Modernization - \$220 million

*Same as the FY 08 enacted level*

# DEPARTMENT OF STATE

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS and PROGRAMS (IO&P)

### **International Conservation Programs**

The U.S. State Department's International Conservation Programs (IO&P) support cooperative approaches to conservation challenges and provide technical expertise to help developing countries build capacity for conservation and sustainable natural resource management. Modest U.S. contributions often leverage millions of dollars in project co-funding.

Through these programs, the U.S. facilitates the exchange of information and new environmental technologies between countries. It also provides support for a number of important cooperative initiatives. These include the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), which monitors and regulates the international trade in threatened and endangered species; the World Conservation Union (IUCN), which is the foremost scientific forum for the advancement of conservation and sustainable development objectives; the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, which acts as the global framework for action to conserve and sustainably manage wetland resources; the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), which brings together producing and consuming countries of tropical timber to address all aspects of the tropical timber economy, including market transparency and sustainable management; and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), which addresses the fundamental causes of famine and food insecurity by bringing government representatives, local communities, and NGOs into more effective partnerships and encouraging the sharing of information and new technology.

Department of State IO&P also provides funding for the UN Environment Programme and the World Heritage Convention, both of which support nature conservation in developing countries.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

International Conservation Programs - \$12.0 million

*An increase of 5.45 million over the FY 08 enacted level of 6.55 million*

### **Global Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation (The Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005)**

President Bush signed the "Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005" in December 2005. This was a bipartisan success, supported by unanimous consent in Senate and by an overwhelming majority in the House. The Act aims to address the most serious environmental health challenge on the planet—lack of access to safe water for more than 1 billion people and lack of sanitation for over 2 billion people in the developing world. The Act also recognizes that meeting human needs for safe drinking water in a sustainable way is an essential component of protecting watersheds and freshwater biodiversity, and that improper disposal of human waste by more than one-third of the world's population threatens surface and ground water quality. Furthermore, there is growing recognition that changes in climate will exacerbate the existing safe water crisis, and this Act represents a way for the United States to show leadership on assisting developing countries in adapting to these changes.

It was not until FY 08 that specific monies were appropriated to implement this Act. However, there is concern that the State Department in their 2008 Report to Congress may double count certain monies and include monies that do not further the intent of the Act, in order to exaggerate the Administration's compliance with the Act. Therefore, greater accountability and transparency should be provided in this year's Report to Congress.

Given the gravity of the safe water and sanitation crises, \$500 million per year should be directed toward the USAID Development Assistance Account to effectively implement the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act, to help extend water, sanitation, and hygiene to an average of 10 million people per year between 2008 and 2015.

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**  
**INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS and PROGRAMS (IO&P)**

**FY 10 Recommendation:**

Funding to implement the Senator Paul Simon Water for the Poor Act of 2005 - \$500 million

*An increase of \$200 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$300 million*

# U.S. AGENCY for INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID)

## **Biodiversity Conservation Programs**

USAID is the single largest U.S. government contributor to biodiversity conservation in developing countries. For more than 20 years, the USAID Biodiversity Conservation program, implemented through U.S. missions with guidance from headquarters, has provided expertise on the development and conservation needs of local communities around the world. The bedrock and driving force behind the program are the highly effective partnerships forged by USAID professionals, foreign governments, local communities, conservation organizations and the private sector.

USAID programs are responsible for protecting some of the largest and most threatened natural landscapes on the planet, including South America's Amazon Basin, central Africa's Congo Basin, Southeast Asia's Coral Triangle and Afghanistan's Hindu Kush. These regions support globally important biodiversity and endangered wildlife populations and are home to millions of people, often impoverished, who depend on local natural resources for survival. Directing foreign assistance to conservation projects in these priority areas serves the pressing needs of local communities while also addressing larger foreign policy objectives. USAID's Biodiversity Conservation Programs are not only securing environmental resources, ensuring clean water and combating global warming; they are also reducing poverty, promoting global health, sustaining local livelihoods and helping to build stable and democratic societies. USAID's investments in international conservation have a solid track record of delivering both development and conservation results on multiple levels. They also consistently leverage significant additional support from donors around the world.

The pressures on natural resources are rapidly intensifying due to expanding populations, increasing consumption habits and the pervasive and growing effects of climate change. U.S. commitments to international conservation will need to rise accordingly if we are to address these challenges effectively. By greatly expanding U.S. support for these combined efforts, we can help countries in the developing world meet the needs of tomorrow without destroying the vital natural resources upon which their long-term growth and our planet's future both depend.

As part of the FY 2009 funding recommendation, we request that \$25 million in new funding be directed toward implementation of the environment chapter and forest governance annex under the recently enacted U.S.-Peru Free Trade Agreement.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Biodiversity Conservation Programs - \$275.0 million

*An increase of \$80.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$195.0 million*

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

### **National Landscape Conservation System**

The Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) 26 million acres of congressionally and presidentially designated lands and waters, including National Monuments and National Scenic Trails, contain some of the last places where one can experience the history and wild beauty of the West. The BLM's Conservation System provides critical wildlife habitat, clean water, wilderness, innumerable recreational opportunities and open space near fast-growing cities. It also provides countless research opportunities because of its astounding cultural, historic, and paleontological resources, the largest and most important collection managed by any federal land agency.

Since the Conservation System's inception in 2000, insufficient funding has undermined the BLM's ability to steward these lands effectively, and resources are suffering from neglect and abuse. Pressures include growing numbers of visitors, looting of archaeological sites and reckless off-road vehicle use. The BLM struggles to complete essential resource protection work, such as signing trails, closing illegal and unnecessary roads, and inventorying and protecting cultural sites. Since the Conservation System's inception, funding has averaged only \$57.3 million—a scant \$2.20 per acre. The System has grown and pressures have increased while the System's budget has failed to even keep up with inflation and uncontrollable cost increases. Funding of \$75 million in FY 2010 would help prevent additional damage to the System's resources and ensure visitor safety. This funding level, while insufficient to ensure consistent resource protection and visitor management, would provide critical resources for BLM to hire essential law enforcement rangers, monitor natural and recreational resources, expand volunteer programs to better take advantage of in-kind donations, educate visitors, and undertake needed habitat restoration projects.

### *Budget Clarity for the Conservation System*

In FY 2008, the Bush administration recognized the overdue need for transparency and accountability in the System's budget by creating dedicated accounts for the System's National Monuments and National Conservation Areas. These new subactivities will allow the BLM to better plan for management of those designations and track how those monies are spent. The next administration must finish the job of ensuring budget clarity for all System units by creating dedicated accounts for the System's other units that lack this attention: National Scenic and Historic Trails and Wild and Scenic Rivers.

### **FY 10 Recommendation**

National Landscape Conservation System - \$75.0 million and full budget transparency  
*An increase of \$19.7 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$55.3 million*

### **Wildlife, Fisheries and Threatened and Endangered Species Management**

BLM manages more land, and more wildlife and fish habitat, than any other federal agency including half of the remaining habitat for the imperiled sage grouse and almost 15 million acres of prairie grasslands vital to many declining grassland dependent species. The diverse habitat managed by BLM supports over 3,000 species of wildlife, more than 300 federally proposed or listed species, and more than 1300 sensitive plant species. The Wildlife and Fisheries Management (WFM) and the Threatened and Endangered Species Management (TESM) programs fund inventory and monitoring, habitat restoration, endangered species recovery, and other proactive conservation activities vital to maintaining healthy, functioning ecosystems and fish, wildlife, and plant populations.

Inappropriately, the WFM program and TESSM program have been forced to pay for the compliance activities of BLM's energy, grazing and other non-wildlife related programs. Traditionally, funding for compliance work has come from benefiting programs, however in recent years, at least 30 percent of WFM and TESSM resources have

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

been routinely diverted to other programs, eroding their ability to conduct proactive species and habitat conservation activities and efforts to recover listed species. While this practice has undergone increased scrutiny in the last two years, no information has emerged to suggest that the situation has been rectified. This diversion of funding must be stopped, or additional funding provided to these two programs to make up for the deficiency.

Even if the diversion were halted, however, the meager funding still would not be adequate to the task at hand. The BLM has only one biologist per 591,000 acres of land, tens of millions of dollars are needed for fish passage restoration, and estimated costs for recovery of threatened and endangered species on BLM lands is \$300 million annually over the next five years. Moreover, the status of the wide-ranging declining sage grouse is of great concern throughout the West, and significant additional resources will be needed for its protection. Finally, BLM already is seeing changes out on the ground from climate change and must have the ability to address its impacts on wildlife and habitat. WFM and TESM will need additional funding in future years to address these and other crucial needs. Increases recommended for FY 2010 should be directed to recovery of threatened and endangered species, additional staff, monitoring and habitat restoration for species at risk, restoration of fish passages, inventory and improvements for wetlands, lakes and streams, fixed costs, and other critical needs.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Wildlife and Fisheries Management - \$66.1 million

*An increase of \$21.8 million over the FY 08 level of \$44.3 million*

Threatened and Endangered Species Management - \$33.2 million

*An increase of \$10.9 million over the FY 08 level of \$22.3 million*

### **Challenge Cost Share**

The BLM's Challenge Cost Share (CCS) program allows the BLM to partner with state and local governments, private individuals and companies and nongovernmental organizations to restore habitat, monitor species, maintain archeological sites, and repair trails, along with other activities. The program, which requires a dollar for dollar match, averages a two-to-one match-and for some projects, upwards of three to one match-providing tremendous leverage of federal funds. Given the ongoing diversion of resources from the wildlife programs, much of the proactive conservation work being accomplished in field offices is through CCS partnerships. Annually, the agency turns away on average \$20 million of potential projects that could be leveraged into \$60 million for the total program. Several years ago, when the various individual BLM challenge cost share programs were combined to establish the single current program that serves multiple BLM needs, 70 percent of the funding came from the wildlife challenge cost share, however in recent years, the portion devoted to wildlife has eroded to the point that, in 2009, only 34 percent of the funding is projected to go to wildlife projects. Increasing the CCS program by \$20 million and directing the increase to wildlife would result in an additional \$60 million on the ground investment for wildlife and address gaping needs for projects relating to sage grouse conservation, off-highway vehicle management, invasive species control, and, in the near future, for addressing impacts from climate change.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Challenge Cost Share - \$29.3 million

*An increase of \$20.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$9.3 million*

### **Plant Conservation**

BLM lands are crucial to the conservation of more than 1300 sensitive plant species, yet the agency currently has no specific appropriation for plants that are rare but not listed under the Endangered Species Act. Some funding

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

from the Wildlife and Fisheries account currently is used for this purpose. In addition, as part of the Burned Area Rehabilitation account, the BLM has been designating \$4-5 million annually to the Native Plant Materials Development program. Providing native seeds and seedlings for restoration projects after wildfires and other disturbances is vital to preventing the colonization of invasive plant species that degrade habitat and ecosystem functioning, and ultimately cost more to control than preventive measures. The large-scale development of native seed stock is still in its infancy, and often federal agencies are not able to acquire enough plant materials to meet their demands. Moreover, the ability to collect and store native seed stock in the face of the looming climate change threat is more important than ever before—these precious resources will be a crucial tool in ecosystem restoration.

Given the importance of these plant related programs, it has become increasingly apparent that a specific new budget activity or subactivity is needed for plant conservation in the Management of Lands and Resources account that would encompass both its ongoing efforts to conserve rare plants on BLM lands as well as a comprehensive Native Plants Materials Development program. It is estimated that the annual funding need for the Native Plant Materials Development program would be \$25 million over the next 10-15 years, along with one time construction funding of \$6 million for seed storage facilities, and for an ongoing rare plant program, approximately \$15 million annually. The FY 10 recommendation is a first step in reaching these levels.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Plant Conservation - \$5.0 million

*A new program that would increase the overall Department of Interior budget by \$5.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level*

Native Plant Materials Development - \$15.0 million for programmatic needs plus one time construction funding of \$6 million

*An increase of \$16.4 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$4.6 million for Native Plant Materials Development*

### **Resource Management Planning**

Given the enormous land management challenges of the coming decades—including the complex natural resource dilemmas associated with climate change (i.e. species adaptation, extreme variability in natural processes)—it is imperative to support science-based planning, analysis and decision-making processes for the BLM. Well constructed BLM Resource Management Plans (RMP) and assurances for RMP implementation, including inventory, monitoring and evaluation, support high-quality, legitimate, effective and efficient resource management decisions.

BLM RMPs need to be funded at sufficient levels such that impacts associated with multiple-use activities as well as climate change can be fully assessed. This needs to occur at relevant spatial scales, including landscapes, to assess linkages between habitats and analyze cumulative effects across agency boundaries, and on multiple levels of biological organization (e.g. ecosystems and wildlife populations).

Consistent implementation of science-based analysis and decision-making also requires dedicated funding for monitoring and science-based adaptive management processes. The BLM RMP program must increase its capacity to respond to changing conditions, by utilizing key inventory, monitoring, evaluation, maintenance and amendment processes, which take on increasing importance given the increasing diversity of values associated with BLM management processes, and critical biophysical changes associated with climate change.

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

In particular, development of the Assessment, Inventory and Monitoring (AIM) strategy is critical given the significant socio-ecological challenges of 21<sup>st</sup> century land management. According to the BLM, the intent of the AIM strategy is to create efficiencies in collection, analysis and reporting of resource conditions on BLM lands. As a cross-cutting program, the AIM strategy is designed to improve interaction between RMP development and implementation and the BLM Wildlife Program. If done right, and provided with sufficient direction and resources, the AIM program has the potential to ensure a “proactive and effective wildlife program” that, through efficient operation, can “preclude the need to list species under the Endangered Species Act.”

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Resource Management Planning - \$52.5 million

*An increase of \$5.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$47.5 million*

### **Landscape Scale Habitat Conservation**

Starting in 2007, the President’s budget included funding for a new cross-cutting “Healthy Lands Initiative” (HLI) for BLM and, to a lesser extent, other Department of the Interior agencies that ostensibly was to be primarily targeted to protecting wildlife and restoring habitat in energy interface areas. While extensive restoration will be needed to reverse the damaging impacts of massive recent energy development on BLM lands, conservation organizations had concerns about the HLI proposal for various reasons, including: the lack of detail on how the money would be spent; the inclusion of limited geographical areas in the program; and the relatively small amount of funding proposed given that energy development and other extractive industries on BLM land were expected to generate \$4.8 billion in 2008 and \$6.1 billion in 2009—more of that money should be used for mitigation activities. Proposals to revamp the current misguided energy policies would be far more effective in conserving wildlife and habitat than HLI as it was originally proposed.

However, it also is true that the BLM, and potentially all of the federal land management agencies, would significantly benefit from a larger, institutionalized cross-cutting program with a defined structure that gives the agency the capability to address large-scale regional planning and conservation efforts at the landscape level. Rather than being a reactive effort to mitigate the administration’s disastrous energy policies on BLM lands, such a program should be proactive, strategic, and forward looking to aid the agency in properly managing the unique sagebrush, grassland and other ecosystems it administers; conserving wide ranging species such as the sage grouse; and preparing to meet the threat of global warming which already is a major cause in the spread of noxious exotic weeds, catastrophic wildfires, severe drought, and desertification on BLM lands. A cross-cutting effort that encompasses all of the federal land management agencies could provide the mechanism to help address the significant ecological changes that are occurring across whole landscapes.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Landscape Scale Habitat Conservation - \$30.0 million

*An increase of \$25.0 million over the FY 08 HLI enacted level of \$5.0 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

### **Savage Rapids Dam Removal and Pump Replacement**

The Savage Rapids Dam, built in 1921, is the single largest killer of salmon on the Rogue River in Oregon, including coho salmon, which are listed as threatened under the federal Endangered Species Act. Removing Savage Rapids dam will provide an enormous boost to the Rogue River's imperiled salmon and steelhead populations. In July 2001, the U.S. District Court in Oregon issued a consent decree that calls for the dam to be removed and a pumping system to be installed to better serve the Grants Pass Irrigation District's water diversion needs. Construction on the pumping system is almost complete and funds need to be appropriated to remove the dam.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Savage Rapids Dam Removal and Pump Replacement - \$10.0 million  
*A decrease of \$4.8 million from the FY 08 enacted level of \$14.8 million*

### **Yakima River Basin Enhancement Project**

The Yakima River Basin is home to Washington's largest Native American tribe and contains one of the largest Bureau of Reclamation projects in the West. The various Reclamation projects in the basin have depleted and polluted river flows, and water rights conflicts in this basin are legendary. Partly as a result, Yakima River bull trout and steelhead are now listed under the Endangered Species Act. Phase II of The Yakima River Basin Water Enhancement Project, authorized by Congress in 1994, was designed to ameliorate these conditions for both fish and farmers. It aims to restore the river and make better use of the existing water supplies. This legislation was a compromise agreed to by the basin's disparate stakeholders, and the program it created is a model for water conservation and water rights acquisition.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Yakima River Enhancement Project - \$10.0 million  
*An increase of \$1.7 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$8.3 million*

### **Deschutes Resources Conservancy**

The Deschutes River Conservancy (DRC) is focused on restoring streamflow and improving water quality in the Deschutes Basin of Central Oregon. The DRC accomplishes these goals through water conservation projects, water leasing projects, water purchases, and habitat restoration projects. Projects are done in close collaboration with numerous stakeholders, including farmers, recreation enthusiasts, ranchers, conservationists, and tribal communities. The DRC brings together groups working to restore the Deschutes River through its restoration grants program, enterprise programs creating markets for environmental services, and community development work aimed at developing a shared vision for basinwide restoration. Past federal funds appropriated for the Deschutes Ecosystem Restoration Project have been leveraged more than three-to-one with non-federal and in-kind contributions by the DRC.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Deschutes Resources Conservancy - \$750,000  
*An increase of \$321,000 over the FY 08 enacted level of \$429,000*

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

### **California-Federal Bay Delta Program**

The California-Federal Bay Delta Program (CalFed) is a partnership between federal and California agencies to provide a balanced, collaborative approach to the water resource demands on the San Francisco Bay and San Pablo Bay watersheds. The Ecosystem Restoration and Watershed program within CalFed works to restore and improve wildlife habitat through out the watershed, improve fish passage, integrate flood control and ecosystem restoration, and implement specific watershed restoration projects in conjunction with watershed plans. The Ecosystem Restoration program has funded over 460 projects restoring 100,000 acres of fish habitat, screening 68 water intake points and initiating 23 comprehensive watershed programs. The Watersheds Program has awarded 116 grants totaling about \$50 million to community-based organizations for projects addressing watershed health, drinking water quality, non-point sources of pollution and watershed protection.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

CalFed Ecosystem Restoration and Watershed Program - \$42.0 million  
*An increase of \$2.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$40.0 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

### **Endangered Species Program**

For more than 30 years, the Endangered Species Act has helped prevent the extinction of our nation's wildlife treasures including beloved symbols of America such as the bald eagle, the Florida manatee and the California condor. Only nine of the more than 1900 plants and animals currently protected by the act worldwide have been declared extinct, an astonishing success rate. The Endangered Species Act provides added benefits to people by maintaining healthy natural systems that provide us with clean air and water, food, medicines and other products that we all need to live healthy lives. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to be good stewards of the environment and leave behind a legacy of protecting endangered species and the special places they call home.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (the Service or FWS) is responsible for managing the Endangered Species program through four main accounts: Candidate Conservation, Listing, Consultation, and Recovery. The Endangered Species Act's outstanding successes have been achieved despite severe and chronic funding shortfalls that plague the Service's program. Staff levels fall at least 30 percent below what is needed to properly implement the program. The Listing account, which supports the protection of new plants and animals under the Endangered Species Act and designation of their critical habitat, had a backlog of \$160 million, far in excess of available funding, with 280 candidates awaiting proposal for protection, as of early 2008. Addressing the listing backlog will require increasing funding well over current levels, as well as more efficient use of funds, given that the Service currently lists far fewer species per dollar today than in 2000. Despite the staff shortage, estimates are that more than 90% of the insufficient recovery funding goes to salaries leaving almost nothing for projects to facilitate recovery actions. The number of projects reviewed under the consultation program has increased dramatically, from 40,000 in 1999 to 67,000 in 2006. The development and implementation of Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs), intended to allow non-federal activities to proceed while still protecting listed plants and animals, continues to grow, with funding critically needed to help ensure timely and effective development and monitoring of nearly 600 existing and over 300 HCPs under development. In addition, the Service must begin to take into account the staggering impacts of climate change in all aspects of the Endangered Species program. To adequately implement the endangered species program funding must gradually increase for the four main accounts to at least \$305.8 million by 2013, an increase of \$155.3 million over FY 08.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Endangered Species program - \$217.0 million  
    \$15.0 million for Candidate Conservation  
    \$32.0 million for Listing  
    \$75.0 million for Consultation  
    \$95.0 million for Recovery

*An increase of \$66.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$150.5 million*

### **National Wildlife Refuge System**

The National Wildlife Refuge System is our nation's only public lands system dedicated to wildlife conservation. The Refuge System, with its 548 refuges on nearly 100 million acres across the country, is the key to protecting our nation's wildlife and ensuring that there are lands where wildlife protection is a priority. There is a refuge in every state and within an hour's drive of most American cities. In addition, our national wildlife refuges serve as economic engines for many local communities, visited by nearly 40 million people each year. The Fish and Wildlife Service estimates that, in 2006 alone, visitors generated nearly \$1.7 billion for local economies supporting almost 27,000 private sector jobs and producing about \$543 million in employment income.

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Despite its crucial role in conserving our nation's wildlife heritage, the Refuge System has been crippled for years by severe funding shortfalls. The most recent information indicates that the operations and maintenance backlog totals \$3.5 billion. Since 2004, annual appropriations have consistently failed to keep pace with the more than \$15 million annual increase needed to address rising fixed costs, pushing the Refuge System to a crisis point. As a result, the Fish and Wildlife Service announced plans for a massive downsizing with more than 10 percent of a planned 20 percent loss in staff already eliminated. If the restructuring were implemented, refuge visitors would find roads and visitor centers closed, viewing platforms and trails in disrepair, increased crime due to scarcity of law enforcement officers, and biological, education, hunting and fishing programs eliminated. The National Wildlife Refuge System is a unique and irreplaceable treasure and should not be forced to face such a choice. Moreover, in the coming years, the Refuge System will become even more important as our nation fights to protect our wildlife from the ravages of global warming.

The final FY 2008 Interior appropriations bill provided a desperately needed infusion of funding that thus far has provided the FWS with breathing room to avert the most damaging of the restructuring measures for the time being. However, significant funding increases are needed in the coming years to eliminate the need for restructuring and to ensure that the Refuge System envisioned in the landmark bipartisan 1997 National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act will be realized. The Cooperative Alliance for Refuge Enhancement (CARE), a diverse coalition of 22 conservation, recreation and scientific organizations representing a national constituency of 14 million Americans, recently updated its long-term funding recommendations with a focus on addressing the crisis facing the Refuge System and providing it with the resources it needs to meet its mission in the coming years. This carefully researched analysis, *"Restoring America's Wildlife Refuges 2008: A Plan to Solve the Refuge System Funding Crisis"*, found that the annual operations and maintenance budget for refuges should total at least \$765 million, a conservative request that provides funding for operations and routine maintenance but still does not address the full backlog. Given the current budget constraints, CARE is recommending that this level be reached by FY 2013. In addition, the Refuge System suffered massive damage in 2008 from Hurricanes Gustav, Hannah, and Ike and the flooding in the Midwest. Initial estimates found almost \$300 million in impacts, almost equal to three quarters of the System's current yearly budget. While the Consolidated Security, Disaster Assistance, and Continuing Appropriations Act of 2009 provided a first infusion of \$75 million to address the effects of these natural disasters, additional emergency funding will be needed.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Wildlife Refuge System - \$514.0 million

*An increase of \$79.9 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$434.1 million*

### **Migratory Bird Management**

Migratory birds are integral to healthy natural systems in many ways, including as predators, prey, seed dispersers and pollinators, and are actively appreciated and enjoyed by millions of people across the country. In 2006 alone, 71 million U.S. residents spent more than \$45 billion to watch wildlife and the majority of these, 47.7 million people or 67 percent, observed birds. Yet despite their vital importance to our nation, about 25 percent of our nation's migratory bird species are in serious need of conservation to assure their long-term survival. As the global warming crisis worsens, increasing numbers of bird species, along with their habitats, will become vulnerable.

The FWS Migratory Bird Management program is multi-faceted and encompasses survey and monitoring, "Urban Treaty" partnerships with cities to conserve birds, management of permits and hunting regulations, efforts on international treaties, habitat restoration, coordination of work to reduce direct bird mortalities, and implementation of the North American Waterfowl Management Plan as well as other efforts to conserve bird habitat through the

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Joint Ventures and Federal Duck Stamp programs. In an effort to make more demonstrable progress in on-the-ground conservation to restore bird species to healthy levels, the FWS has developed a list of 139 focal species to receive greater attention in the coming years through development and implementation of specific action plans on each species. Twelve action plans have either been completed or are near completion and the program is committed to completion of a total of 36 plans by the end of FY 2010. The new administration should work to complete plans for at least half of the focal species by the end of its first term. FY 2010 Increases should be directed toward: 1) implementation of completed focal species plans and continued development of plans; 2) inventory and monitoring; 3) Urban Treaties; 4) increased permitting demands under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act; 5) the Joint Ventures program; 6) the Junior Duck Stamp program; and 5) full funding of fixed costs.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Migratory Bird Management - \$61.2 million

*An increase of \$20.8 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$40.4 million*

### **International Affairs**

Conservation of the Earth's wildlife and habitat is a global priority and requires nations to work together cooperatively-wildlife recognizes no political borders. The relative wealth of our country in comparison to desperate situations around the globe means that modest investments of U.S. conservation dollars can reap significant returns when invested in the developing world, in recent years leveraging three dollars for every dollar invested by the U.S. government. The FWS is mandated through numerous statutes and international treaties to support U.S. involvement in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the Convention on Nature Protection and Wildlife Preservation in the Western Hemisphere, and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance. FWS provides scientific justification and implementation of permitting for international endangered species, participates in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), and supports the Western Hemisphere Migratory Species Initiative (WHMSI), which strengthens international communication and cooperation to raise awareness of the ecological, economic and cultural importance of migratory species and encourage measures to conserve them. International Affairs works to meet its responsibilities through its International Conservation and International Wildlife Trade programs.

Through its Wildlife Without Borders (WWB) regional programs, International Conservation supports the preservation of endangered and migratory species and habitat through capacity building, environmental outreach, education, and training. At present, WWB regional programs are focused on Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, China, India, Mexico and Russia and act as an important complement to the project-level efforts funded through the Multinational Species Conservation Funds. Efforts are being considered to broaden the scope and reach of these highly effective programs, including expanding them to more fully address cross-cutting, global threats to wildlife, such as climate change and disease. At the same time, new regional and bilateral partnerships are being explored in West Africa and with countries such as Mongolia, Paraguay and Tanzania.

Funding levels for International Affairs have been meager and are not proportionate to its importance in conserving wildlife around the globe. In the face of emerging and intensifying global threats to wildlife and habitat such as human-wildlife conflict, wildlife disease, and global warming, its funding should be significantly increased and its status elevated in the coming years. The administration and Congress should work together to move International Affairs out of General Operations and establish it as a new budget activity and, by the end of its first term, consolidate all non-regulatory functions of the International Affairs program into an International Institute for Wildlife Conservation. FY 2010 funding increases should be focused on: 1) boosts to the regional Wildlife Without Borders programs; 2) implementation of the Convention for the Conservation of Wetlands of International

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Importance (Ramsar), the Western Hemisphere Migratory Species Initiative, and the Wild Bird Conservation Act; 3) listing and permitting actions to address a backlog of foreign species awaiting Endangered Species Act protection; 4) replacing key Service personnel; and full funding of fixed costs.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

International Affairs program - \$21.0 million

*An increase of \$9.4 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$11.6 million*

### **Office of Law Enforcement**

As our world grows increasingly complex, the protection of wildlife faces escalating criminal threats, including illicit trade, unlawful commercial exploitation, illegal destruction of habitat, and environmental hazards. Growing populations and accompanying development pressure; expansion of international communication, shipping and travel; rising global commerce; and broadly proliferating access to computer technology along with the evolution of the internet and “e-commerce” all combine to create mounting challenges to enforcement of U.S. and international wildlife laws. The U.S. supports one of the largest markets for both legal and illegal wildlife and wildlife products, and intercepted contraband includes caviar, coral, elephant ivory, sea turtle eggs and live birds.

The Office of Law Enforcement (OLE) investigates wildlife crimes, enforces regulation of wildlife trade, helps citizens comply with the law and works with other international and U.S. government entities to carry out its mission. OLE’s wildlife inspectors and special agents, supported by the National Fish and Wildlife Forensics Laboratory and a new wildlife law enforcement data system, have achieved important successes in many arenas, including reduction of illegal harvest and trade in caviar and cases involving wolves, manatees, and endangered migratory birds. Despite these successes, the program is severely understaffed to meet the rapidly proliferating threats and in recent years has been starved of needed personnel and resources, slashing its effectiveness in enforcing both federal wildlife laws and international treaties. Numbers of all-important special agents which should total 261 plunged from a high of 238 in 2002 to 184 in 2008, a 30 year low. While funding increases and specific direction by the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress will bring the agent force up to 210 in early FY 2009, it still falls 19 percent below authorized numbers, and, on average, 14 are lost each year through attrition. The vital port inspection function is far overstretched and the Forensics Laboratory has suffered budget shortfalls over the last eight years. Also, in 2008 Congress passed a groundbreaking law, (P.L.110-246), amending the Lacey Act, to ban international imports of illegally sourced plants and plant products – including illegally logged timber and wood products. This will require a new system of electronic declarations for plant product imports, a database system to monitor these imports, and more staff, including port inspectors.

Increases for FY 2010 should be focused on: 1) the hiring, training and equipping of 24 special agents; 2) 10 additional port inspectors; 3) 12 critically needed scientists for the forensics laboratory; and 4) full funding of fixed costs. In addition, during its first term, the administration, with the support of Congress, should undertake plans to bring the agent force up to its authorized level of 261 and to ensure its maintenance at that level given the yearly loss of 14 through attrition. The OLE also should finalize its proposed user fee increase to help cover costs of the inspection program, add 40 additional inspectors, and develop yet another new fee structure to cover the escalating costs of the program.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Office of Law Enforcement - \$72.8 million

*An increase of \$13.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$59.6 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

### **National Fish Passage Program**

The National Fish Passage Program currently benefits 16 federally endangered and threatened fish species and is helping to prevent numerous other species from being listed as endangered. Since its inception in 1999, working with local, state, tribal, and federal partners, the Fish Passage Program has leveraged federal dollars nearly three-to-one. Through this work, the program has opened more than 3,750 miles of river and restored 69,000 acres of wetlands for fish spawning and rearing habitat. Restoring fish migration enhances entire watersheds and benefits birds and mammals, such as eagles, ospreys, herons, kingfishers, brown bears, otters, and mink. In FY 2008, the Open Rivers Initiative was expanded to supplement the work of the Fish Passage Program by adding \$6 million to its base funding specifically for small barrier removal.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Fish Passage program - \$11.0 million

*An increase of \$0.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$10.8 million*

### **Coastal Program**

Healthy coastal wetlands provide many benefits to wildlife and people by supporting recreation, tourism, and fishing industries. Thousands of acres already have been lost or degraded by commercial and residential development, polluted runoff and waste disposal, shoreline modification, and over-harvesting of resources. The FWS Coastal Program is an effective partnership that brings together FWS scientists, land trusts, biologists, and other conservation partners to protect and restore habitat in coastal regions and coastal rivers. These partnerships allow the Coastal Program's dollars to be matched at least two to one for on-the-ground work. In 2006, the Coastal Program completed 242 projects in 19 states, restored 21,262 acres of wetlands and 24 miles of riverine habitat.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Coastal program - \$15.0 million

*An increase of \$1.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$14.0 million*

### **National Fish Habitat Initiative**

The goal of the National Fish Habitat Initiative is to harness the expertise of existing efforts to create a coordinated approach to improving fishery habitat. The FWS has been the lead federal agency in the initiative, but it is a public/private partnership that includes other federal agencies (NOAA, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, USDA, and other DOI agencies), state and local governments, and conservation groups. This combined force will leverage federal dollars with both private and non-profit resources in order to maximize funding for fish habitat conservation projects across the nation. The initiative partners have created an 'action plan' in 2006 that will foster geographically focused, locally driven, and scientifically based partnerships to protect, restore, and enhance aquatic habitats. The plan is non-regulatory and will succeed only through its collaborative nature.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Fish Habitat Initiative - \$5.0 million

*Same as the FY 08 enacted level*

### **State and Tribal Wildlife Grants Program**

This important program gives states and Indian tribes funding to develop and implement comprehensive conservation plans to protect declining wildlife and habitats before protection under the Endangered Species Act is

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

necessary. More than 1300 U.S. plants and animals currently are under the act's protection. Without proactive efforts to reverse declines, scientists estimate that an additional estimated 10,000 wildlife and plant species are also at risk. The State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program is particularly important to future efforts to prevent habitat loss. To ensure program implementation would be strategic and cost-effective, states were required to develop State Wildlife Action Plans which now have been completed and are being implemented. As documented in the plans, most wildlife is declining in the U.S. because of habitat loss, fragmentation, and degradation. As the effects of global warming grow, this program and its action plans will be on the front line of States' and Tribes' efforts to help wildlife and habitat adapt to and survive its impacts. The State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program has emerged through the work of a broad national bipartisan wildlife coalition called Teaming With Wildlife which includes more than 5,700 organizations.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

State and Tribal Wildlife Grants program - \$85.0 million

*An increase of \$11.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$73.8 million*

### **Cooperative Endangered Species Fund**

Non-federal lands are crucial to the conservation of rare species. At least 65 percent of federally listed plants and animals are found on non-federal lands, with many absolutely dependent upon these lands for their survival. The Cooperative Endangered Species Fund provides grants to states for wildlife and habitat conservation activities on non-federal lands for listed and candidate species. Without the proposed increases, states will fall further behind in their ability to independently work to protect imperiled species. Crucial conservation activities funded by these grants include: research, species status surveys, habitat restoration, captive propagation and reintroduction, planning assistance, and land acquisition by states for Habitat Conservation Plans and recovery. Twenty-three states and one territory received funding under this program in 2008 to benefit species ranging from butterflies to Canada lynx. To adequately fund state endangered species conservation activities, it is critical to gradually increase funding to at least \$170 million annually by FY 2013, which includes an annual level of \$30 million for conservation grants to states.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Cooperative Endangered Species Fund - \$110.0 million, including \$20.0 million for conservation grants to states

*An increase of \$36.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$73.8 million*

### **Incentives: Landowner Incentive and Private Stewardship Grants, Tax Incentives**

Endangered and other at-risk wildlife depend upon private lands for their survival. The help of private landowners is essential for the conservation of these species. Landowner Incentive Grants and Private Stewardship Grants provide funding for voluntary conservation actions taken by landowners to conserve plants and animals at risk on private lands. The Landowner Incentive program awards competitive grants to state and tribal conservation agencies for their work with private landowners and tribal lands, while the Private Stewardship program allows the Fish and Wildlife Service to provide funding directly to individuals and groups implementing private land conservation actions. In 2007, funding was awarded to efforts in 46 states. The need for these programs far outstrips available funding-the amount requested for worthy projects on average totals two to three times the yearly available funding. Unfortunately, neither program has been funded in the last two years due to budget constraints; these important programs should be re-started in FY 2010. The amount recommended for FY 2010 is the FY 2007 enacted level. To support private landowners in their voluntary conservation efforts, a gradual increase to \$77 million is needed by FY 2013 in these two incentive programs.

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

In addition, the 110<sup>th</sup> Congress enacted some provisions of the Endangered Species Recovery Act as part of the 2008 Farm Bill that allow landowners to deduct the cost of measures taken to implement species recovery plans on their property. Additional staff and funding should be provided for FWS to assist private landowners in making full use of these benefits.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Landowner Incentive and Private Stewardship programs - \$31.0 million

\$23.7 million for Landowner Incentive

\$7.3 million for Private Stewardship

*An increase of \$31.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$0*

*Additional increases for implementation of the Endangered Species Recovery Act*

### **Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program**

With two-thirds of America's land privately owned, private landowners play an important role in maintaining diverse ecosystems and wildlife for future generations. Through the voluntary Partners for Fish and Wildlife program, FWS provides financial and technical assistance to landowners to restore degraded habitat on their property. The need for Partners for Fish and Wildlife is great. Our nation has lost approximately 70 percent of the nation's streamside habitat, 53 percent of wetlands in the continental United States, and 90 percent of the tallgrass prairie in the Midwest and Great Plains. Not only has important habitat for fish and wildlife been lost, but so has the multitude of other essential functions these habitats provide – reduced floods, decreased sediment and nutrient loads, and protection and improvement of water quality. In 2006, the Partners Program completed 2100 projects in 45 states, restored 149,935 acres of wetlands and 320 miles of riverine habitat.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Partners for Fish and Wildlife program - \$50.0 million

*Same as the FY 08 enacted level*

### **Multinational Species Conservation Fund (MSCF)**

The Multinational Species Conservation Fund has consistently enjoyed strong and broad-based support that far exceeds its very modest resources, described by the Congressional Research Service as “a relatively small program that has generated enormous constituent interest, chiefly concerning the funding levels.” Since the African Elephant Conservation Fund was established by Congress in 1990, four additional funds to help conserve Asian elephants, rhinos/tigers, great apes and marine turtles have been authorized. Collectively, they comprise the MSCF, supporting conservation of charismatic mega-fauna in their natural surroundings through law enforcement, capacity building, mitigation of human-animal conflicts, habitat conservation, surveys and monitoring of populations, and public outreach and education programs. Over the past 18 years, the Funds have had a consistently successful track record, providing more than \$52 million in conservation assistance and leveraging more than \$128 million in partner contributions.

However, there is an urgent need for additional funding. Tiger populations in India have fallen from an estimated 3,600 animals in 2002 to 1,400 today. Asian elephants face ongoing difficulties in South and Southeast Asia from reduced habitat and human-animal conflicts. Rhinos in Indonesia are critically endangered, with several subspecies reduced to only about 25-50 remaining individuals. The number of qualified proposals for projects to protect marine turtles has far exceeded currently available funding, preventing worthwhile projects from going forward that

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

would guard against poaching and support turtle-based tourism as an alternative source of income for local people. In order to prevent the extinction of some of the world's most iconic species, a more robust commitment will be required. In addition, two new multinational species bills are awaiting passage by Congress – the Great Cats and Rare Canids Act and the Crane Conservation Act. Should those two bills be passed and signed into law, it is recommended that an additional \$1.25 million be provided for each in addition to the amount below for the existing programs.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Multinational Species Conservation Fund - \$15.0 million

*An increase of \$7.1 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$7.9 million*

### **North American Wetlands Conservation Fund**

More than half of the original wetlands in the U.S. have been lost. This has contributed to the steady decline of migratory birds as well as other fish and wildlife species dependent on wetlands. With fewer wetlands, millions have been spent on erosion control, water treatment, and flood protection that natural wetlands used to provide for free. Restoring and protecting wetlands is vital to conserving fish and wildlife species dependent upon such habitat and maintaining healthy watersheds. These areas protect our safety and welfare without having to invest in costly projects, and provide innumerable opportunities for outdoor recreation for people across the nation. Through FY 2008, this grant program has helped to fund more than 1,800 wetland conservation projects in all 50 U.S. states, Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, 13 Canadian provinces and 31 Mexican states and leveraged some \$2.8 billion in matching and non-matching funds to conserve approximately 24.4 million acres of wetlands and associated uplands. The program continues to play a major role in conserving North American wetlands, migratory birds, and other species of fish and wildlife that depend upon such ecosystems.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

North American Wetlands Conservation Fund - \$50.0 million

*An increase of \$8.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$42.0 million*

### **Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Fund (NMBCA)**

Since 2000, the NMBCA has functioned as a matching grant program to fund projects that conserve neotropical migratory birds—those that breed in or migrate through the United States and Canada and spend the non-breeding season in Latin America and the Caribbean. Monies support partnership programs to conserve birds in the U.S., Latin America and the Caribbean, where approximately 5 billion birds representing over 500 species spend their winters, including some of the most endangered birds in North America. These funds provide an upland complement to the wetland bird conservation work accomplished under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act. Projects may include bird habitat conservation, research and monitoring, law enforcement, and outreach and education. All grant requests must be matched by non-federal funds at least 3 to 1. By law, 75 percent of the funds must be spent internationally. Between 2002 and 2008, partners in 48 U.S. states and 36 other countries have been involved in 260 NMBCA-supported projects. More than \$25.5 million in grants has leveraged some \$122.6 million in total partner contributions to support activities that bring long-term benefits to neotropical migratory birds including conservation of 1.9 million acres of bird habitat. While more than 100 worthy proposals are received each year, with the current funding provided, only 40 can be funded.

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

**FY 10 Recommendation:**

Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Fund - \$6.5 million

*An increase of \$2.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$4.4 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

### **The Land and Water Conservation Fund**

The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) creates parks and open space, protects wilderness, wetlands and refuges, preserves wildlife habitat, and enhances recreational opportunities from two complementary programs: a federal program and a state matching grants program. The federal program provides funds to purchase land and water resources for national parks, forests, wildlife refuges and other public lands while the state matching grants program provides federal funds to states to assist in the acquisition of more urban open space and creation of local recreation facilities. The Stateside program is the government's primary investment tool for ensuring that kids and families have access to close-to-home recreation. The LWCF stateside program has funded over 41,000 projects including sports fields, outdoor recreation facilities and trails.

The success of the LWCF has helped create parks for people to enjoy in 98 percent of counties in the U.S. and has provided protection for more than five million acres of land and water areas across the country. From Denali National Park to the Grand Canyon and from the Everglades to the Appalachian Trail, the LWCF has been the critical source of funding available to federal agencies for protecting our most treasured lands.

Despite this strong record of success, our nation's need for recreation infrastructure continues to grow. In its 2007 Annual Report on the LWCF state assistance program, the National Park Service reported that states estimated their unmet need for outdoor recreation facilities and parkland acquisition at \$15.6 billion. Additionally, forty-two of fifty states meet only twenty percent or less of their total estimated need for local outdoor recreation facilities and parkland acquisition. Clearly the need for matching federal investment is profound.

As global warming continues to imperil plant and animal species, the LWCF will be a critical program in mitigating for and adapting to the effects of climatic changes. To maintain healthy and vibrant ecosystems, plants and animals will need migration corridors and open space to adapt to the changes around them. LWCF provides that opportunity by giving land management agencies the ability to acquire land that connects ecosystems.

In difficult economic times, the LWCF is also a program that saves federal dollars. Acquiring critical 'inholdings' within public land or wilderness boundaries allows the agencies to manage their lands more effectively. Connected and contiguous public lands require fewer resources to be devoted to the mitigation of private land uses, boundary surveys, law enforcement, private land owner disputes, and permitting. The recent economic downturn has also led to a spike in willing sellers during a time when home and land equity is comparatively low. These factors present an opportunity for the land management agencies to acquire previously unavailable tracts of land for less money than in previous years.

Returning these high priority lands to the federal estate is an investment in our future because, in so doing, we ensure that recreational and conservation opportunities are available nationwide. Much of the American West has seen unprecedented economic growth over the past decade as a result of protected open space being in close proximity to urban centers. The LWCF can be a catalyst in returning balance to our communities by providing the recreational and employment opportunities that lead to higher property values and economic growth.

Conservation of these places, whether private or public, is critical to maintaining the health of our public lands, our quality of life, our recreational opportunities and our economic well-being. Unfortunately, the LWCF has been seriously underfunded and reached a low when the President's FY 2006 budget zeroed out the stateside program. The stateside program is authorized by Congress to receive \$450 million annually in funding, a level that has been met only once in its 30 year history despite a designated funding source. Between 2002 and 2005, the President requested, and Congress appropriated between \$89 million and \$140 million per year for the LWCF stateside program. In contrast, between 2006 and 2008, funding averaged only \$27 million. The final FY 2006

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

appropriation was the lowest funding level for LWCF in a decade. From 2001 to 2006, funding for LWCF was cut 75 percent.

Congress took a step in the right direction in the FY 08 appropriations bill to reverse this downward funding trend. However, without passing appropriations bills during the past fiscal year, the federal government has further marginalized the LWCF to a critical point. The land management agencies are unable to fully staff their LWCF programs and manage their growing backlog lists – all during a time when land acquisition opportunities are very high.

Congress must continue to increase funding for this important land conservation program and make a commitment to return to full funding of the LWCF program at its authorized level of \$900 million. Royalties from offshore oil and natural gas drilling are used to fund the LWCF program each year, and these dollars should be returned to the federal estate in the form of land acquisition. An incremental funding increase over five years, until full funding, would allow the federal land management agencies to address staffing shortages, train more staff in real estate, address backlog lists, and conduct land surveys to identify all potentially available land purchases. Congress must begin this process in FY 2010 by providing \$325 million to the LWCF federal program and \$125 million for the LWCF stateside program. Restoring funding to the LWCF program will help preserve U.S.'s natural places and create valuable public recreation areas and facilities for all Americans.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Land and Water Conservation Fund - \$450.0 million (\$325.0 million for federal and \$125.0 million for stateside)  
*An increase of \$295.7 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$154.3 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The National Park Service is home to some of America's most precious and important cultural, natural, and historic treasures. With 391 units spanning 49 states, its holdings and responsibilities are vast, but for many years the annual agency budget has failed to keep pace with need, resulting in an ever-widening deficit across virtually all areas of the agency budget. Given this reality, the focus for the agency and agency budgets must be 2016, the Park Service's centennial year. This focus allows the Park Service to steadily recover, gain efficiencies and refocus itself to effectively meet future challenges. It is crucial that we reinvest and revitalize our national parks by their hundredth birthday.

### **Operations of the National Park Service**

The National Park Service protects and manages the nation's most treasure natural and cultural resources, representing our national heritage. Providing the National Park Service with a strong operating budget is critical to enabling the Park Service to protect these resources and provide visitor services to the 391 units of the National Park System.

While congress took an important step toward addressing the operating shortfall facing the parks by providing a healthy increase in the Park Service's operating budget in FY 2008, we still have critical work to do moving forward as we approach the park service Centennial. The annual operations shortfall of the parks remains at \$750 million. We have only just started the work toward eliminating the operating shortfall plaguing our national treasures by renewing our commitment to fully fund the parks.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Operations of the National Park System - \$2.25 billion

*An increase of \$280.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$1.97 billion*

### **Centennial Challenge**

The Centennial Initiative, if authorized by Congress, will be an important funding stream to not only improve the crumbling infrastructure in the National Park System, but create new programs and projects that reflect modern-day challenges and opportunities. The National Park Service will be 100 years old in 2016. We believe Congress should pass legislation to invest funding above the agency's budget to restore and reinvigorate our parks, seashores, heritage areas, and monuments.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

*Federal Centennial Funding of \$100.0 million above fixed costs*

*An increase of \$75.4 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$24.6 million*

### **Resource Stewardship: Targeted Funds**

Proper management of NPS resources is a key area in which the park service must excel. In FY 2009 the park service was slated to receive targeted resources to begin restoration of natural lands through control of exotic plant species and the reintroduction of native plants. An estimated 1,900 additional acres of invasive plant species are scheduled for containment, with an additional 3,725 acres planned for FY 2010. We encourage aggressive funding of park stewardship projects that maintain and enhance park natural resources.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

*Total targeted funds for Resource Stewardship – 221.0 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

### **Elwha River Restoration**

The Glines Canyon and Elwha dams located inside Olympic National Park in Washington State have nearly wiped out once abundant salmon and steelhead trout populations in the Elwha River, fisheries to which the Elwha Klallam Tribe are guaranteed rights in perpetuity through an 1855 treaty agreement. In 1992, Congress approved federal purchase of the dams and directed the DOI to study how the river and native fisheries could be completely restored. DOI reported that only dam removal could fully restore the ecosystem. Removal of the two Elwha dams will restore salmon access to the Elwha River's wilderness heart in the Olympic National Park for the first time in 100 years.

This dam removal will produce a landmark in river restoration for our national parks and an unprecedented opportunity to study a large dam removal and its impact on the river and wild salmon populations. Work has started on the down stream improvements, but time is running critically thin for the ecosystem. The federal government must uphold its portion of the agreement by providing the bulk of money in the next two years. This will allow engineers and scientist to design and plan the implementation, which will allow the removal to start in 2010.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Elwha River Ecosystem Restoration - \$20.0 million

*An increase of \$0.3 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$19.7 million*

### **International Park Affairs Program**

Through the U.S. National Park Service (NPS) and its Office of International Affairs (OIA), the United States has a proud history of assisting other nations in creating and managing park systems. International engagement is embedded in the NPS mission statement, which declares that the agency "cooperates with partners to extend the benefits of natural and cultural resources conservation and outdoor recreation throughout this country and the world." Since 1962, NPS/OIA has achieved this mission by facilitating technical assistance and exchange projects with counterpart agencies in other countries. NPS experts in park and protected area management have assisted in efforts to preserve cultural heritage, create conservation benefits for developing communities, and protect some of the world's most spectacular places. Through its international work, NPS has generated goodwill toward the United States while learning from innovative practices developed by park agencies in other countries. Recent projects have involved such diverse nations as Brazil, Cambodia, Chile, China, Gabon, and Qatar.

Cooperation across borders is also crucial in order to conserve migratory species, which may reside in U.S. national parks for only part of their lives, and to protect U.S. parks against threats originating elsewhere, such as air and water pollution and invasive species. NPS/OIA also serves as the staff office for the U.S. World Heritage program; manages the International Volunteers-in-Parks Program; coordinates "sister park" relationships between U.S. parks and counterpart sites abroad; and supports the Park Flight Migratory Bird Program, a public-private partnership to protect neotropical migratory birds and their habitat.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

International Park Affairs Program - \$2.0 million

*An increase of \$0.41 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$1.59 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

### **Water Resources Investigations**

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) water resource programs provide a strong and unbiased source of information for those making decisions that affect our water resources, including Congress; federal, state, and local agencies; conservation groups; and industry. The National Water Quality Assessment (NAWQA) program provides historical and current water quality conditions and identifies water quality trends in representative river basins and aquifers nationwide. The NAWQA program's unique design provides a consistent record of information on water resources in 42 important river basins and aquifer systems across the nation.

The Toxic Substances Hydrology Program carries out long-term research to improve scientific understanding of river and groundwater contamination. Toxic contamination, whether from radioactive waste, petroleum products, sewage, or other sources, can cause considerable damage to rivers, groundwater, people and wildlife. The program has led to improvements in the ability of the government and private sector to clean up existing toxic contamination and protect against future contamination.

Information regarding the quantity and timing of streamflow is of critical importance to protecting, restoring, and safely enjoying our nation's rivers. The nation's stream gauging network, primarily operated through the USGS National Streamflow Information Program (NSIP), provides essential data for habitat preservation, water quality, recreational safety and quality, agriculture, industry, municipal water supplies, navigation, and flood hazard identification. If stream gauging stations are discontinued, the consequences of inaccurate hydraulic data could result in a drastic loss of life during an unanticipated flood or bridge collapse. Stream gauges become more valuable as their data records become longer and those that also record sediment loads and water quality are especially valuable.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Water Quality Assessment Program - \$70.0 million

*An increase of \$6.1 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$63.9 million*

Toxic Substances Hydrology Program - \$15.0 million

*An increase of \$1.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$13.5 million*

National Streamflow Information Program - \$21.0 million

*An increase of \$0.9 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$20.1 million*

### **Biological Research and Monitoring Program**

The core of scientific expertise regarding fish, wildlife and plants within the Department of the Interior is found within the Biological Research Discipline (BRD) of USGS. BRD scientists are responsible for research, development of analytical tools, and sharing of information needed to manage and conserve these biological resources. However, support to carry out these activities and to ensure adequate scientific staff and expertise has steadily eroded over the last eight years. For example, although demands to address declining or stressed biological resources have increased dramatically over the last decade, funding for the Biological Research and Monitoring program of BRD has declined 12 percent when adjusted for inflation since FY 1999. BRD also has suffered significant declines in the number of its RGE scientists who are, in effect, the Interior Department's "seed corn." The erosion of funding and scientific expertise within BRD has had particularly negative consequences for the wildlife and ecosystems research programs. Restoration of funding and staff for the Wildlife Resources program is needed to: (1) identify factors that contribute to or limit conservation and recovery efforts for terrestrial plant and

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

wildlife species-at-risk; (2) institute an adaptive science approach to support the management of terrestrial plants and wildlife and; (3) provide technical assistance to natural resource managers. Restoration of funding and staff also is needed for the Ecosystems Resources program, which is the focal point for research on the effects of wildland fire outside of forested areas and for restoration and rehabilitation of these fire-impacted, non-forest ecosystems and watersheds.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Biological Research and Monitoring Program - \$155.3 million

*An increase of \$14.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$141.3 million*

### **Biological Information Management and Delivery Program**

The Biological Informatics program of the BRD makes data and information available for use by decision-makers from all levels of government, the education community, and other non-governmental entities. This program provides the backbone for communication of vital information on climate change and other significant impacts to biological resources.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Biological Information Management and Delivery Program - \$24.6 million

*An increase of \$2.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$22.4 million*

### **Cooperative Research Unit Program**

The 40 Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Units (CFWRUs) located at universities in 38 states, which make up the USGS Cooperative Research Unit program, are crucial to successfully addressing the natural resource management challenges posed by global warming, energy development needs, imperiled species conservation, invasive species, infectious diseases, wildfire, and increased demand for limited water resources. CFWRUs also will play a critical role in meeting the challenge natural resources management agencies face in replacing the unprecedented number of scientists and other professionals who will be retiring over the next 10 years. CFWRUs have established a record of educating new natural resource professionals who are management-oriented, well-versed in science, grounded in state and federal agency experience, and able to assist private landowners and other members of the public. Because each of the CFWRUs is a true federal-state-university-private partnership, this program is able to build on its partner contributions to leverage more than three dollars for every dollar appropriated to the program by Congress. To restore the integrity of the CFWRU program, funding is needed to fill the one-fifth of all scientist positions (23) that have become vacant since FY 2001. In addition, a new competitive, matching fund program within existing CRU legislative authority should be established to eventually make available up to \$20 million annually in new funds beyond base operational costs. These new funds would support future cooperative high priority research efforts and essential training of new natural resource professionals.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Cooperative Research Unit Program (operational funding and scientist staffing) - \$20.0 million

*An increase of \$3.8 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$16.2 million*

Cooperative Research Unit High Priority Research (new program) - \$5.0 million

# DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

### **National Climate Change and Wildlife Science Center**

The FY 2008 appropriation provided USGS approximately \$7.4 million for high priority global climate change research, including up to \$2.5 million for establishment of a National Climate Change and Wildlife Science Center. The FY 2009 House version of the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill passed by the subcommittee in June 2008 provided \$10 million for the Center. This level of funding is needed in FY 2010 to continue establishment of the Center and ensure that it is responsive to the research needs of federal and state agencies in conducting scientific research on national issues relating to the impact of global warming on wildlife and wildlife habitat and mechanisms to address those impacts through adaptation, mitigation or prevention. Funding for the Center should increase to approximately \$50 million per year by FY 2013 to support, based on a competitive review process, high priority global climate change research projects and the development of decision support tools in relation to: (1) identification of species and ecosystems at greatest risk; (2) identification and ranking, based on effectiveness, the best responses to assist species and ecosystems at greatest risk; (3) research related to wildlife adaptation; (4) refinement of climate change models to regional and local scales relevant for fish, wildlife, and land management; and (5) development of robust monitoring programs to detect changes in wildlife abundance, distribution, and behavior related to global warming for use in federal and state programs, including land management.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Climate Change and Wildlife Science Center - \$10.0 million

*An increase of \$7.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$2.5 million*

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

**Editor's note:** The budget recommendations below pertain to programs currently included in the federal surface transportation program, last authorized in legislation known as SAFETEA-LU in 2005 (P.L. 109-59). SAFETEA-LU expires in September of 2009, and many of these programs may be merged, expanded, eliminated, or otherwise altered. As part of an effort to improve federal transportation policy, many of the organizations supporting these budget recommendations have endorsed broad reforms to the federal surface transportation program, or may do so at a future date. The budget recommendations in this document are made without consideration for any potential changes in the scope, intent, or structure of U.S. surface transportation policy.

### **Surface Transportation Program (STP)**

The STP program provides flexible funding to states and localities for highway, bridge projects, and capital transit projects, including public bus terminals and facilities. Electrification systems for truck stops, remediation of high accident/high congestion intersections, environmental restoration and pollution mitigation, weed control, and establishment of native species have also recently been made eligible activities.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Surface Transportation Program - \$6.785 billion

*An increase of \$0.435 billion over the FY 08 enacted level of \$6.35 billion*

### **Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ)**

The highly-successful CMAQ program provides flexible funding to state and local governments for transportation projects and programs that help them to meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Funding is available for areas that are out of compliance with National Ambient Air Quality Standards, as well as areas that have reattained compliance.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement - \$1.83 billion

*An increase of \$0.109 billion over the FY 08 enacted level of \$1.721 billion*

### **Safe Routes to School**

This program is intended to enable and encourage children to walk and bicycle to school. Funding can be used for both infrastructure projects and outreach programs. The goal of the program is to support childhood wellness as well as to reduce traffic, fuel consumption, and air pollution in the areas around schools.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Safe Routes to School - \$188.0 million

*An increase of \$41.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$147.0 million*

### **Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program (TCSP)**

State and local governments, metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs), and tribal governments are eligible for discretionary grants to integrate transportation, community development, and system preservation plans and activities. Additionally, the program is meant to identify private sector initiatives that can improve those relationships. A local funding match is required.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program- \$630.0 million

*An increase of \$568.7 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$61.3 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

### **Fixed Guideway Modernization**

This program is intended to offer public transit agencies and governments that run public transportation grants to help modernize or improve existing fixed guideway transit systems. Eligible projects include purchase and rehabilitation of rolling stock, track, line equipment, structures, signals and communications, power equipment and substations, passenger stations and terminals, security equipment and systems, maintenance facilities and equipment, operational support equipment including computer hardware and software, system extensions, and preventive maintenance. Fixed guideway systems include heavy rail, commuter rail, light rail, and trolleybus, in addition to others, as well as portions of motor bus service operated on exclusive or controlled rights-of-way, or in high-occupancy-vehicle lanes.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Fixed Guideway Modernization - \$1.717 billion

*An increase of \$0.147 billion over the FY 08 enacted level of \$1.57 billion*

### **New Starts/Small Starts**

The Federal New Starts program is the federal government's primary financial resource for supporting capital investments in locally new fixed guideway transit systems, or substantial expansion of existing systems. Eligible projects include heavy, light rail, commuter rail, and bus rapid transit. The FTA's New Starts program has helped to make possible hundreds of new or extended transit fixed guideway systems across the country. These rail and bus investments, in turn, have improved the mobility of millions of Americans; have reduced greenhouse gas emissions and oil consumption; have reduced transportation costs for working families; have helped to reduce congestion and improve air quality in the areas they serve; and have fostered the development of safer, more livable communities.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

New Starts/Small Starts - \$1.861 billion

*An increase of \$0.291 billion over the FY 08 enacted level of \$1.57 billion*

### **Bus and Bus Facility Program**

The Bus and Bus-Related Facilities program provides capital assistance to states and municipal areas for new and replacement buses and related equipment and facilities.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Bus and Bus Facility Program - \$1.012 billion

*An increase of \$189.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$823.0 million*

### **Clean Fuels Grants Program**

The Clean Fuels Grant Program accelerates the deployment of advanced bus technologies by supporting the use of low-emission vehicles in transit fleets. The program assists transit agencies in purchasing low-emission buses and related equipment, constructing alternative fuel stations, modifying garage facilities to accommodate clean fuel vehicles, and assisting in the utilization of biodiesel.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Clean Fuels Grants Program - \$53.0 million

*An increase of \$4.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$49.0 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## FEDERAL RAILWAY ADMINISTRATION

### **Amtrak**

Amtrak is the quasi-governmental organization that provides intercity passenger train service in the United States. Amtrak operates service in forty-six states, and offers one of the most energy efficient forms of intercity travel. According to the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Amtrak consumes 17 percent less energy per passenger-mile than airlines and 21.4 percent less than cars. Amtrak carried a record 28.7 million people in FY 2008, an 11 percent increase over FY 2007, with each of its routes seeing ridership gains. The company has posted six consecutive years of ridership and revenue growth.

Legislation reauthorizing appropriations for Amtrak was passed in 2008 by veto-proof margins in both houses of Congress, and was signed by President Bush on October 16<sup>th</sup> (P.L. 110-432). Our recommendation reflects the appropriations authorized in this legislation.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Amtrak - \$2.534 billion

*An increase of \$1.209 billion over the FY 08 enacted level of \$1.325 billion*

### **Federal Matching Grants for State Rail Corridor Investments**

This program is intended to encourage and assist states seeking to develop passenger rail infrastructure by providing a fifty percent federal match for eligible capital investments. This is a new source of funding for state passenger rail improvements recently created in the Amtrak reauthorization.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Federal Matching Grants for State Rail Corridor Investments - \$502.0 million

*An increase of \$472.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$30.0 million*

# DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

## **The Global Environment Facility (GEF)**

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is the largest funder of projects to protect the global environment. It is the designated financial mechanism for international conventions on biodiversity, climate change, persistent organic pollutants and desertification, and supports the work of global agreements to protect international waters and the ozone layer. The 178 member-strong financing body channels funds provided by the U.S. government and 31 other donor countries in support of numerous multilateral agreements – saving resources, avoiding duplication, and promoting cost-effectiveness by alleviating the need for each convention to have its own financing arm and oversight process. The United States Government has pledged \$1,610 billion to the GEF to date. For every dollar invested, the U.S. has leveraged \$23 from other sources.

Since 1991, the GEF has established a strong track record, providing \$7.4 billion in grants and leveraging \$28 billion in co-financing for over 1,800 projects in over 150 countries. Through its Small Grants Program (SGP), the GEF has also made more than 7,000 small grants of up to \$50,000 each directly to nongovernmental and community organizations. Biodiversity conservation projects have received more than one-third of total GEF funding. More than \$1.56 billion has been invested in over 1,600 protected areas, leveraging an additional \$4.15 billion in co-financing from project partners, and GEF funds have helped establish more than 60 conservation or endowment trust funds worldwide. Using innovative market-based approaches, such as payments for ecosystem services, the GEF ensures that efforts to protect the environment and projects to support local economic development work hand-in-hand.

GEF donor countries pledge financial resources every four years. In 2006, donor countries agreed to the replenishment of \$3.13 billion for the July 2006 - June 2010 period, with the U.S. pledging a total of \$320 million. The approval of the 2009 federal budget will secure payment of the third U.S. installment of \$80 million, and possibly pay down some of the U.S.'s \$170 million of arrears from past pledges. This represents significant progress, but the U.S. enters FY 2010 still substantially in arrears. Until the U.S. pays its share, other major donors are freezing nearly \$230 million in contributions. The U.S. can free up those funds by fulfilling its current pledge and paying off remaining arrears over the next year. Counting additional local matches, this would generate more than \$1 billion in on-the-ground projects for the global environment.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

The Global Environment Facility - \$80.0 million + half of remaining arrears  
*\$1.7 million less than the FY 08 enacted level of \$81.75 million (plus arrears)*

## **Tropical Forest Conservation Act**

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act (TFCA) was enacted in 1998 to give eligible developing countries the option to relieve official debt owed to the U.S. Treasury while generating funds in local currency for tropical forest conservation activities. Debt reduction occurs in exchange for the debtor government's commitment to make local currency payments for the protection of its forests. The TFCA also works to strengthen civil society by creating local foundations to provide small grants to NGOs and local communities.

The TFCA offers a unique opportunity for public-private partnerships and the majority of agreements have included funds raised by U.S.-based NGOs. As of December 2007, \$95 million has been used to complete 13 TFCA debt-for-nature agreements, generating more than \$163 million in long-term commitments for tropical forest conservation in Bangladesh, Belize, Botswana, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Jamaica, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, and the Philippines. Conservation organizations have contributed a total of \$12 million to eight of these agreements. Two to three new projects are developed each year under the TFCA program.

# DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

A reauthorization of the TFCA has been pending before Congress and is likely to pass in 2009. The reauthorized Act would extend the TFCA model to include coral reef ecosystems, making its application more flexible and encompassing a wider range of opportunities to support international conservation of large-scale terrestrial and marine ecosystems.

**FY 10 Recommendation:**

Tropical Forest Conservation Act - \$20.0 million (if the reauthorized TFCCA becomes law, we recommend funding at the maximum reauthorized level)

*The same as the FY 08 enacted level of \$20.0 million*

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

### **Global Change and Sustainability Research**

Current budget levels will only allow the agency to meet its impact assessment obligations under the government-wide Climate Change Science Program. The Agency will be forced to terminate, in midstream, research vital to understanding ongoing changes in temperature, precipitation, flooding, snow pack, and other factors will affect water quality across the U.S. To our knowledge, no other federal agency is supporting such work on a national scale. The reductions in the budget are coupled with the termination of the Superfund Innovative Technology Evaluation Program and Environmental Technology Validation Program. This means that the Agency will lose much of its ability to test and verify new environmental technologies. This loss harms American industry's competitive position for environmental technology in world markets, at a time when other nations treat these technologies as opportunities.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Global Change and Sustainability Research - \$21.2 million

*An increase of \$1.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$19.7 million*

### **Human Health and Ecosystem Research**

The EPA Scientific Advisory Board, over the past several years, has called on both the Agency and the Congress to revitalize, raise the profile of, and increase the funding for ecological research at EPA. Instead, work in this area continues to decline. Cuts in human health research will handicap areas that are needed to provide the data necessary for risk assessment and risk management decisions to be efficient and effective. On a global scale, science cannot yet accurately tell us where all the mercury in the U.S. comes from, where it goes, or in what chemical forms it exists.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Human Health and Ecosystem Research - \$239.8 million

*An increase of \$16.6 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$223.2 million*

### **Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS) Database**

Many of the EPA assessments of regulated chemicals are publicly available on its database, the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS), which contains EPA scientific consensus positions on potential human health effects from environmental contaminants. IRIS information is used by regulators at the state, tribal and federal level and by the international community in combination with exposure data to set cleanup standards and various exposure standards for air, water, soil, and food). The database receives over a half-million visits monthly, from over fifty countries, underscoring its widespread use.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

IRIS Database - \$4.4 million

*An increase of \$0.3 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$4.1 million*

### **STAR Fellowship Program**

EPA has mature scientific staff reaching retirement age, and the Agency will face significant staffing challenges in environmental sciences, engineering, economics, behavioral, and decision sciences in the next five to ten years.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

STAR Fellowship Program - \$10.5 million

*An increase of \$0.7 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$9.8 million*

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

### **Enforcement**

The Environmental Protection Agency's ability to enforce environmental laws is critical to our nation's efforts to fulfill objectives of protecting and enhancing the nation's public health and natural resources. The Clean Water Act prohibits discharges of pollutants from point sources into U.S. waters without a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit. These permits limit what can be discharged and include monitoring and reporting requirements to ensure that the discharge does not harm water quality or human health. EPA and authorized states and Indian tribes implement and enforce these permits. The Clean Air Act's new source review program requires installation of modern pollution control technology when industrial facilities undertake changes that increase air pollution by significant amounts. The EPA has uncovered widespread violations of this requirement that resulted in illegal air pollution releases totaling millions of tons from coal-fired power plants, oil refineries and other industrial sectors. In recent years, as a result of legal settlements and court decisions arising from NSR enforcement cases against power plants and oil refineries, EPA has achieved air pollution reductions that dwarf any other Clean Air Act enforcement activities undertaken by the agency. Finally, EPA is responsible for ensuring that strong enforcement actions are taken in environmental justice communities. EPA must maintain a strong enforcement presence, in concert with the states and Indian tribes, to produce real improvements in environmental quality and protect public health.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Enforcement Programs - \$500.0 million

*An increase of \$312.1 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$187.9 million*

### **Environmental Justice**

In 1992, President George H.W. Bush established the Office of Environmental Equity (now the Office of Environmental Justice) within the U.S. EPA to integrate environmental justice into the agency's programs. In 1994, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12,898 requiring each federal agency "to make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations." The EPA adopted commitments to environmental justice, yet today there continues to be many places where minority and low-income neighborhoods face disproportionately high levels of air and water pollution and exposure to toxic waste and other health hazards due to federal environmental laws not being evenly enforced. Data shows that black Americans are 79 percent more likely than whites to live in neighborhoods where industrial pollution poses the greatest health danger, and residents in neighborhoods with the highest pollution scores also tend to be poorer, less educated, and more often unemployed than residents of less-polluted neighborhoods. In 2005, the Government Accountability Office released a report finding that the EPA generally devoted little attention to environmental justice issues while drafting three significant clean air rules on gasoline, diesel, and ozone between fiscal years 2000 and 2004. Then in 2006, EPA's own Office of Inspector General issued yet another scathing report on EPA's failure to fully implement the Executive Order, and recommends that EPA review all its programs, policies, and activities to develop a plan to ensure compliance with the Order.

Funding for the Office of Environmental Justice must be sustained and Executive Order 12898 must be fully implemented by the EPA to integrate environmental justice into their day to day operation.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Office of Environmental Justice - \$6.5 million

*An increase of \$0.1 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$6.4 million*

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

### **Clean Water Act Permits**

The Supreme Court's 2006 decision (*Rapanos v. U.S.*) interpreting the Clean Water Act and the interpretive "guidance" issued by the Corps and EPA have led the agencies to devote significant effort to examining whether innumerable water bodies are protected by the law. Under the Clean Water Act, EPA is the final arbiter of whether a water body is protected, and it also needs sufficient resources to review jurisdictional determinations made by the Corps' field personnel and resolve disputes over particular water bodies. A budget increase of \$4 million will help enable EPA to meaningfully police the implementation of this aspect of the Clean Water Act.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Clean Water Act Permits - \$4.0 million

*An increase of \$4.0 million over base funding*

### **WaterSense**

The World Water Council has named the United States the most inefficient water user of 147 countries studied, including European countries that enjoy standards of living comparable to ours. As the population continues to expand more demand will be placed on our scarce water supplies, even in areas that were once thought of as 'water rich' like the southeastern part of the country. Water supply is beginning to be the limiting factor in economic growth in areas that have stressed water resources. Climate change science points toward future summers of greater warmth and less rain. Water conservation programs can produce significant results. Nationwide surveys indicate that over 80% of water utility customers would support some form of water conservation measure. The WaterSense program will be establish water efficiency standards and promote efficient products and practices. The program is modeled after the *Energy Star* program that promotes energy efficient appliances and practices.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

WaterSense - \$7.5 million

*An increase of \$5.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$2.0 million*

### **National Estuary Program**

Estuaries are vibrant coastal zones where saltwater meets freshwater, creating some of the most biologically productive areas on Earth. Started in 1987 under amendments to the Clean Water Act, the National Estuary Program protects and restores the nation's estuaries by creating partnerships with local communities. The program focuses not only on improving water quality in an estuary, but also on maintaining the integrity of the whole system – its chemical, physical, and biological properties, as well as its economic, recreational, and aesthetic values. Since its inception, the program has grown to include twenty-eight programs across the country, but funding levels have stagnated.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Estuary Program - \$26.8 million

*Same as the FY 08 enacted level*

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY SUPERFUND

## **Superfund**

The Superfund program was created in 1980 to locate, investigate, and clean up the worst hazardous and toxic sites nationwide. As a mature program, most remaining sites are now in the construction phase of cleanup where steady and adequate funding is necessary. The EPA Inspector General (IG) and others have documented a significant and growing funding shortfall over the past several years. This shortfall is exacerbated by the bankruptcy of the Superfund Trust Fund. In 2003, the Superfund Trust ran out of polluter-contributed funds because Congress and the Administration have refused to renew the polluter pays tax on the oil and chemical industries that formerly funded cleanups. American taxpayers should not shoulder the costs of all Superfund-led cleanups.

## **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Superfund - \$1.50 billion

*An increase of \$280.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$1.22 billion*

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM

### **Leaking Underground Storage Tanks**

In 1986, Congress established the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Trust Fund to help the EPA states, and Indian tribes pay the costs of cleaning up leaking petroleum tanks when owners fail to do so, and to oversee LUST cleanup activities. The Trust Fund is financed by a 0.1 cent tax on each gallon of motor fuel sold nationwide. Congress and the administration have repeatedly failed to appropriate sufficient funds from the LUST Trust Fund to pay for cleanups needed. Despite initial strides in addressing leaking petroleum underground storage tanks in the 1990s, a new problem emerged as the gasoline additive MTBE was detected at thousands of LUST sites and in numerous drinking water supplies. Even small amounts of MTBE can render water undrinkable due to its strong taste and odor.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Leaking Underground Storage Tanks - \$110.0 million

*An increase of \$4.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$105.8 million*

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

### State Revolving Funds

With the passage of the Clean Water Act more than 30 years ago, Congress made a financial commitment to protecting and improving water quality first through a grant program and later in 1987 through the establishment of the “state revolving loan fund” (SRF), offering grants and low-interest revolving loans to municipalities for construction of wastewater treatment systems. In 1996 the Safe Drinking Water Act created another state revolving fund for drinking water treatment and protection of surface water and groundwater supply areas. There is also a 1.5 percent set-aside for Indian tribes under each SRF to conduct the same types of activities accorded to states.

The funds directed to the states through both SRF programs need to be prioritized toward nonstructural projects that reduce non-point source pollution, protect estuaries, prevent contamination of drinking source waters, and reduce polluted runoff by protecting natural areas and other “green infrastructure,” such as stream buffers. These approaches are often more cost-effective than traditional pipe and cement options and provide a wide array of environmental and social benefits, including open space, wildlife habitat, recreation, and improved water supply.

Drastic cuts in federal funding over the past seven years have hampered efforts to clean up the nation’s water sources and to upgrade our drinking water systems. According to recent studies, communities will need an estimated \$300 billion to \$1 trillion over the next 20 years to repair, replace, or upgrade aging drinking water and wastewater facilities. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Clean Water and Drinking Water Infrastructure Gap Analysis found a \$535 billion gap between *current* spending and projected needs for both drinking water and wastewater infrastructure over the next 20 years.<sup>1</sup> Looking at drinking water infrastructure alone, EPA estimated that the nation’s water systems will need to invest \$276.8 billion in drinking water infrastructure over the next 20 years to protect public health (an average of nearly \$14 billion per year).<sup>2</sup> While assessments have revealed dramatically increased need, funding for programs such as the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund (SRF) has actually *declined* since the high point of \$850 million in 2002, even without adjusting for inflation. The Clean Water SRF also has been cut by almost a half billion dollars since FY2001.

Funding cuts in the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds also impact Indian tribes, which as noted above, rely upon a 1.5 percent set-aside under each of these funds. Under the EPA 2006-2011 Strategic Plan, a 2015 target was established for both achieving a 50 percent reduction in the number of tribal homes with inadequate wastewater, and a 50 percent reduction in the number of tribal homes without access to safe drinking water. To meet these goals, the annual amount of the set-asides through 2015 would need to be at least \$13.7 million and \$19.95 million respectively, with such amounts highly dependent upon the overall funding levels of the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds. Thus far, such funding levels have been too low to meet EPA’s goals with respect to tribes.

Proper maintenance of the tens of thousands of public drinking water systems around the country is critical to protect the health and wellbeing of families and communities nationwide. A greater investment is needed in order to ensure that our waters are fishable, swimmable and drinkable.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Clean Water SRF - \$6.5 billion

*An increase of \$5.8 billion over the FY 08 enacted level of \$689.1 million\**

<sup>1</sup> <http://win-water.org/reports/2004-09-15ADU.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> From 2003 – the most recent estimate conducted by EPA.

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

*\*At least 7.5% should be reserved for green decentralized or non-structural stormwater and wastewater management that mimics natural hydrology*

*Drinking Water SRF - \$1.33 billion*

*An increase of \$501.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$829.0 million*

### **Brownfields**

The Brownfields Revitalization Act was signed into law in 2002, providing a framework to clean up lightly contaminated properties and restore them for more widespread use. The program has the potential to turn unusable areas into engines of prosperity and positive local development. Despite broad support from many stakeholders including the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Development Organizations, and the National Association of Industrial and Office Properties, the program has continued to struggle with a lack of funding.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Brownfields - \$168.0 million

*An increase of \$74.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$93.5 million*

### **Non-point Source Management Program, Clean Water Act Section 319**

The damage caused by non-point source pollution includes degradation of wildlife habitat and aquatic life, contamination of drinking water, beach and swimming area closures, lost recreational opportunities, fish kills, aesthetic degradation of waterways, and many other severe environmental and human health problems. The Section 319 Non-point Source Management Program provides grant money that states, territories, and Indian tribes can use for a wide variety of non-point source pollution reduction activities including technical and financial assistance, education, training, technology transfer, demonstration projects, and monitoring.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Section 319 Non-point Source Management Program - \$220.0 million

*An increase of \$19.1 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$200.9 million*

### **Pollution Control – Section 106**

The establishment of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) under section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act is a sensible and necessary step in accounting for the range of activities and sources that damage and threaten water quality. TMDLs allow states, Indian tribes and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to identify all sources of water quality impairment to rivers, streams and lakes that do not meet water quality standards, develop specific goals for improvement, and design plans to reduce pollutant loads into receiving water bodies. TMDLs must be developed in a way that is consistent with the Clean Water Act, is compatible with related water quality programs and regulatory processes, and leads to real improvements, rather than more paperwork and delay. The development of strong TMDLs by the states and Indian tribes requires a commitment of adequate resources.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

State Program Management Grants (CWA section 106) - \$220.0 million

*An increase of \$1.8 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$218.2 million*

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

### **BEACH Act Grant Program**

Our nation's public beaches are popular destination spots for recreation. The local economies of many coastal communities depend largely on clean and healthy beaches for use by residents and tourists alike. Unfortunately, many of our nation's public beach waters are polluted with bacteria and viruses that can make swimmers ill. Polluted urban stormwater, sewage spills and combined sewer overflows are the major sources of beach water pollution. There were more than 20,000 closings and swimming advisory days issued in 2007 at ocean, bay, and Great Lakes beaches for the third consecutive year. In 2000, Congress unanimously passed the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act. The BEACH Act established a grant program for beach water testing and public notification programs. Regular information about beach water quality protects the health of beach-goers and consequently the vitality of coastal, tourism-based economies. Unfortunately, perennial underfunding has prevented full state and tribal implementation, and has left public health at risk in many instances.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

BEACH Act Grant Program - \$40.0 million

*An increase of \$30.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$9.8 million*

### **Targeted Watershed Grants**

The Targeted Watershed Grants program provides direct grants to a limited number of watershed groups, Indian tribes and communities working to improve water quality. Portions of these funds are designated for technical assistance programs and to train community groups engaged in watershed-level protection and restoration projects. This training is essential to protect and restore the nation's rivers and watersheds.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Targeted Watershed Grants - \$25.0 million with \$2.5 million dedicated to technical assistance

*An increase of \$15.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$9.8 million*

### **Diesel Emissions Reduction Program**

The Diesel Emissions Reduction Act of 2005 authorized \$200 million per year in grants to states, Indian tribes and municipalities to aid in their work to reduce diesel pollution by replacing or retrofitting old, dirty diesel engines. These diesel engine retrofits are incredibly cost-effective: for every dollar of cost, EPA estimates more than \$12 in health benefits. Plus with many states facing PM and ozone SIP deadlines in the coming year, this program will be critical to protecting the health of communities around the country. Funding for this work should receive priority over other initiatives in the CMAQ program as authorized in the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Diesel Emissions Reduction Program - \$55.0 million

*An increase of \$5.8 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$49.2 million*

### **State and Local Air Quality Management**

These grants, provided under Sections 103 and 105 of the Clean Air Act, are critical to state and local agency efforts to implement the many complex requirements of our nation's clean air program. These expenditures are authorized under the Clean Air Act and the funds would be awarded to state and local air pollution control agencies in all 50 states.

Fine particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) is very damaging to public health, even leading to thousands of premature deaths. The air quality monitoring program is the foundation of our efforts to understand the nature of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> problem

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

and address it. Dedicated funding under Section 103 has enabled states and localities to build a strong PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitoring program.

Section 105 of the Clean Air Act authorizes the federal government to provide grants for up to 60% of the cost of state and local air quality programs, while states and localities must provide a 40% match. In reality, the federal government provides only about 25% of the total (not including Title V permit fees, which state and local agencies collect from major sources and can use to fund only permit-related activities). The total amount needed to fund state and local efforts to implement the Clean Air Act is estimated at over \$1 billion each year. If the federal government were to provide 60% of that amount, as the Clean Air Act envisions, federal grants would equal approximately \$600 million annually. However, federal grants have been only about one-third of this total in recent years. To make matters worse, over the past 15 or 20 years, federal grants for state and local air pollution control agencies to operate their programs have decreased by approximately one-third in terms of purchasing power.

Dirty air poses a significant risk; tens of thousands of people die prematurely every year and many more suffer ill-health as a result of air pollution. While we have made great progress under the Clean Air Act, millions of people in this country continue to breathe unhealthful air. Over 150 million people live in areas that violate at least one of the six health-based National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Exposure to these pollutants causes a host of problems including aggravation of existing respiratory and cardiovascular disease, damage to lung tissue, impaired breathing, irregular heart beat, heart attacks, lung cancer and death. The pollutants covered by the NAAQS are not the only problems we face. EPA's own data on toxic air pollution estimate that more than 270 million people in this country live in census tracts where the combined upper-bound lifetime cancer risk exceeds 10 in one million (one in one million is generally considered "acceptable"). Further, over 92% of the population lives in areas with "hazard index" values for respiratory toxicity above 1.0 – the level above which adverse effects to the respiratory system occur.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Section 103/105 Grants for State and Local Air Agencies - \$232.9 million\*

*\*Grants for the PM 2.5 monitoring program should not be shifted from Section 103 authority to Section 105 authority*

*An increase of \$16.1 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$216.8 million*

### **Tribal Air Quality Management**

Section 301(d) of the 1990 Amendments to the Clean Air Act (CAA) authorized the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to treat Indian tribes "as States" under the Act, and required the Agency to issue a rule specifying the provisions of the Act for which it was appropriate to treat tribes as states. The EPA complied with this requirement in February of 1998 by finalizing the Tribal Authority Rule (TAR) which provides that tribes may be treated in a manner similar to states for virtually all provisions of the CAA. Tribes are not only eligible for section 103 grant funding to conduct air quality monitoring, emissions inventories, and other studies and assessments, but they may also obtain section 105 grant funding to implement CAA regulatory programs.

In anticipation of the TAR, the EPA increased its tribal air grant funding during a time when few Indian tribes were conducting air-related activities. This funding, however, has remained relatively flat during the past 10 years, specifically between a range of \$10.7 million and \$11.05 million. At the same time, the number of tribes seeking 103 and 105 grant funding has substantially increased to the point that any carryover of tribal air funding from previous years has now been exhausted. The EPA and its regional offices are now being forced to turn away a

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

number of tribes for 103 and 105 grant funding requests. Tribes, however, are facing many of the same air-related issues that neighboring state and local jurisdictions are facing, but are significantly underfunded to address such issues. Tribal air grant funding must therefore be increased to more accurately reflect the air quality-related needs of tribes across the nation.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Section 103/105 Grants for Indian tribes - \$22.0 million

*An increase of \$11.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$10.8 million*

### **Revitalization through Renewable Energy**

Many of the sites EPA tracks or manages could be a good fit for some of the new clean and renewable energy facilities the nation needs to move towards a clean energy future. In conjunction with the Department of Energy's National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), EPA completed a mapping analysis yielding an inventory of over nine thousand EPA-tracked sites that might be good candidates for solar, wind, or biomass energy production facilities. These sites have existing transmission capacity and infrastructure in place; most of the acreage is in non-urban areas. By using these sites, the nation can help meet the growing national demand for renewable energy while lessening pressure on greenspace and providing economically viable and socially beneficial futures for sites that are currently under used or vacant. However, this analysis is only the first step in facilitating development of these sites, including conducting detailed site-specific evaluations of development potential and a thorough analysis of reclamation requirements. EPA's Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response has the authorities to play a key role in coordinating partnerships among federal, state, tribal and other government agencies, utilities, communities and the private sector that will result in many new clean and renewable energy facilities on these contaminated properties, but does not have adequate funding or structure. This work should be prioritized and funded as a formal initiative within EPA's FY2010 budget and provided sufficient staff and financial tools.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Revitalization Through Renewable Energy Initiative - \$15.0 million

*A new program that would increase the overall Environmental Protection Agency Budget by \$15.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level*

### **Energy Star**

Energy Star is a partnership program between government and industry that identifies and labels energy-efficient products, equipment and buildings. It helps businesses, consumers, and state and local governments save money, protects the environment, saves energy and yields multiple other private and public benefits. By providing clear information on which products and practices are energy efficient, Energy Star builds awareness of energy-savings opportunities, and provides recognition and support for organizations that are committed to energy efficiency. The Energy Star Program could accomplish even more with greater funding. More money is needed to add products, increase public outreach, work with more businesses, and expand state and local programs such as the Home Performance with Energy Star Program.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Energy Star - \$100.0 million

*An increase of \$51.8 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$48.2 million*

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

### **Tribal General Assistance Program**

The Indian General Assistance Program (IGAP) authorizes the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to provide grants to federally-recognized tribes to assist them in planning, developing and establishing environmental protection programs. These grants are especially critical to Alaska Native villages which tend to lack other sources of funding to address their basic environmental needs.

In FY 04, the enacted IGAP funding level was \$62.5 million, meaning that Indian tribes on the average received \$110,000 in grants, providing most tribes with only a minimal level of environmental protection. Unfortunately, IGAP funding has steadily decreased during the past several years with the FY 08 level being only \$56.03 million. More IGAP funding is instead needed to provide tribes with access to monies in an amount commensurate with their environmental needs.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Indian General Assistance Program - \$68.3 million

*An increase of \$12.27 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$56.03 million*

### **Direct Implementation Tribal Cooperative Agreements**

A means to help offset the limited dollars available to Indian tribes under the Indian General Assistance Program is the utilization of Direct Implementation Tribal Cooperative Agreements (DITCAs). These agreements allow tribes and intertribal consortia to help the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) implement federal environmental programs for Indian tribes. DITCAs were initially authorized in the FY 2001 Appropriations Act and must be approved on an annual basis by Congress. As such activities take place under federal authority, DITCAs do not trigger jurisdictional entanglements with other governmental bodies, sometimes a problem when tribes attempt to assert regulatory jurisdiction for their own programs. The DITCAs also provide environmental results and meet strategic targets prized by both tribes and the EPA.

Thus far, the EPA has awarded over 20 DITCAs to Indian tribes to undertake such activities as Clean Air Act Title V permitting, development of smoke management plans, National Pollution Discharge Elimination System stormwater permitting compliance, water quality monitoring, public water system supervision, and the hiring of a tribal pesticide circuit rider. While there is a strong interest among tribes to enter into more DITCAs, they are constrained by the availability of resources to do so. Specifically, discretionary funding under the Environmental Program & Management account and State and Tribal Assistance Grants has been the primary vehicle for DITCAs, meaning that such DITCAs must compete with a myriad of other EPA priorities. To assure a consistent level and source of funding for DITCAs, a separate budget set-aside should be established within the Agency.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Direct Implementation Tribal Cooperative Agreements - \$8.0 million

*A new set-aside that would increase the overall Environmental Protection Agency Budget by \$8.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level*

# ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

## ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

### **Environmental Education**

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Office of Environmental Education implements highly-leveraged, successful nationwide environmental education programs authorized by the National Environmental Education Act (NEEA - PL 101-619), the nation's first environmental education legislation that is still the only federal law devoted solely to environmental education. NEEA supports life-long education and environmental stewardship, helping to ensure that our citizens are environmentally literate and competitive in increasingly important environmental fields such as engineering. Some of the successful programs supported by NEEA include: the Environmental Education and Training Partnership, Project Learning Tree, Weather and the Environment, Health and the Environment, National Public Lands Day, and The Green Business Network. In addition, NEEA established the National Environmental Education and Training Foundation, a private foundation to increase public private partnerships for life-long environmental education. The EPA's environmental education programs have a notable track record of success and provide indispensable tools for teachers, museum staff, business leaders, health care professionals, meteorologists, and others responsible for educating young people, employees, and the public about the environment. EPA's environmental education programs meet the highest standards for educational rigor and scientific accuracy.

While funding has remained flat for NEEA at \$9.0 million for several years, Congress has increasingly recognized the economic, educational, and environmental benefits of strong environmental education programs. Thus, Congress should fund NEEA programs at the authorized level of \$14 million.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Environmental Education Act Programs - \$14.0 million

*An increase of \$5.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$9.0 million*

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC  
ADMINISTRATION

# NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

## **National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration**

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is responsible for: protecting marine and coastal habitats; managing commercial and recreational fisheries; expanding scientific exploration and ocean observation; sustaining coastal economies; managing National Marine Sanctuaries; forecasting weather; and a number of critical activities. These activities are conducted pursuant to a number of environmental laws including the *National Environmental Policy Act*, *Federal Power Act*, *Endangered Species Act*, *Marine Mammal Protection Act*, *Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act*, *Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act*, *Coastal Zone Management Act*, and the *National Marine Sanctuaries Act*. These and other statutes require federal departments to consult with NOAA on federal actions that could impact protected species and resources.

NOAA will experience a significant increase in inter-agency consultation and coordination activities, corresponding with the impending development of energy and other facilities in the ocean. As ice melts and new areas of the Arctic open to navigation, NOAA projects a significant workload increase related to environmental reviews of energy development, shipping, and fishing. NOAA also gathers the science needed to understand the impacts of global warming on our nation. Despite these many important responsibilities, NOAA continues to be critically underfunded.

The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, the Pew Oceans Commission, and the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative all identified the need to provide additional resources for NOAA. A broad coalition of industry, conservation organizations, academic researchers, and scientific organizations, among others, have joined together to support overall funding for NOAA at \$4.5 billion.

In addition, if the Administration intends to make climate change a national priority, then funding for NOAA needs to be substantially increased, because activities related to understanding and responding to climate change impacts cannot be funded at the current budget level. This increase should include funds necessary for climate change research, monitoring, outreach, and adaptation efforts, and NOAA's oversight of the siting, monitoring, and eventual decommissioning of renewable energy projects in the ocean.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration - \$4.5 billion

*An increase of \$580 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$3.92 billion*

# NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

## NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

Chronic under-funding for ocean programs is hindering significant progress in addressing the threats to our ocean fisheries and wildlife.<sup>i</sup> A case in point is the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), the agency within NOAA responsible for the conservation and management of the nation's fisheries and protecting ocean wildlife, such as marine mammal and sea turtles. Due to inadequate funding for data collection, research staff, and observers, information is extremely limited for many marine mammals and the status of 36 marine mammal stocks is completely unknown. In fisheries management the situation is no better: only 128 of the 530 fish stocks managed by NMFS have been adequately assessed to determine whether they are being overfished.<sup>ii</sup> Of the nation's 300 fisheries, only 42 have trained fishery observers on board to collect essential catch and bycatch information and assess interactions with marine mammals, seabirds, and sea turtles. Basic monitoring and enforcement of compliance with regulations is woefully underfunded as well. The combined impact of these factors shows approximately 20 percent of our fish stocks are either depleted (overfished) or being caught faster than they can reproduce (experiencing overfishing).

The 2009 budget request for the NMFS is actually 8 percent less than the agency received in 2002. In general, the overall budget for NMFS over the past seven budget cycles has been flat, which means the agency has absorbed seven years worth of inflation in costs and an expanding mission. To be effective in its role as steward of U.S. fisheries, marine mammals, sea turtles, and ocean habitat, the NMFS budget must be increased substantially above NOAA's recent requests, with special focus on program areas that will address overfishing, stock assessments, fishery bycatch monitoring and reduction, habitat protection and restoration, and improved marine mammal and sea turtle conservation and management.

### **Marine Mammal Protection**

Marine mammals are managed primarily by the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and all marine mammals are protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. There are also 13 domestic species of marine mammals that are protected under the Endangered Species Act. NMFS's research and management programs: carry out critical stock assessments that determine the abundance of various species and reasons for decline, study the impacts of sonar and ocean noise on mammals, and work with the shipping industry, citizen groups, and others to reduce user conflicts with marine mammals.

NOAA has recently taken much-needed steps to provide better protection for certain species of marine mammals, such as a ship strike rule to reduce mortality of North Atlantic right whales and the listing of Cook Inlet beluga whales under the ESA. Whale deaths caused by entanglement in commercial fishing gear and ship strikes are serious impediments to the recovery of endangered whales. Vital programs that help understand and reduce conflicts, such as acoustic tagging of humpbacks and passive monitoring of North Atlantic right whales, are facing elimination with further budget declines. However, these steps are only as effective as the agency's ability to implement them. It is highly questionable whether NOAA can continue to meet legal requirements with continued budget cuts that jeopardize the survival of imperiled marine mammals.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Protected Resource Research & Management Programs-Mammals - \$82.0 million (restored to FY 05 enacted level)  
*An increase of \$42 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$40.0 million*

### **Hawaiian Monk Seal**

Hawaiian monk seals are the most endangered seal in the United States, and one of the most endangered marine mammals in the world. The Hawaiian Monk Seal is the only marine mammal whose entire range lies within the

# NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

## NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

jurisdiction of the United States. Over the last 50 years, the Hawaiian monk seal population has declined by more than 60 percent and is now at its lowest level in recorded history, less than 1200 individuals. Factors contributing to the decline include poor juvenile survival, entanglement in marine debris, predation by sharks, injury or death of pups, juveniles, and some adult females caused by aggressive adult male monk seals, habitat modification and loss caused by humans, and overfishing of lobster in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands (collapse may have contributed to a depletion of monk seal prey resources).

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Hawaiian Monk Seal Line under Marine Mammal, Office of Protected Resources - \$7.0 million (NOAA's new recovery plan identifies funding needs totaling approximately \$36.0 million over the next five years)

*An increase of \$4.9 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$2.1 million*

### **Sea Turtle Conservation**

All sea turtles in U.S. waters are listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act, yet populations of sea turtles continue to decline. New information shows that loggerhead sea turtle nesting in Florida, making up approximately 90 percent of all U.S. loggerhead nesting, has declined by nearly 50 percent in the past decade. According to the recent loggerhead five-year status review conducted by NMFS and the Fish and Wildlife Service, "the most significant human-made factor affecting conservation and recovery of the loggerhead is incidental capture in commercial and artisanal fisheries." However, NMFS is allowing tens of thousands of loggerhead sea turtles to be killed annually in the Atlantic Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico by destructive fishing gear. Additional resources are needed to conduct enhanced sea turtle stock assessments, place fisheries observers who understand turtle bycatch, develop and implement bycatch mitigation methods, and protect important habitat.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Protected Resources Research & Management Programs-Marine Turtles - \$26.4 million

*An increase of \$12.7 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$13.7 million*

### **Expand Annual Stock Assessments**

Fishery stock assessments are the basis for determining whether a stock is overfished, experiencing overfishing, or healthy. As of 2007, only 128 of the 530 U.S. fish stocks identified by NMFS have been adequately assessed to determine whether they are experiencing overfishing. NMFS's analysis indicates that even modest increases in funding for this program will provide the capability to assess less than 60 percent of the 230 'major' fish stocks that comprise the national Fish Stock Sustainability Index (FSSI). Currently, 65 of the major fish stocks or stock assemblages (comprised of multiple species) are classified as 'unknown' with respect to their population status. Additional resources are needed to hire scientists, fund data collection at sea, and develop fishery stock assessments that are the basis for determining the status of fished species. Increased funding is essential to support management activities related to the implementation of new requirements for annual catch limits and accountability measures for all U.S. fisheries by 2011. Increasing the number of fish stocks with adequate assessments will significantly improve the federal government's efforts to maintain viable fisheries and healthy marine ecosystems. A net increase of \$18.4 million in FY 2010 to a level of \$50 million would provide a much-needed boost for expanded stock assessment work and fishery data collection in order to support the accelerated implementation of annual catch limits in all U.S. fisheries.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Expand Annual Stock Assessments - \$50.0 million

# NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

## NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

*An increase of \$18.4 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$31.6 million*

### **Marine Recreational Fisheries Registry and Information Program**

Marine recreational fishing is a significant cause of mortality for many marine species, yet little information is available to assess most of these fisheries. In the reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Act of 2006, Congress called for improved management of saltwater recreational fisheries by mandating the creation of a national saltwater angler registry (a database of recreational fishermen) and an overhaul of the system of collecting and assessing recreational fishery information. The measures are based on the recommendations of a national panel of independent scientists, which concluded that the existing Marine Recreational Fishing Statistics Survey (MRFSS) program is woefully inadequate. In the FY 2009 budget request, NOAA sought a net increase of \$3 million for a total of \$6.5 million to complete the final phase of the development of a new registry system for recreational fisheries by January 1, 2009. However, completion of a revamped recreational fisheries statistics program will not fully address the ongoing need for improved recreational fishery catch statistics in the fishery management process. According to NMFS, the Magnuson-Stevens Act's new requirements for annual catch limits and accountability measures in all U.S. fisheries will require dedicated funding estimated at about \$20 million per year to provide fishery managers with the data needed to manage saltwater recreational fisheries and address overfishing. A net budget increase of at least \$6.5 million over the FY 2008 enacted level would provide \$10 million to complete the establishment of the national registry program and support the collection of survey information for the improved management of these fisheries.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Marine Recreational Information Program - \$10.0 million

*An increase of \$6.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$ 3.5 million*

### **Fisheries Enforcement**

Compliance with fishery regulations is uncertain without funds supporting the deployment of enforcement personnel at sea and at ports. Enforcement of fisheries laws and management regulations is essential to the achievement of national objectives for sustainable fisheries as well as efforts to address Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) fishing on the high seas as required in the new Magnuson-Stevens Act. The enforcement program also provides money to support cooperative agreements with state enforcement officials.

A budget increase above the enacted FY 2008 funding level of \$53.3 million will be required to establish a high seas IUU enforcement and surveillance program within the existing NMFS fisheries enforcement program. Successful implementation of the new legal requirements for annual catch limits and accountability measures in all U.S. fisheries will also require greater commitments of funding in order to improve catch accounting and monitor compliance with annual catch limits in all regions and fisheries.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Enforcement - \$57.1 million (including \$18.3 million for Vessel Monitoring System)

*An increase of \$3.7 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$53.4 million*

### **Fishery Observer Program**

Fishery observers are independent scientists who gather information about fishing practices by accompanying fishermen at sea. Observers collect data on the composition and amount of the actual catch brought on board

# NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

## NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

during fishing operations. This is in contrast to landings data which only record what is brought to port, failing to account for “bycatch,” or what is caught and discarded at sea. This data is especially important as it is the primary source for identifying and monitoring marine mammal, sea turtle, sea bird, and other wildlife bycatch.

According to the National Marine Fisheries Service, observers are currently deployed in only 42 of the nation’s 300 fisheries. For many of those fisheries that have observers, existing coverage levels are well below the levels needed for precise and accurate estimates of bycatch and total catch of fish and protected marine species. Considering the NMFS makes fishery management decisions based on this data, more observers at sea will lead to better fishery management.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Fishery Observer Program - \$56.0 million

*An increase of \$24.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$31.5 million*

### **Fisheries Habitat Restoration Program**

The Fisheries Habitat Restoration Program, funded through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA) Restoration Center, reaches out to local constituencies to accomplish on-the-ground, community-based projects to restore estuaries and coastal habitats through its Community-based Restoration Program. Partnerships and local involvement are fundamental to the success of this program. Partners typically match federal dollars three- or five-to-one and leverage those dollars up to ten times more through state and local participation. To date, the program has funded more than 900 projects in 25 states, promoting fishery habitat restoration in coastal areas with a grassroots, bottom-up approach. The success of the Restoration Center’s work spawned the creation of the Open Rivers Initiative in FY 2007. The program must continue to receive adequate support due to this increased capacity and to continue the overall success of the program itself.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Fisheries Habitat Restoration Program - \$40.0 million

*An increase of \$8.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$31.5 million*

### **Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund**

Wild Pacific salmon and steelhead are national treasures of enormous environmental, economic, and cultural significance. These important species are in decline due to dams, unsustainable logging and agricultural practices, urban sprawl, and poor hatchery practices. Twenty-six of the 51 salmon and steelhead stocks along the West Coast from Washington to California are listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). The Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund, funded through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), is aimed at restoring and protecting habitat for the imperiled fish. The program provides much-needed assistance to state, local, and tribal governments in Washington, Oregon, California, Idaho and Alaska. These funds are matched dollar-for-dollar at the state and local level, and can be used for habitat restoration, preservation, and acquisition, as well as for monitoring the health of salmon populations and watersheds.

Citizens, watershed groups, Native American tribes, and federal and state agencies from across the nation have been working on several new salmon recovery plans to bring the species back from the brink of extinction and set them on the road to recovery. Funding these plans at levels that enable full implementation is imperative to successfully recover wild salmon and steelhead. The recommendation below of \$120 million is an excellent starting point; however, in order to provide an adequate federal contribution for the completion and implementation

# NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

of remaining recovery plans from Southern California to Alaska to Idaho, funding of the PCSRF will need to increase to \$200 million per year by 2012.

## **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund - \$120.0 million

*An increase of \$53.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$67.0 million*

# NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

## NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE

### **National Estuarine Research Reserve System**

The National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS) is a network of protected areas established for long-term research, education, and stewardship. Through an effective partnership between NOAA and coastal states, the NERRS plays a critical role in sustaining the nation's estuaries and coasts. There are currently 27 reserves throughout the country that conduct research, monitoring, restoration, education, and training designed to improve our understanding and management of estuaries. Additional funding will be essential to support core research, education, and stewardship programs, and to allow for the expansion of the NERRS to new estuaries. In addition, NERRS construction and acquisition funding is critical to maintain, upgrade, and construct facilities and acquire priority lands for conservation.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

NERRS - \$27.0 million

*An increase of \$21.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$6.5 million*

NERRS Construction and Acquisition - \$15.0 million

*An increase of \$3.4 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$11.6 million*

### **Deep Water Corals**

Corals are usually associated with shallow tropical waters, however coral ecosystems are also found on the deep sea floor. Unfortunately, these ecosystems are not well understood and are vulnerable to destructive fishing practices. Recently, scientists discovered that deep water coral communities may provide valuable chemical compounds used in manufacturing pharmaceuticals that may lead to treatments for cancer and HIV.

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (MSRA) directs NOAA to establish a Deep Sea Coral Research and Technology Program. This program will allow managers to identify and better protect sensitive deep sea coral habitat throughout our national waters. Program activities such as mapping and research cruises are intrinsically linked to another new MSRA activity, the affirmation of the Regional Fishery Management Councils' authority to protect and conserve deep sea coral habitat for their own merit as valuable and vulnerable marine ecosystems. Additionally, this program is as an important step in achieving NOAA's goal of ecosystem-based management.

#### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Deep Sea Coral Research and Technology Program - \$7.0 million

*An increase of \$5.5 million over the FY 09 president's budget of \$1.5 million*

### **Coral Reef Conservation Program**

Tropical coral reefs are often called the rainforests of the sea because of the amount of rich biodiversity that these habitats provide. Coral reef ecosystems provide shelter for marine animals, protection from predators, and feeding, spawning, and nursery areas for many fish species including commercially important fish. For coastal communities, coral reefs also play important roles in the protection of coastlines from storms and generate income through tourism. Tropical corals face many threats including damaging fishing practices, land-based pollution, vessel strikes, and climate change. Recent science regarding the threat of ocean acidification to corals, episodes of coral bleaching, and the listing of coral species as threatened under the Endangered Species Act illustrate a dire need for managers to better understand all the threats these important ecosystems face.

# NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

## NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE

NOAA's Coral Reef Conservation Program with the U.S. Coral Reef Task Force, focuses on improving the understanding tropical coral reef ecosystems and minimizing the threats to their health and viability.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Tropical Coral Reef Programs - \$50.0 million

*An increase of \$21.7 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$29.3 million*

### **Marine Debris**

Marine debris has become one of the most widespread pollution problems facing the world's oceans and waterways. Once thought of as simply something unpleasant to look at, research has proven that debris has serious effects on the marine environment, marine wildlife, the economy and human health and safety. Marine debris wreaks havoc on our oceans and the species that depend on the ocean for survival. Reports of death by entanglement of endangered and threatened seals, sea turtles, and seabirds continue to grow. The numbers are staggering and bring to light the urgency of immediate action to control these devastatingly destructive occurrences.

In conjunction with the Marine Debris Research Prevention and Reduction Act, NOAA developed and is implementing a Marine Debris Program, a national and international effort focused on identifying, reducing and preventing debris in the marine environment. Additional Resources are needed to enhance the ability of NOAA to identify the types and sources of marine debris, and to support programs on the ground working towards assessing, reducing and preventing marine debris.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Marine Debris Program - \$10.0 million

*An increase of \$6.8 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$3.2 million*

### **National Marine Sanctuary Program**

The National Marine Sanctuary System, which consists of 13 national marine sanctuaries and the Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument, encompasses more than 150,000 square miles of ocean and Great Lakes waters and includes several of our nation's most diverse marine ecosystems. While this may seem like a large area, only 3.3 percent of our sensitive ocean is protected by sanctuary designations and most of this is in a remote area of the Pacific. Areas such as coral reef and mangrove forest ecosystems off the Florida Keys, to the tide pools and kelp forests on the Olympic Coast are managed through the Sanctuary Program.

Papahānaumokuākea Marine National Monument is the newest addition and creates an immense and irreplaceable coral reef ecosystem preserve, covering 140,000 square miles of reefs, atolls, and shallow and deep sea. It is home to more than 7,000 marine species, including the critically endangered Hawaiian monk seal.

The National Marine Sanctuary Program is responsible for important education and outreach to the public, ocean monitoring and research, and enforcement projects in the sanctuaries. The three-year average operations and capital budget for sanctuaries and the monument, a combined area of approximately 96 million acres that exceeds our national parks in size, costs approximately \$57 million per year, and has employed about 250 full time government and contractor personnel since FY 2006. This works out to be approximately 60 cents per acre to manage our national parks of the sea or one person for every 600 square miles. Level spending has caused real decreases in effort over time. Increased funding is essential to fully implement the existing sanctuaries' management plans, to revise outdated management plans, and to enhance research and educational outreach.

# NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

## NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE

Funding is also needed to provide additional resources for the Marine Monument as well as for sanctuary expansion proposals currently before Congress.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Marine Sanctuary Program - \$80.0 million

*An increase of \$20.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$60.0 million*

### **Marine Protected Areas Center**

Well-designed and implemented Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) are an important tool for maintaining marine biological diversity, protecting ocean habitats, and managing fish populations. They also provide opportunities for scientific research, education, and recreation compatible with their mission. The term “Marine Protected Area” encompasses a spectrum of management schemes, but generally refers to area-based management where natural or cultural resources are given greater protection than the area surrounding them. The National Marine Protected Areas Center was established within NOAA to undertake the essential task of developing an integrated national system of MPAs which advances the conservation of our nation’s vital natural and cultural marine resources. The MPA Center must have its funding restored if it is to carry out its goals, including implementation of the framework for the national system of MPAs, restoration of a modest technical assistance and stewardship support program, stakeholder and advisory committee participation and engagement, collection of data for the marine managed areas inventory, and expansion of the MPA pilot project to other regions – all of which will contribute to the effective use of MPAs as a tool for ecosystem-based management.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Marine Protected Areas Center - \$4.0 million (Restores the MPA Center FY 04 enacted level)

*An increase of \$2.6 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$1.4 million*

### **Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program**

CELCP, the Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program, was created by Congress in 2002 to protect “coastal and estuarine areas with significant conservation, recreation, ecological, historical and aesthetic values, or that are threatened by conversion from their natural or recreational states to other uses.” Since its inception, the CELCP program, partnering with state and local communities, has protected more than 40,000 acres in 27 of the 35 coastal states and territories. This investment of over \$200 million federal dollars has leveraged an even greater amount in nonfederal matching funds. However, the demand for CELCP dollars far exceeds Congressionally-appropriated levels, particularly with funding falling to a low of \$8 million in FY 2008. In the FY 2009 competitive grants process, the CELCP program received 54 proposals from 27 states and territories, totaling \$79 million in requests.

According to NOAA, coastal counties constitute only 17 percent of the nation’s land area, but account for 53 percent of its population. The benefits of coastal lands are well known. They filter pollutants from storm water runoff, control flooding after severe storms, serve as important nursery habitat for commercial and recreational fish and shellfish as well as nesting and foraging habitat for coastal birds, and provide valuable opportunities for coastal recreation and nature-based tourism. Yet, intense and spiraling development pressures along our once-pristine coastlines are substantially reducing public access, exacerbating non-point source pollution, destroying coastal wetlands and drastically impairing estuaries, some of the most productive habitat on earth. Full funding for the CELCP program provides a critical tool to respond to the mounting pressures on our coasts and to protect the most sensitive coastal areas.

# NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

## NATIONAL OCEAN SERVICE

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program - \$60.0 million

*An increase of \$52.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$8.0 million*

### **Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA)**

For more than thirty years, the Coastal Zone Management Program has helped states to manage the nation's coasts, islands, and Great Lakes. This innovative partnership offers an effective mechanism for federal and state managers to address important national coastal objectives. It has resulted in the establishment of thirty-four coastal management programs, which have significantly reduced environmental impacts of coastal developments, resolved significant conflicts between competing coastal uses, and provided critical assistance to local governments in coastal planning. States are empowered by the CZMA to make their own management decisions, and all federal activities within a state's coastal zone must comply with the state plan once it is approved at the federal level. The CZMA is a true financial partnership, with each federal dollar matched by a state dollar and often leveraged for additional funds from local and private investment.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Coastal Zone Management Grants - \$100.0 million

*An increase of \$35.6 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$64.4 million*

### **Estuary Restoration Program**

NOAA's Estuary Restoration Program is a comprehensive program for the restoration of our nation's estuaries, authorized through the Estuary Restoration Act. By setting a goal to restore one million acres of estuary habitat by 2010, the Act encourages coordination among all levels of government, and engages the unique strengths of the public, nonprofit, and private sectors. The Act ensures a strong federal commitment and resources to restore estuary habitat by authorizing \$4 million for NOAA, which includes \$2.5 million for implementation of on-the-ground restoration projects and \$1.5 million for the acquisition, maintenance, and management of monitoring data on restoration projects.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Estuary Restoration Program - \$4.0 million

*This is the level authorized for NOAA under the Estuary Restoration Act, as reauthorized through the Water Resources Development Act of 2007*

# NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF EDUCATION

## **Environmental Education Initiatives**

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Office of Education oversees several Environmental Education Initiatives, the largest being the Environmental Literacy Grants (ELG) program which helps to establish new partnerships that deliver educational materials to thousands of teachers and students. The ELG program enables NOAA to partner with the top science centers, aquaria, and educators in the country to educate the public about vital issues around our changing planet. It also allows NOAA to leverage the vast array of climate science being undertaken to increase public understanding and the quality of education in critical areas. These funds are awarded on a competitive basis and are increasingly used to build capacity at the national and regional levels.

Funding NOAA Environmental Education Initiatives at \$12.0 million, including \$10.0 million for Environmental Literacy Grants, will enable NOAA's Office of Education to implement the education recommendations in the President's U.S. Ocean Action Plan, particularly the goal to strengthen collaboration among public and private sectors, states and regions, scientists and educators, and the federal agencies. Funding would also further leverage the existing capabilities of formal and informal education partners through competitive grants and coordinate regional education efforts, such as the education component of the Gulf of Mexico Alliance. These funds are important to NOAA because they represent virtually all of the discretionary funds available to the Office of Education for addressing annual NOAA education goals as called for in the America COMPETES Act.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Environmental Education Initiatives - \$12.0 million

Environmental Literacy Grants - \$10.0 million

*An increase of \$7.1 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$4.9 million*

## **Bay Watershed Education and Training Programs**

Administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) since 2003, the Bay Watershed Education and Training (B-WET) program offers competitive grants to leverage existing environmental education programs, foster the growth of new programs, and encourage development of partnerships among environmental education programs within watershed systems. B-WET's rigorously evaluated programs are implemented by region, which allows the unique environmental and social characteristics of the region to drive the design of targeted activities to improve community understanding, promote teacher competency, and enhance student interest and achievement in science. A fundamental goal of the program is to demonstrate how the quality of the watershed affects the lives of the people who live in it. B-WET supports programs for students as well as professional development for teachers, while sustaining regional education and environmental priorities. B-WET awards have provided environmental education opportunities to more than 100,000 students and 10,000 teachers.

With an increase in funding in FY 2008, B-WET expanded from the Chesapeake Bay, California, and Hawaii to also include the Pacific Northwest, the northern Gulf of Mexico, and New England. An increase of \$2.3 million in FY 2010 will enable this successful program to expand to additional watersheds in areas such as the Great Lakes and the Southeast.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Bay Watershed and Training Programs - \$12.0 million

*An increase of \$2.3 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$9.7 million (includes B-WET regional programs and B-WET California program)*

# NATIONAL OCEANIC & ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION OFFICE OF EDUCATION

## **Climate Change Education Grant Program**

Implementation of comprehensive global climate change policies being considered by Congress will require coordinated and effective federal efforts to help improve broad public understanding of the core ecological, social, and economic concepts and principles involved in climate change mitigation and adaptation. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) Office of Education has legislative authority for such education initiatives through the America COMPETES Act (PL 110-69 Sec. 1502). Funding in FY 2010 for a new Climate Change Education Grant Program will enable NOAA to leverage the vast array of climate science being undertaken at the agency as part of developing strategies for addressing the gaps between the state of climate change education and the state of public climate change literacy. Grants would contribute to improving the climate literacy of the nation's citizens, students, workforce, and decision- and policy- makers by systemically and strategically strengthening climate change education in formal and informal education at all age levels.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Climate Change Education Grant Program - \$12.0 million

*An increase of \$12.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$0*

---

<sup>i</sup> See U.S. Ocean Policy Report Cards of the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative (JOCI): [www.jointoceancommission.org](http://www.jointoceancommission.org), the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy (USCOP 2004) and the Pew Oceans Commission (POC 2003).

<sup>ii</sup> National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), unpublished data. "Adequate" means an assessment has been done within the past five years, equivalent to Level 3 of the Stock Assessment Improvement Plan (NMFS 2001).

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR/HHS

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NASA

# DEPARTMENT OF LABOR/HHS

## CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

### **Energy Conservation Corps**

The 111<sup>th</sup> Congress is expected to reauthorize America's national service programs operated by the Corporation for National and Community Service, including new programs that focus on engaging Americans in energy conservation and service to the environment. The proposed Energy Conservation Corps, building on the legacy of the depression-era Civilian Conservation Corps and modeled after today's Service and Conservation Corps, will address the nation's energy and transportation infrastructure needs while providing work and service opportunities for disadvantaged youth. In a manner similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s, disconnected young people can be mobilized to retrofit, weatherize, and otherwise improve the energy efficiency of residential and public facilities that account for more than 40 percent of carbon emissions.

With additional funding, the successful Learn and Serve America program will reach students through public and private schools, institutions of higher education, and non-profit organizations through green service-learning. The Senior Corps program will leverage the talents and experiences of seniors to improve the energy efficiency of housing for elderly and low-income people, as well as provide opportunities for volunteering in schools to support environmental education and energy conservation education.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Energy Conservation Corps - \$100.0 million

Learn and Serve America - \$10.0 million (specifically for environmental service learning)

Senior Corps - \$10.0 million (specifically for environmental service and energy conservation)

*An increase of \$120.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$0.0 million*

### **Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Worker Training Program**

The Green Jobs Act (GJA), Title X of the Energy Independence and Security Act, authorizes \$125 million per year in grants for an Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Worker Training Program. It identifies needed skills, develops training programs, and trains workers for jobs in a range of green industries, but has a special focus on creating "green pathways out of poverty." The program will be administered by the Department of Labor in consultation with the Department of Energy. The Act responds to already existing skill shortages. The National Renewable Energy Lab has identified a shortage of skills and training as a leading barrier to renewable energy and energy efficiency growth. This labor shortage is only likely to get more severe as baby-boomers skilled in current energy technologies retire; in the power sector, for example, nearly one-quarter of the current workforce will be eligible for retirement in the next five to seven years.

### **FY10 Recommendation:**

Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Worker Training Program - \$125.0 Million

*Fully fund at the level of authorization to start this critical program*

# DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

## **University Sustainability Program**

Interest in sustainability is exploding on college campuses across the nation, and institutions are making remarkable changes to try to reduce campus carbon footprints and energy use. However, despite increasing interest and demand from students, sustainability education programs on college campuses are on the decline according to an independent study released in August 2008. Environmental curriculum requirements are slipping and today's students may be less environmentally literate when they graduate than their predecessors.

Congress recently authorized a new University Sustainability Program (USP) at the Department of Education as Part U of the recently enacted Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (HR 4137). This program has the potential for high impact, high visibility, broad support within higher education, and is responsive to an important national trend in higher education. Sustainability on college campuses is critical, from education in the classroom to facility operations. Higher education produces almost all of the nation's leaders in all sectors and endeavors, and many college campuses are virtually small cities in their size, environmental impact, and financial influence. Campuses use vast amounts of energy to heat, cool, and light their facilities. In all, the nation's 4,100 campuses educate or employ around 20 million individuals and generate over three percent of the nation's GDP. The economic clout of these schools is further multiplied by the hundreds of thousands of business suppliers, property owners, and other commercial and nonprofit entities involved with higher education. Funding for the newly authorized USP is necessary to help provide difficult-to-get seed funding to launch sustainability education programs and to help support mainstream higher education associations including sustainability in their work with their member institutions.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

University Sustainability Program - \$50.0 million

*An increase of 50.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$0.0 million*

## **Healthy High Performance Schools Program**

The Healthy High Performance Schools Program seeks to facilitate the design, construction and operation of high performance schools: environments that are not only energy and resource efficient, but also healthy, comfortable, well-lit, and containing the amenities for a quality education. This grant program is critical at a time when energy costs for America's elementary and secondary schools are skyrocketing. The No Child Left Behind Act (PL 107-110, Title 5, Part D, Subtitle 18) authorized grants to state education agencies to advance the development of "healthy, high-performance" school buildings. States may use the funds to provide information and technical assistance, as well as monitor, evaluate, and provide funding to local education agencies for "healthy, high-performance" school buildings. In turn, local agencies may use the funding to obtain technical assistance, develop plans that address reducing energy and meeting health and safety codes, and conduct energy audits. Funds may not be used for construction, maintenance, repair or renovation of buildings. This program has yet to be funded by Congress. While it would seem to be a given that we are providing our children with a healthy learning environment, many of the nation's 150,000 public school buildings fall far short of this standard. Research clearly shows that improving specific factors such as a school's indoor environmental quality improves attendance, academic performance, and productivity.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

University Sustainability Program - \$25.0 million

*An increase of 25.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$0.0 million*

# NATIONAL AERONAUTICS and SPACE ADMINISTRATION CLIMATE CHANGE EDUCATION

## **Climate Change Education Grant Program**

While public awareness and concern for climate change continues to rise, the vast majority of the public remains illiterate about how climate change works, how it impacts their lives, and how their decisions and actions contribute to it. In FY 08, Congress appropriated funds for the first time to address this issue by providing funding for climate change education grants through the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). In August 2008, NASA announced a Request for Proposals for a first-ever competitive grant program seeking applications from educational and nonprofit organizations to use NASA's unique contributions to climate and earth system science. The goals of the program include: improving the teaching and learning about global climate change in elementary and secondary schools and on college campuses, increasing the number of students using NASA earth observation data/NASA earth system models to investigate and analyze global climate change issues, increasing the number of undergraduate students prepared for employment and/or to enter graduate school in technical fields relevant to global climate change, and increasing access to high quality global climate change education among students from groups historically underrepresented in science. Congress should continue this grant program in FY 10.

## **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Climate Change Education Grant Program - \$8.5 million

*Same as the FY 08 enacted level*

## CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

### **National Environmental Policy Act**

For close to 40 years, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) has proven to be an essential tool for both public and federal agencies. NEPA, enacted by Congress in 1969, proclaims a national policy for environmental protection and requires Federal agencies to analyze how their actions could affect the environment. NEPA also ensures that the public has an opportunity to be involved in these decisions—decisions that will impact the environment, their family’s health and their quality of life. Without a strong NEPA, we stand to lose an indispensable tool that guides us as we make policy decisions that directly impact our environment and communities.

Despite the importance of NEPA, Federal agencies over the past decade have not been allocated adequate resources to implement their NEPA responsibilities. The decrease in available resources has left Federal agencies understaffed and undertrained, leading to delays in the implementation of NEPA responsibilities and production of NEPA documents. These delays in NEPA implementation and inadequate NEPA documentation can lead to project delays and spur lawsuits from both the environmental and regulatory community, further compounding these problems.

The need for additional NEPA resources across the board is critical. An increase in funding for NEPA would ensure that agencies have the resources to carry out their NEPA activities, and the ability to increase training opportunities for Federal agency employees who are responsible for implementing NEPA. This section focuses on a few key agencies with urgent need. In addition, the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency should undertake a study of resource needs at the Federal agencies and develop proposals for additional funding in future years.

### Council on Environmental Quality

As part of the enacting NEPA legislation, Congress established the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) within the Executive Office of the President in 1969 and tasked CEQ with the hefty responsibility of ensuring that federal agencies meet their NEPA obligations. Specifically, CEQ provides oversight on NEPA through the issuance and interpretation of NEPA regulations, reviews and approves Federal agency NEPA procedures, and approves alternative arrangement to comply with NEPA if an emergency arises. In addition, CEQ helps resolve disputes between Federal agencies and with members of the public concerning NEPA implementation.

CEQ staff and funding levels are significantly below those from as far back as the 1970s. Currently, only one person on the CEQ staff is assigned to full time oversight of NEPA related-activities, with help from several others who offer administrative, technical, and other support. This one full-time equivalent has the primary responsibility of ensuring that CEQ meets its mandate. This includes, but is not limited to, providing guidance and oversight of agency NEPA procedural rules, assisting agencies in the development of numerous rulemakings, and issuing guidance to agencies on various NEPA provisions. On average, for the last eight years CEQ has helped agencies finalize five NEPA procedural rules per year, but has also provided guidance to numerous agencies on their NEPA implementation rules.

Increased funding is needed in order to enable CEQ to meet its responsibility to ensure that Federal agencies meet their obligations under NEPA. With that increase in funding, CEQ should restore its NEPA staffing to a level at which the agency can adequately provide the requisite NEPA guidance and oversight to the Federal agencies.

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

### Forest Service

The Forest Service is responsible for the management of National Forests and National Grasslands comprising 193 million acres of public lands. NEPA plays a major role in the Forest Service's management of these lands; as part of its planning process, the Forest Service prepares, on average, 150 environmental impact statements per year.

The Forest Service has faced tight budget constraints over the past several years directly limiting the funds available for NEPA implementation. Due to this lack of adequate funding, the Forest Service faces many challenges when conducting their NEPA reviews. First, the Forest Service cannot always fully staff its NEPA interdisciplinary teams that are tasked with integrated resource planning for the National Forests and the concurrent environmental analysis. Second, NEPA Project Managers have reported losing key individuals at inopportune times as people are assigned to perform both NEPA related activities and other unrelated tasks, including all-hazard detail. Finally, further compounding these staffing problems is a lack of NEPA training opportunities for Forest Service employees. These problems all lead to delays in NEPA implementation, including delays in the finalization of NEPA documents.

It is important that the Forest Service perform valuable NEPA analysis and continue to meet its NEPA requirements. In order to address the challenges outlined above, the Forest Service needs significant additional resources to dedicate to NEPA implementation including funding for additional staff. Moreover, in order to ensure that such funds are in fact allocated to NEPA implementation, the Forest Service should include NEPA compliance as a separate line item in future budgets to allow the public and other agencies to track what the Forest Service spends on NEPA related activities.

### Bureau of Land Management

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is responsible for carrying out a variety of programs for the management and conservation of resources on approximately 258 million surface acres, as well as 700 million acres of subsurface mineral estate. BLM's responsibilities include, but are not limited to, playing a key role in the management of Federal renewable and non-renewable sources of energy and managing livestock grazing practices on BLM-managed lands. Although BLM suffers from budget constraints that detrimentally impact the agency's NEPA efforts, these two components of BLM's responsibilities are in particular need of increased funding.

First, BLM continues to face a backlog of expired grazing permits; currently there are approximately 3,600 permits that need to be processed. For the past several years, Congress has allowed BLM to renew grazing permits without environmental review in order to expedite the renewal process. Unfortunately, this practice has allowed harmful grazing practices to continue unabated and has not eliminated the backlog. Overgrazing can lead to disastrous results, including the disappearance of vegetative species, an increase in erosion, and degradation in water quality. As has been the case year after year, BLM's annual performance analysis reveals that nearly half of the agency's rangelands – 123 million acres – failed to meet the Department of the Interior's standard for desired conditions. In order to prevent further destruction and degradation of public resources, increased funding is needed to allow BLM staff to finally eliminate the backlog so that proper NEPA analysis for these grazing permits can be resumed.

Second, BLM is facing new challenges in regulating access to public land energy resources, most importantly with respect to its role in development of renewable energy. Specifically, BLM has been inundated with proposals for the development of solar energy and wind resources on public lands. These proposed projects will have significant environmental impacts that BLM will need to analyze pursuant to NEPA. Currently, BLM is processing pending solar energy applications for developing large scale solar energy projects on public lands and faces a backlog of more than 130 solar project applications. In addition, over 40 percent of currently approved wind generation sites are failing to implement best management practices due to insufficient oversight on the part of BLM.

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

In addition to processing pending solar energy applications BLM, in partnership with the Department of Energy, is preparing a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) to assess environmental impacts associated with the development and implementation of agency-specific solar programs. While the budget for processing these permits has actually been cut in real dollars since FY 2005, the BLM has been tasked by the administration to increase the energy created by renewable sources by 34 percent. This is in stark contrast to BLM's oil and gas permitting program, where additional resources have been provided to ensure that permits are processed in a timely manner. BLM needs additional funding to process renewable energy applications as well as complete its PEIS.

### Environmental Protection Agency

The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Office of Federal Activities is responsible for coordinating EPA's review of all environmental impact statements (EIS) prepared by other Federal agencies, maintaining a national EIS filing system, and assuring that EPA is complying with NEPA in its own actions.

On average, EPA reviews approximately 500-600 EISs and several hundred environmental assessments annually. Also, a major focus of effort that is increasing within the EPA is their role in helping other agencies develop their EISs, including scoping and following up with an agency if concerns arise over a proposed project.

EPA is in need of additional funds to ensure it can fully meet its unique NEPA responsibilities and achieve several important NEPA objectives. With the support of additional funding, EPA could increase collaboration efforts between itself and other Federal agencies in the beginning stages of NEPA implementation in order to address potential concerns and offer increased NEPA training for EPA employees.

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is tasked with the responsibility of protecting marine mammals and endangered marine life. Among NMFS' responsibilities is the implementation of policies and regulations for issuance of permits and authorizations under the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act – decisions that are subject to NEPA.

Over the last few years, NMFS has experienced a significant increase in NEPA-related workload, including environmental reviews for projects led by other agencies, such as the Minerals Management Service and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. This workload is likely to further increase with recent executive and legislative actions that will increase the number of permits and projects for coastal and ocean energy projects requiring NEPA review. To ensure that NMFS can continue to provide quality NEPA review and consultation with other agencies, and to ensure that the public has opportunity to comment on the permits in a timely manner, NMFS must receive adequate funding for its NEPA activities.

### **FY 10 Recommendations:**

Council on Environmental Quality

\$0.8 million for an additional 4 FTEs

Forest Service

\$2.1 million for an additional 12 FTEs; 2 in Headquarters and 10 in Regional Offices

Bureau of Land Management

# **CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS**

## **NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT**

\$1.7 million for an additional 10 FTEs; 2 in Headquarters and 8 in Regional Offices

\$2.0 million for the environmental analysis of renewable energy permits and completion of PEIS

### Environmental Protection Agency

\$2.7 million for an additional 25 FTEs; 5 in the Office of Federal Activities and 20 in the regional offices

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

\$10.0 million for an additional 7 FTEs; 1 in Headquarters and 6 in Regional Offices

*(NEPA resources are combined with resources for the programs that they affect so it is not possible to disaggregate baseline numbers)*

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## NATIONAL STRATEGY TO ADDRESS IMPACTS OF GLOBAL WARMING & OCEAN ACIDIFICATION

### **National Strategy to Address Impacts of Global Warming & Ocean Acidification**

Global warming poses one of the most serious threats to wildlife and wildlife habitats in the U.S. and around the world. Cutting greenhouse gas emissions is essential to stave off mass extinctions and major disruptions of ecosystems, but cutting emissions alone is not sufficient. Global warming is already happening and substantial additional warming is inevitable due to pollution already released into the atmosphere. Scientists project that this warming will lead to increased sea level rise, intensified storms, floods and droughts, disappearing mountain snowpack and altered stream flows, evaporating lakes and wetlands, and numerous other disruptions.

Planning for how to best assist wildlife and ecosystems in becoming more resilient and adapting to the impacts of climate change and ocean acidification is needed by all federal land management agencies. A report by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) underscores natural resource managers' need for national policy direction on this issue. In *Climate Change: Agencies Should Develop Guidance for Addressing the Effects on Federal Land and Water Resources*, the GAO found that federal land and wildlife management agencies lack the guidance and capacity to respond effectively to the impacts of global warming on our federal lands and wildlife.

The FY 2010 budget should provide funding to develop a comprehensive national strategy for assisting fish and wildlife and ecosystems in becoming more resilient and adapting to the impacts of climate change and ocean acidification. This cross-cutting initiative should be coordinated by the President to ensure all government jurisdictions are effectively addressed. Future federal climate change legislation is likely to direct significant funding to wildlife adaptation measures, and the U.S. needs to start planning now to ensure that federal funds are prudently committed and positive results are achieved. Funding is requested for the President, acting through the Council on Environmental Quality to:

- Develop a comprehensive national strategy in close consultation with relevant federal agencies, including the Interior, Commerce, Agriculture, and Defense Departments and the Environmental Protection Agency, states, territories, Indian tribes, and other stakeholders, with input from the public, including:
  - Prioritized goals and measures, and a schedule for implementation to identify, monitor and conserve natural resources threatened by climate change and ocean acidification;
  - Coordination with other relevant conservation plans, including the state comprehensive wildlife conservation plans, the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, the national fish habitat action plans, coastal zone management plans and reports of the Pew Oceans Commission and the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy.
- Establish a Science Advisory Board comprised of 10 to 20 scientists recommended by the National Academy of Sciences and appointed by the President. The Board would ensure the scientific integrity of the national strategy and advise the President and federal agencies on the best available science regarding the impacts of climate change and ocean acidification on wildlife and ecosystems, adaptation responses, and research needs.

The FY 2009 House Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill included language directing the Secretary of the Interior to initiate development of such a strategy. Should that language remain in the final bill, the broader FY 2010 initiative would build upon it.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

National Strategy for Addressing Global Warming & Ocean Acidification Impacts on Wildlife and Habitat - \$5.0 million allocated among the following agencies: Council on Environmental Quality, the Department of the Interior, Forest Service/Natural Resources Conservation Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, and the Army Corps of Engineers

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE FOUNDATION

### **National Fish and Wildlife Foundation**

The National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) is a private, non-profit organization established by Congress to conserve fish, wildlife, plants and habitats through multi-sector partnerships. A primary function of NFWF is to support the mission of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration through competitive grant programs. NFWF also has long-standing partnerships with the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management and USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service. NFWF serves as a broker for the federal agencies and has been successful in attracting private funds for conservation through corporate sponsorship and direct gifts. This collaborative model has supported nearly 10,000 grants to over 3,000 organizations and leveraged more than \$500 million in federal funds into over \$1.5 billion for conservation. Projects funded through NFWF benefit diverse terrestrial and marine species and habitats, with positive impacts for the National Wildlife Refuge System, National Forest System, Bureau of Land Management lands, and associated private lands. NFWF continues to excel in grantmaking while emphasizing accountability, measurable results, and sustainable conservation outcomes. Modest funding increases will allow NFWF to expand well-established partnerships to implement keystone initiatives which focus on select species of birds, fish and sensitive habitats in need of immediate conservation action

### **FY 10 Recommendations:**

#### U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Resource Management - \$7.5 million

*Same as the FY 08 enacted level*

#### U.S. Forest Service

National Forest System - \$2.6 million

*Same as the FY 08 enacted level*

#### Bureau of Land Management

Management of Lands and Resources - \$2.8 million

*Same as the FY 08 enacted level*

# **CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS**

## **BORDERLANDS ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION**

America's nearly 2,000 mile long border with Mexico includes many national parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness areas, tribal reservations and other environmentally important areas. Several nationally significant protected areas are found here, including Big Bend National Park, Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument, and Santa Ana and Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuges (NWR). These protected lands provide essential habitat for hundreds of imperiled species, including nearly 40 species listed or proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act in Arizona alone. Much of this country's most spectacular wildlife, including jaguar, ocelot, pronghorn, and hundreds of bird and butterfly species, and the substantial economic benefit these species provide to local communities, depend upon maintaining connected and intact habitat on public borderlands.

Illegal border crossings and related enforcement activities are placing a tremendous burden on federal land management agencies and causing serious long-term damage to natural and cultural resources. In addition, private property, agricultural fields, tribal reservations, cities and towns all lie directly in the path of large-scale construction projects, including hundreds of miles of proposed border walls and roads authorized by the Secure Fence Act of 2006. Several lengthy wall segments have already been constructed on protected federal lands, including at Buenos Aires NWR and San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area in Arizona, and on the Lower Rio Grande Valley NWR in Texas. The effects of large-scale construction of walls and roads across sensitive areas will have adverse effects on people and wildlife, such as erosion and sedimentation that impairs water quality and stream habitat, elevated risk to wildlife and human safety from increased floods, untamed wildfires, and the many devastating ancillary effects of fragmenting wildlife populations in previously unbroken and vast habitat.

Federal land management agencies are in dire need of resources to reduce or mitigate the effects of illegal immigration and law enforcement activities on public lands in the borderlands region. A cross-cutting budget initiative that includes the Departments of Homeland Security (DHS) and Defense, both of which either manage borderlands or have enforcement responsibilities, could alleviate some of the pressure on federal land managers and their already inadequate budgets. Further, the DHS should be directed to follow through with its stated promise to transfer up to \$50 million to the Department of the Interior (DOI) to mitigate the adverse impacts of wall and road construction on federally listed threatened and endangered species. In addition, there are other deleterious impacts for which DHS should provide compensation, such as short and long-term injury to other (non-listed) wildlife, habitat destruction, impaired quality of, and access to surface water, depletion of groundwater, introduction of invasive species, and more. The DHS should also fund implementation of a borderlands biological monitoring protocol, now being jointly developed by DHS, DOI, and the U.S. Geological Survey.

In addition to mitigating for border security infrastructure impacts, funding increases also are needed for:

- More staff and appropriate infrastructure improvements for resource agencies, including more law enforcement agents; providing environmental and cultural sensitivity training for Border Patrol and other non-land management agency law enforcement agents; needed facilities and vehicles; and improving visitor services.
- Biological research, habitat restoration, and monitoring programs, including funding for understanding and mitigating impacts on endangered species, other wildlife and habitat; and restoration of degraded habitats. Resource protection, including the removal of trash and abandoned vehicles; cleaning and protecting fouled water sources; blocking hundreds of miles of illegal roads; using surveillance and deterrence technology; fighting fires associated with border crossers; and protection and restoration of important historic, cultural, and anthropological structures and artifacts.

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## WILD AND SCENIC RIVER MANAGEMENT

### Wild and Scenic River Management

The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act protects free-flowing rivers with remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic and cultural values. Four federal agencies share responsibility for administering designated rivers, conducting studies to determine if rivers qualify for wild and scenic river designation, and developing wild and scenic river management plans: the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Forest Service, National Park Service, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Unfortunately, none of these agencies receives sufficient funding to adequately protect the Wild and Scenic Rivers System and ensure that it represents a broad diversity of river types, as Congress intended. Although 84,500 stream miles are potentially eligible for designation, only about 165 rivers covering almost 11,500 miles are currently designated. With increased funding, these agencies could complete management plans and studies to identify additional rivers that qualify for designation. Additional funding would also allow them to better manage and protect designated rivers and promote their values to the public.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Department of Agriculture

Forest Service (FS):

National Forest System- Recreation, Heritage, and Wilderness-

\$9.0 million for Forest Service wild and scenic river management

\$3.0 million for the creation of river management plans

\$3.0 million for the completion of wild and scenic river studies

Department of the Interior

Wild and Scenic Rivers (WSR)

Bureau of Land Management (BLM):

National Landscape Conservation System-

\$7.0 million for WSR Management

\$5.0 million for completion of WSR studies

Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS):

National Wildlife Refuge System-

\$1.787 million for FWS wild and scenic river management, restoration and studies

National Park Service (NPS):

National Programs- Rivers and Trails Studies-

\$1.0 million for wild and scenic river studies

\$16.0 million for wild and scenic rivers managed as units of the National Park System

*An increase of \$16.6 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$1.5 million*

*(The Wild and Scenic Rivers programs for the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Fish and Wildlife Service above are included in larger program requests, management funding is not tracked by the agencies, and do not have separate line requests in either the President's Budget request or individual appropriation bills, so there can be no comparison to the FY 08 levels.)*

# **CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS COASTAL LOUISIANA RESTORATION**

Where the Mississippi River meets the Gulf of Mexico it forms a complex web of ecosystems that are unique and vitally important to the economic, environmental, and security-related concerns of the gulf region and its citizens. Vast wetland complexes that previously covered acres of the Mississippi delta are disappearing at an alarming rate because the river cannot deposit its vital sediments into the surrounding wetlands. The loss of more than 2000 square miles of wetlands through the years has led to a dramatic decrease in the natural protection afforded by wetlands and barrier islands to coastal cities such as New Orleans. The added impacts of sea level rise, rising water temperatures, salt water intrusion, invasive species, and the increasing frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, all being exacerbated by global warming, make clear the urgent need for coastal restoration and conservation as an integral portion of the rebuilding of New Orleans and the Gulf Coast and to appropriate funds accordingly.

## **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Atchafalaya Restoration [WRDA 2007 § 7002(e)] - \$10.0 million

Science and Technology Program - \$10.0 million

Beneficial Use of Dredged Material - \$100.0 million

Coastal Wetland Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act (CWPPRA) - \$60.0 million

Violet Diversion Project Design - \$12.0 million

Mississippi River Sediment Pipelines - \$75.0 million

Myrtle Grove Restoration Design - \$7.0 million

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION

The 18,000-square-mile Everglades ecosystem of central and southern Florida is one of the world's most diverse and productive wetlands, but is also one of the nation's most imperiled natural wetland ecosystems. Since 1900, more than half of the ecosystem has been drained and lost to urban and agricultural development, and the remaining marshes are crisscrossed by 1,400 miles of canals that alter natural water flows. Restoration of the Everglades is at a critical juncture and keeping the Everglades' restoration on schedule along with the Federal/Florida partnership requires significant federal investment in 2009. **The long anticipated Modified Waters and Kissimmee River Restoration Projects will be completed by 2012, but only if fully funded over the next two years.** It is time to begin implementation of the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP), authorized 6 years ago.

### Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program

The Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program (CERP) is aimed at reversing the decline of the Everglades and loss of the many ecological and economic services it provides. The program will restore water flows throughout the ecosystem, clean up polluted waters, purchase privately owned lands to create a buffer between natural and urban areas, protect habitat, and enhance recreational opportunities.

### Kissimmee River Restoration

Upon completion of the Kissimmee River restoration project in 2011, over 40 square miles of river and floodplain ecosystem will be restored, including returning 43 miles of meandering river to its original course and re-creating 27,000 of the 35,000 acres of wetlands that were lost to past flood control efforts. The estimated \$494.8 million restoration project is being jointly implemented and equally cost-shared by the South Florida Water Management District and the Army Corps of Engineers.

### FY 10 Recommendation:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-

Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program (CERP)

Indian River Lagoon - \$38.7 million

Picayune Strand - \$31.0 million

Site I Impoundment - \$25.0 million

CERP Design - \$64.0 million

C-111 - \$25.0 million

C-51 - \$17.0 million

Kissimmee River Restoration - \$40.0 million

CERP Critical Projects - \$5.0 million

Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park - \$50.0 million

Department of the Interior-

CERP-Fish & Wildlife Service and National Park Service - \$10.0 million

# **CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS EVERGLADES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION**

Critical Ecosystem Studies Initiative (CESI) - \$6.0 million

South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force - \$1.3 million

USGS Integrated Research, Planning, and Interagency Coordination - \$8.0 million

U.S. Department of Commerce, National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration  
NMFS, NOS, OAR programs - \$6.0 million

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## OPEN RIVERS INITIATIVE

### **Open Rivers Initiative**

Our nation's rivers are plugged with millions of dams, most still functional and benefiting society. Many others are either dilapidated, having outlived their 50-year life expectancy or are no longer providing the benefits for which they were built. These dams are unnecessarily degrading the riverine ecosystem and holding up economic development. The Open Rivers Initiative (ORI), a Presidential initiative announced by the Secretary of Commerce in 2005, will provide grants to communities and local dam owners to remove dams that no longer make sense. These restoration projects provide significant environmental improvements and offer noteworthy economic and societal benefits. They create new opportunities for recreational fishing, river rafting, and kayaking; provide cost savings by eliminating the need for dam repairs; and remove safety and liability risks associated with outdated structures.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Open Rivers Initiative - \$20 million

NOAA's Community Based Restoration Center - \$10.0 million

*An increase of \$4.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$6.0 million*

Department of the Interior- FWS' Fish Passage Program - \$10.0 million

*An increase of \$4.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$5.8 million*

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## PENOBSCOT RIVER RESTORATION

### **Penobscot River Restoration Project**

The Penobscot River Restoration Project is an unprecedented approach to river restoration that will reconfigure hydropower facilities and maintain energy production while opening up more than 500 miles of habitat to 10 native species of anadromous fish, improve water quality, boost wildlife and create new opportunities in communities along New England's second largest river. The two lowermost Penobscot dams, Veazie and Great Works, will be removed and a state-of-the-art fish bypass will be installed at Howland Dam. The restoration project will reestablish the river's historic connection to the ocean, and help feed fisheries and wildlife in the river and the Gulf of Maine. The project's reconfiguration of dams will have a wide range of benefits to fish and wildlife populations, water quality and communities along the river. The restoration of the Penobscot River is the best last chance for the dwindling Atlantic salmon populations in the country.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Penobscot River Restoration Project - \$10.0 million for removal

NOAA's Habitat Restoration Center - \$6.0 million

*A decrease of \$4.0 million under the FY 08 enacted level of \$10.0 million*

Department of the Interior - \$3.0 million

*An increase of \$2.5 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$0.5 million*

Department of Agriculture- \$1.0 million

*An increase of \$1.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$0*

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION HYDROPOWER RELICENSING

### FERC Hydropower Relicensing

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) issues 30-50 year operating licenses for non-federal hydroelectric dams, setting the rules for how these dams may be operated. When issuing these licenses, FERC is required by law to look beyond power production and give equal consideration to fish and wildlife, recreation, environmental protection, and other public values. When these licenses expire, Americans will get a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to protect and improve the health of the rivers that flow through their communities.

Federal resource agencies play a very important role in FERC's hydropower licensing process. Congress has given these agencies the authority to recommend license conditions that will minimize the harmful impacts that dam operations have on public resources. The Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAAct) gave these agencies significant new obligations associated with protecting public assets affected by hydropower dams. In particular, agencies must now hold costly "trial-type" administrative hearings for disputed license conditions. Federal resource agencies need funding sufficient to allow them to uphold their congressionally authorized duties to protect public resources with license conditions when appropriate and hold hearings mandated by EPAAct when the factual basis of the conditions are being reviewed.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Energy Projects - \$57.5 million

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration - National Marine Fisheries Service, Habitat Conservation:

- \$12.4 million and a direct line item for hydropower relicensing
- \$2.8 million for implementation of hydropower requirements under the EPAAct of 2005

Department of the Interior - Fish and Wildlife Service, Habitat Conservation, Project Planning:

- \$2.35 million for hydropower relicensing
- \$1.5 million for implementation of hydropower requirements under the EPAAct of 2005

Bureau of Indian Affairs - FERC Activities, Trust Services:

\$2.0 million for hydropower relicensing

Bureau of Land Management - Land Resources/Wildlife and Fisheries:

- \$1.1 million for hydropower relicensing
- \$300,000 for implementation of hydropower requirements under the EPAAct of 2005

National Park Service - Hydropower Recreation Assistance:

- \$1.5 million for hydropower relicensing
- \$150,000 for implementation of hydropower requirements under the EPAAct of 2005

Department of Agriculture - U.S. Forest Service, Lands Budget:

- \$11.6 million and a direct line item for hydropower relicensing
- \$750,000 for implementation of hydropower requirements under the EPAAct of 2005

## CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS LONG ISLAND SOUND

The Long Island Sound Restoration Act strives to protect and restore the environmentally and economically vital resources of the Sound. In 1985, the Sound was one of the first estuaries recognized under the National Estuary Program because it provides feeding, breeding, nesting and nursery areas for a diversity of plant and animal life, and contributes an estimated \$5.5 billion per year to the regional economy from commercial fishing, sport fishing, and recreational activities. More than eight million people live in the Long Island Sound watershed, and the resultant development has led to increasingly poor ecosystem health. Future funding will allow regional conservation groups to continue their implementation of programs aimed at restoring the health of the Sound through improvements in water quality, the control of invasive species, the restoration of and/or reclamation of natural areas, and the bolstering of native species populations. In 2006, Congress passed the Long Island Sound Stewardship Act which will build on the ongoing work of restoring the Sound.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Long Island Sound Restoration Act - \$10.0 million

*An increase of \$5.2 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$4.8 million*

Long Island Sound Stewardship Act- \$6.0 Million

*An increase of \$6.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$0*

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## CHESAPEAKE BAY RESTORATION

The Chesapeake Bay is a national treasure. However, the ecological health of the largest estuary in the U.S., a 64,000 square-mile watershed that encompasses six states and the District of Columbia, continues to be poor – dropping a point to 28 on a 100 point scale according to the Chesapeake Bay Foundation’s annual State of the Bay report. Aggressive efforts undertaken over the past thirty years to limit pollution and restore the Bay’s incredible biological productivity are not keeping pace with population and development trends. Water pollution – mainly excess nitrogen and phosphorous – from sewage treatment plants, agriculture, and urban runoff, together with air pollution from power plants, vehicles, and industry, threaten the Bay’s future. A major influx of funds for the implementation of projects to control the flow of pollution to the Bay is vital to success of efforts to restore the Chesapeake Bay.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

Environmental Protection Agency

Chesapeake Bay Program - \$32.0 million

*An increase of \$9.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$23.0 million with a \$4.0 million increase to State Implementation Grants and \$4.0 million to Small Watershed Grants*

Chesapeake Bay Targeted Watershed Grants - \$12.0 million

*An increase of \$4.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$8.0 million*

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

Agricultural Management Assistance Program - \$10.0 million

*An increase of \$10.0 million over the FY 08 enacted level of \$0*

Army Corps of Engineers

Chesapeake Bay Oyster Restoration - \$4.0 million

*An increase of \$2.0 million over FY 08 enacted level of \$2.0 million*

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

Chesapeake Bay Studies - \$3.0 million

*An increase of \$1.58 million over enacted FY 08 level of \$1.42 million*

Chesapeake Bay Oyster Restoration - \$6.0 million

*An increase of \$4.13 million over enacted FY 08 level of \$1.87 million*

All other programs that support Chesapeake Bay Conservation should continue to be funded at their current level.

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## LACEY ACT AMENDMENT

Illegal logging threatens some of the world's most biologically diverse and vulnerable forests, while harming the legal forest products trade by significantly depressing world timber prices. In 2008, the U.S., the world's largest consumer of forest products, became the first country to ban trafficking of all products containing illegally sourced wood. Through an amendment of the Lacey Act, commerce of plants and derivative products – including all timber and wood products – that have been illegally taken or traded is now prohibited. Additionally, the new law requires importers to declare the species, country of origin, and other related sourcing information in an effort to increase wood supply chain transparency and focus law enforcement efforts.

Adequate implementation of the new import declaration requirements and prohibitions will require new funds for APHIS, which will be necessary for, inter alia, design of a streamlined electronic declarations database system and capacity to perform data analysis of the declarations. Funding should also be directed to APHIS to establish and maintain a public website with information that those involved in the wood products trade would find useful in complying with the new law; such information might include genus and species and common/trade name information for plants; a continuously updated compilation of foreign laws related to taking, possessing, transporting, or selling plants; and a reference of available tools for tracking wood and assessing and addressing risk of illegal sourcing within a wood supply chain.

Finally, new funds should be directed to the Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Law Enforcement for specially dedicated staff to enforce the new provisions of Lacey through investigations, inspections and training.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

#### USDA/APHIS

- Lacey Act Amendment – Prevention of Illegal Logging - \$6.0 million
- Streamlined declaration database - \$5.0 million
- Additional data analysts - \$500,000
- Educational resources for traders on foreign laws, tools for tracking wood and eliminating illegal wood from supply chain - \$500,000

#### USFWS Office of Law Enforcement

- Dedicated FWS staff for Lacey Act plant enforcement, inspections, investigations, and training - \$1.67 million (\$5.0 million over 3 years)

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## GREEN JOBS

Economists, business leaders, and American workers all agree that our economy needs quick attention from Congress. Whether in a stimulus bill or through the appropriations process, investing in green infrastructure and green jobs development will immediately put people to work and reinvigorate the economy. This package is a down payment on prompt action in 2009 to enact a comprehensive energy package including a cap-and-invest program.

Investments in transforming our energy infrastructure, updating clean water infrastructure, boosting transit funding, restoring lands, and training our workforce will yield significant economic growth and job creation. In fact, “green” investments, on average, create more than twice as many jobs per dollar invested compared to traditional fossil fuel-based generating technologies, by redirecting money previously spent on inefficient energy use and imported fuel toward advanced technology, modern infrastructure, and skilled labor.<sup>1</sup>

These green jobs programs could include near-term spending on a range of transportation, manufacturing, construction, building efficiency, neighborhood revitalization, natural resource restoration and workforce development programs and some changes to the tax code. The job creation benefits of many of these programs have been outlined in a report released by the Center for American Progress and the University of Massachusetts’s Political Economy Research Institute, entitled “Green Recovery: A Program to Create Good Jobs and Start Building a Low-Carbon Economy.”<sup>2</sup> Other spending listed below would inject dollars into clean water infrastructure and transit projects that are waiting on state, tribal and local “ready-to-go” lists to ensure rapid start-up of new construction or maintenance projects.

- **Transit agencies and ready-to-go transportation projects:** Provide \$2 billion in assistance to transit agencies to reduce transit fares and expand services, and begin construction on ready-to-go rail and other projects.
- **Home efficiency tax incentives:** Congress should extend through 2011 tax credits for efficient new homes and high efficiency heating and cooling equipment. Congress should also 1) adopt a new tax credit for home efficiency retrofits that is based on the percentage of energy savings achieved by the retrofit, 2) make the home efficiency incentives refundable, and 3) include installation costs in the incentives.
- **Energy-Star Home Equipment Deployment:** Provide EPA with \$10 billion to provide consumers with rebates for purchase of Energy-Star certified appliances, windows, and other residential products.
- **Workforce investment in the Green Jobs Act:** Increase appropriations for the Green Jobs Act, authorized in the 2007 Energy Independence and Security Act, to \$250 million to provide job training and workforce investment in energy efficiency and renewable-energy installations.
- **Technical fix to renewable energy tax incentive provisions:** Address effects of the credit availability crisis on the renewable energy industry by making the renewable production tax credit, investment tax credits and provisions governing accelerated depreciation fully refundable.
- **Clean renewable energy bonds:** Increase CREB funding for consumer-owned utilities to \$5 billion to jump-start renewable energy projects.
- **The Weatherization Assistance Program:** Fully fund the Weatherization Assistance Program at \$900 million, the amount Congress has authorized to spend on the program in FY 2009, and build toward a goal of

---

<sup>1</sup> Center for American Progress, November 10, 2008. A Strategy for Green Recovery: Stimulating the Economy Today by Rebuilding for Future Prosperity

[http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/2008/green\\_recovery\\_memo.html](http://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/2008/green_recovery_memo.html)

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.peri.umass.edu/green\\_recovery](http://www.peri.umass.edu/green_recovery).

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## GREEN JOBS

weatherizing 1 million low-income homes.

- **Energy efficiency and conservation block grants:** Increase appropriation to \$6 billion to fund states, tribes, cities, and counties in pursuing clean energy projects.
- **Solar roofs on Federal buildings:** Authorize \$3.5 billion to install 2,000 MW of solar power on Federal rooftops, and amend Federal electricity contracting to allow for 30-year power purchasing agreements for renewable energy.
- **New Starts Transit project investments:** Fully fund the New Starts Transit budget at the \$6.6 billion authorized in Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users.
- **Green school construction and renovation:** Support state, tribal and local school modernization, renovation, and repair at \$7.25 billion.
- **Green affordable housing HOME block grants:** Supplement block grant funding through the HOME program with \$1 billion for energy-related projects.
- **HOPE VI program for green community revitalization:** Appropriate \$800 million for greening HOPE VI projects to meet Energy Star and green communities standards.
- **Smart grid federal matching funds:** Fund the Smart Grid Title of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to support \$1.3 billion for infrastructure investment and demonstration projects.
- **Green jobs restoring the land:** Expand existing programs by \$800 million to restore habitat and ecosystems, including parks, wildlife refuges, forests, and wetlands, which will create jobs and return significant economic benefits, especially in rural communities.
- **Manufacturing Extension Partnership:** Expand the capacity of domestic manufacturing modernization efforts by increasing MEP funding to \$200 million, directed to energy-efficiency improvements.
- **Additional green infrastructure for clean water:** Invest in green jobs and effective clean water solutions by funding \$6.5 - 10 billion in clean water infrastructure, with at least \$1 billion of those funds set-aside for "smart, clean and green" infrastructure grants.
- **“Crusher Credit” rebates for retirement of inefficient vehicles:** Initiate a \$2.5 billion annual program to incentivize the retirement and scrapping of inefficient vehicles, in exchange for a voucher to be used to acquire an efficient vehicle or for alternative transportation.
- **Retrofit and replace diesel vehicles:** Increase appropriations for the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act (DERA) by \$550 million to reduce emissions from diesels while creating jobs at manufacturers and supporting public transportation and local schools.
- **Rebates and excise-tax waivers to encourage truckers to install fuel-saving equipment.** Provide \$235 million to EPA’s SmartWay program to fund a rebate program to help truckers purchase and install fuel-saving equipment, such as idling reduction kits and fuel-efficient tires; waive the federal excise tax on equipment certified by SmartWay to increase fuel efficiency.

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## GREAT LAKES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS

The Great Lakes hold one fifth of the world's fresh surface water supply. For the more than 30 million people that live within the watershed, the Great Lakes hold the key to economic health, recreation, and irreplaceable family experiences. They support the economy through agriculture, industrial manufacturing, steel production, commercial and sport fisheries, and recreation and tourism. More than 150,000 Americans work in the Great Lakes' shipping industry, which provides passage for approximately 180 million tons of cargo annually. The economic benefits in the Great Lake states are more than \$15 billion for hunting, fishing, and wildlife watching.

Despite their overwhelming greatness and their vast expanse, the Great Lakes are fragile and in peril. Raw sewage contaminates beaches, invasive species threaten native fish, and toxic mercury makes fish unsafe to eat. These problems have reached a critical tipping point. Scientists say that action must be taken now or the entire Great Lakes' ecosystem will be damaged beyond repair. Funding is needed to restore the health of the Great Lakes. The problems continue to worsen and the solutions get more costly with each passing day.

In 2005, the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration (GLRC) produced a blueprint to protect and restore the Great Lakes. The GLRC, which was made up of over 1,500 leaders from around the region, identified goals to restore this fresh water resource. Some recommendations are outlined in other areas of this report, such as the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and Farm Bill conservation programs. The programs listed below are specific to the Great Lakes. They are supported by the region's mayors, governors and families and need adequate funding to ensure the simple solutions identified in the GLRC strategic plan can immediately be carried out.

### **FY 10 Recommendation:**

#### Environmental Protection Agency

Great Lakes Legacy Act - \$54.0 million

Cleans up toxic sediments in polluted harbors and rivers.

*An increase of \$19.0 million over the FY 08 level of \$35.0 million*

Great Lakes National Program Office - \$25.0 million

Provides public access to Great Lakes data; helps communities address contaminated sediments and promotes pollution prevention activities. Includes \$1.0 million set-aside for National Fish and Wildlife Foundation's Great Lakes restoration program.

*An increase of \$3.24 million over the FY 08 level of \$21.76 million*

Great Lakes Watershed Restoration Grants Program - \$1.0 million

Funded under GLNPO, the Great Lakes Watershed Restoration Grants Program provides funds, which are leveraged even more by other Federal and non-federal funds, to protect and restore watershed in the Great Lakes.

Clean Water State Revolving Fund

Helps end sewage dumping in the Great Lakes by updating aging water infrastructure - \$490.1 million

#### Army Corps of Engineers

Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration - \$10.0 million

Provides grants to protect and restore fish and wildlife habitat

*An increase of \$9.0 million over the FY 08 level of \$0.94 million*

Great Lakes Tributary Modeling Program - \$1.5 million

# CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS

## GREAT LAKES ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION PROJECTS

Supports actions to de-list Great Lakes Areas of Concern  
*An increase of \$0.66 million over the FY 08 level of \$0.84 million*

### Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service

Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act - \$16.0 million

Provides grants for local and regional projects designed to protect and restore fish and wildlife habitat

*An increase of \$15.5 million over the FY 08 level of \$0.5 million*

### Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey

Great Lakes Science Center - \$13.2 million

Supports Great Lakes research and monitoring, including additional deepwater fishery science and ecosystem research.

### Department of State

Great Lakes Fishery Commission - \$23.0 million

Supports invasive sea lamprey prevention and control.

*An increase of \$6.3 million over the FY 08 level of \$16.7 million*

International Joint Commission - \$7.2 million

Supports Upper Great Lakes study to evaluate impacts of water levels and flow regulation in Upper Great Lakes, including 3-D modeling of the St. Clair River.

### Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service

Great Lakes Basin Program for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control- \$5.0 million

Helps control soil erosion and protect waterways in the Great Lakes

*An increase of \$4.6 million over the FY 08 level of \$0.43 million*

### Department of Energy

RAP Assistance (Sec 401) - \$3.0 million

Supports toxic harbor clean ups

### Department of Commerce

Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory - \$15.0 million

Supports Great Lakes research and monitoring.

### National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

National Marine Fisheries Service - \$1.5 million

Establishes a Great Lakes Habitat Restoration Program to restore habitat at the watershed scale within the Great Lakes Areas of Concern

## APPENDICES

A – FUNDING TABLE

B – PROGRAM CONTACTS

# APPENDIX A

## FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE (dollars in millions)

	2008 Enacted	2010 Recommended
<b>ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS 1-1</b>		
Project Modification for Improvement of the Environment	29.5	25.0
Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration	29.5	25.0
Flood Hazard Mitigation and Riverine Restoration (Challenge 21)	0.0	0.5
National Levee Safety Program	NA	20.0
Missouri River Fish and Wildlife Recovery Project	50.0	85.0
Navigation and Ecosystem Sustainability Program	NA	50.0
Upper Mississippi Environmental Management Program	16.8	20.0
Lower Mississippi River Resource Assessment	0.3	1.5
Lower Columbia River Ecosystem Restoration: OR & WA	1.7	1.7
Matilija Dam Removal	0.8	1.0
Rindge Dam Removal	0.2	0.6
Rio Grande Environmental Management Program	NA	15.0
<i>Total, Selected Army Corps of Engineers Programs</i>	<i>128.7</i>	<i>245.3</i>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE 2-1</b>		
<b>Farm Bill Conservation Programs - Natural Resource Conservation Service</b>		
Agriculture Management Assistance Program	NA	20.0
Conservation Reserve Program	NA	NA
Conservation Security Program	NA	895.0
Environmental Quality Incentive Program	NA	1450.0
Farm and Ranchland Protection Program	NA	150.0
Grasslands Reserve Program	NA	NA
Ground and Surface Water Conservation Program	NA	60.0
Wetlands Reserve Program	NA	NA
Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program	NA	85.0
Chesapeake Bay Region Watershed Program	NA	43.0
<i>Total, NRCS Farm Bill Programs</i>		<i>2703.0</i>
<b>Additional Farm Bill Conservation Programs</b>		
Access to Local Foods and School Gardens	0.0	10.0
Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education	19.0	25.0
<i>Total, Farm Bill Conservation Programs</i>	<i>19.0</i>	<i>2738.0</i>

# APPENDIX A

FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE  
(dollars in millions)

	2008	2010
	Enacted	Recommended
<b>Forest Service</b>		
Forest Inventory and Analysis Program	64.9	77.9
Forest & Ranchland Research	225.6	260.8
Forest Legacy Program	52.2	125.0
Community Forest and Open Space Program	NA	75.0
International Program	7.5	14.0
Land Management Planning Program	48.8	58.8
Inventory and Monitoring	166.6	175.0
Recreation, Heritage & Wilderness Program	263.0	377.1
Wildlife and Fisheries Habitat Management Program	132.4	197.4
Vegetation & Watershed Management Program	177.4	184.0
Law Enforcement Operations Program	131.9	186.9
Roads Maintenance Program	131.0	325.0
Trails Program	76.4	136.4
Deferred Maintenance	8.9	25.0
Legacy Roads and Trails Remediation Program	39.4	100.0
Accounting Program	NA	NA
State Fire Assistance	80.6	144.0
State, Tribal and Local Fire Assistance	214.7	288.0
Preparedness Program	665.8	672.5
<i>Total, Selected Forest Service Programs</i>	<i>2487.1</i>	<i>3422.8</i>

# APPENDIX A

## FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE (dollars in millions)

	2008 Enacted	2010 Recommended
<b>DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY 3-1</b>		
<b><u>Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy</u></b>		
Hydrogen Technology Program	213.0	199.0
Biomass and Biorefinery Systems R&D Program	198.2	275.0
Solar Energy Technologies Program	168.5	251.9
Wind Energy Program	49.5	75.0
Geothermal Technology Program	19.8	55.0
Water Energy Program		
Ocean Energy Program	NA	39.8
Hydropower Program	9.8	10.2
Vehicle Technologies Program	213.0	349.3
Building Technologies Program	108.9	220.0
Industrial Technologies Program	64.4	135.0
Federal Energy Management Program	19.8	33.0
Weatherization Assistance Program	227.2	500.0
State Energy Program	44.1	79.4
The Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant Program	NA	308.5
Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability	138.6	174.7
Smart Grid Demonstrations	NA	40.0
Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund	617.9	663.9
Defense Environmental Cleanup	5300.0	6300.0
Non-Defense Environmental Cleanup	182.3	296.3
Loan Guarantee Authority		
Nuclear Power Facilities and "Front-End Activities"	20500.0	0.0
Coal-Based Power Generation & Industrial Gasification Activities	6000.0	0.0
Advanced Coal Gasification	2000.0	0.0
Renewables and Efficiency	10000.0	20000.0
<i>Total, Selected Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Programs</i>	<i>46075.0</i>	<i>30006.0</i>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY 4-1</b>		
<b><u>Federal Emergency Management Agency</u></b>		
Flood Mitigation Assistance Program	34.0	35.0
Hazard Mitigation Grant Program	99.0	NA
National Dam Safety Program	5.9	11.7
Repetitive Flood Claims	NA	20.0
Severe Repetitive Loss Program	NA	80.0
National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Fund	114.0	150.0
Flood Hazard Identification Map Modernization	220.0	220.0
<i>Total, Selected Federal Emergency Management Agency Programs</i>	<i>472.9</i>	<i>516.7</i>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF STATE 4-3</b>		
<b><u>International Organizations and Programs (IO&amp;P)</u></b>		
International Conservation Programs	6.6	12.0
<b>U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID) 4-4</b>		
Biodiversity Conservation Programs	195.0	275.0

# APPENDIX A

## FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE (dollars in millions)

	2008 Enacted	2010 Recommended
<b>DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR 5-1</b>		
<b><u>Bureau of Land Management</u></b>		
National Landscape Conservation System	55.3	75.0
Wildlife and Fisheries Management	44.3	66.1
Threatened and Endangered Species Management	22.3	33.2
Challenge Cost Share	9.3	29.3
Plant Conservation	NA	5.0
Native Plant Materials Development	4.6	15.0
Restore Management Planning	47.5	52.5
Landscape Scale Habitat Conservation	5.0	30.0
<i>Total, Selected Bureau of Land Management Programs</i>	<i>188.3</i>	<i>306.1</i>
<b><u>Bureau of Reclamation</u></b>		
Savage Rapids Dam Removal and Pump Replacement	14.8	10.0
Yakima River Basin Enhancement Project	8.3	10.0
Deschutes Resources Conservancy	0.4	0.8
California-Federal Bay Delta Program	40.0	42.0
<i>Total, Selected Bureau of Reclamation Programs</i>	<i>63.5</i>	<i>62.8</i>
<b><u>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</u></b>		
Endangered Species Program	150.5	217.0
National Wildlife Refuge System	434.1	514.0
Migratory Bird Management	40.4	61.2
International Affairs Program	11.6	21.0
Office of Law Enforcement	59.6	72.8
National Fish Passage Program	10.8	11.0
Coastal Program	14.0	15.0
National Fish Habitat Initiative	5.0	5.0
State and Tribal Wildlife Grants Program	73.8	85.0
Cooperative Endangered Species Fund	73.8	110.0
Landowner Incentive Grants and Private Stewardship Grants	0.0	31.0
Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program	50.0	50.0
Multinational Species Conservation Fund	7.9	15.0
North American Wetland Conservation Fund	42.0	50.0
Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Fund	4.4	6.5
<i>Total, Selected Fish and Wildlife Service Programs</i>	<i>977.9</i>	<i>1264.5</i>
<b><u>Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)</u></b>		
LWCF Federal Program	NA	325.0
LWCF Stateside Program	NA	125.0
<i>Total, LWCF</i>	<i>154.3</i>	<i>450.0</i>

# APPENDIX A

FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE  
(dollars in millions)

	2008 Enacted	2010 Recommended
<b><u>National Park Service</u></b>		
Operations of the National Park Service (ONPS)	1970.6	2250.0
Centennial Challenge	24.6	100.0
Resource Stewardship	NA	221.0
Elwha River Restoration	19.7	20.0
International Park Affairs Program	1.6	2.0
<i>Total, Selected NPS Programs</i>	<i>2016.5</i>	<i>2593.0</i>
<b><u>U.S. Geological Survey</u></b>		
Water Resources Investigations		
National Water Quality Assessment Program	63.9	70.0
Toxic Substances Hydrology Program	13.5	15.0
National Streamflow Information Program	20.1	21.0
Biological Research and Monitoring	141.3	155.3
Biological Information Management and Delivery	22.4	24.6
Cooperative Research Unit Program		
Cooperative Research Units	16.2	20.0
Cooperative Research Unit High Priority Research	NA	5.0
National Climate Change and Wildlife Science Center	2.5	10.0
<i>Total, Selected USGS Programs</i>	<i>279.9</i>	<i>320.9</i>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 6-1</b>		
<b><u>Federal Highway Administration</u></b>		
Surface Transportation Program	6350.0	6785.0
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement	1721.0	1830.0
Safe Routes to School	147.0	188.0
Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program	61.3	630.0
<i>Total, Selected Federal Highway Administration Programs</i>	<i>8279.3</i>	<i>9433.0</i>
<b><u>Federal Transit Administration</u></b>		
Fixed Guideway Modernization	1570.0	1717.0
New Starts/Small Starts	1570.0	1861.0
Bus and Bus Facility Program	823.0	1012.0
Clean Fuels Grants Programs	49.0	53.0
<i>Total, Selected Federal Transit Administration Programs</i>	<i>4012.0</i>	<i>4643.0</i>
<b><u>Federal Railway Administration</u></b>		
Amtrak	1325.0	2534.0
Federal Matching Grants for State Rail Corridor Investments	30.0	502.0
<i>Total, Selected Federal Railway Administration Programs</i>	<i>1355.0</i>	<i>3036.0</i>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY 6-4</b>		
Global Environment Facility		see page 6-4
Tropical Forest Conservation Act	20.0	20.0

# APPENDIX A

**FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE**  
(dollars in millions)

	2008 Enacted	2010 Recommended
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY 7-1</b>		
<b><u>Selected Science and Technology</u></b>		
Global Change and Sustainability Research	19.7	21.2
Human Health and Ecosystem Research	223.2	239.8
Integrated Risk Information System Database	4.1	4.4
STAR Fellowship Program	9.8	10.5
<i>Total, Selected Science and Technology</i>	<i>256.8</i>	<i>275.9</i>
<b><u>Environmental Programs and Management</u></b>		
Enforcement	187.9	500.0
Environmental Justice	6.4	6.5
Clean Water Act Permits	0.0	4.0
WaterSense	2.0	7.5
National Estuary Program	26.8	26.8
<i>Total, Selected Hazardous Substance Superfund</i>	<i>223.1</i>	<i>544.8</i>
<b><u>Superfund</u></b>		
Superfund	1216.8	1500.0
<b><u>Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program</u></b>		
Leaking Underground Storage Tanks	105.8	110.0
<b><u>State and Tribal Assistance Grants</u></b>		
State Revolving Funds		
Clean Water State Revolving Fund	689.1	6500.0
Drinking Water State Revolving Fund	829.0	1330.0
Brownfields	93.5	168.0
Non-Point Source Management Program, Clean Water Act Section 31	200.9	220.0
Pollution Control - Sec. 106	218.2	220.0
BEACH Act Grant Program	9.8	40.0
Targeted Watershed Grants	9.8	25.0
Diesel Emissions Reduction Program	49.2	55.0
State and Local Air Quality Management	216.8	232.9
Tribal Air Quality Management	10.8	22.0
Revitalization through Renewable Energy	NA	15.0
Energy Star	48.2	100.0
Tribal General Assistance Program	56.0	68.3
Direct Implementation Tribal Cooperative Agreements	NA	8.0
<i>Total, Selected EPA Programs</i>	<i>2431.3</i>	<i>9004.2</i>
<b><u>Environmental Education</u></b>		
National Environmental Education Act Programs	9.0	14.0

# APPENDIX A

## FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE (dollars in millions)

	2008	2010
	Enacted	Recommended
<b>NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION (NOAA) 8-1</b>		
<b><u>Overall NOAA Funding Level</u></b>	3920.0	4500.0
<b><u>National Marine Fisheries Service</u></b>		
Marine Mammal Protection	40.0	82.0
Hawaiian Monk Seal	2.1	7.0
Sea Turtle Conservation	13.7	26.4
Expand Annual Stock Assessments	31.6	50.0
Marine Recreational Information Program	3.5	10.0
Fisheries Enforcement	53.4	57.1
Fishery Observer Program	31.5	56.0
Fisheries Habitat Restoration Program	31.5	40.0
Pacific Coast Salmon Recovery Fund	67.0	120.0
<i>Total, Selected National Marine Fisheries Service Programs</i>	<i>274.3</i>	<i>448.5</i>

# APPENDIX A

FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE  
(dollars in millions)

	2008 Enacted	2010 Recommended
<b><u>National Ocean Service</u></b>		
National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS)		
NERRS	6.5	27.0
NERRS Construction and Acquisition	11.6	15.0
Deep Water Corals	1.5	7.0
Tropical Coral Reef Program	29.3	50.0
Marine Debris	3.2	10.0
National Marine Sanctuary Program	60.0	80.0
Marine Protected Areas Center	1.4	4.0
Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation Program	8.0	60.0
Coastal Zone Management Grants	64.4	100.0
Estuary Restoration Program	4.0	4.0
<i>Total, Selected National Ocean Service Programs</i>	<i>189.9</i>	<i>357.0</i>
<b><u>Office of Education</u></b>		
Environmental Education Initiatives		
Environmental Education Initiatives	NA	12.0
Environmental Literacy Grants	NA	10.0
<i>Subtotal, Environmental Education Initiatives</i>	<i>4.9</i>	<i>22.0</i>
Bay Watershed and Training Programs	9.7	12.0
Climate Change Education Grant Program	0.0	12.0
<i>Total, Selected Office of Education Programs</i>	<i>14.6</i>	<i>46.0</i>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF LABOR/HHS 9-1</b>		
<b><u>Corporation for National and Community Service</u></b>		
Energy Conservation Corps		
Energy Conservation Corps	NA	100.0
Learn and Serve America	NA	10.0
Senior Corp	NA	10.0
<i>Subtotal, Energy Conservation Corps</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>120.0</i>
Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Worker Training Program	NA	125.0
<i>Total, Corporation for National and Community Service</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>245.0</i>
<b>DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION</b>		
University Sustainability Program	0.0	50.0
Healthy High Performance Schools Program	0.0	25.0
<i>Total, Selected Department of Education Programs</i>	<i>0.0</i>	<i>75.0</i>
<b>NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION</b>		
<b><u>Climate Change Education</u></b>		
Climate Change Education Grant Program	8.5	8.5

# APPENDIX A

**FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE**  
(dollars in millions)

	2008 Enacted	2010 Recommended
<b>CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS 10-1</b>		
<b><u>National Environmental Policy Act</u></b>		
Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ)	NA	0.8
Department of Agriculture (Forest Service)	NA	2.1
Department of the Interior (BLM)	NA	3.7
Environmental Protection Agency	NA	2.7
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	NA	10.0
<i>Total, NEPA Funding</i>		<i>19.3</i>
<b><u>National Fish and Wildlife Foundation</u></b>		
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Resource Management	7.5	7.5
U.S. Forest Service - National Forest System	2.6	2.6
Bureau of Land Management - Management of Lands and Resources	2.8	2.8
<i>Total, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation</i>	<i>12.9</i>	<i>12.9</i>
<b><u>Wild and Scenic River Management</u></b>		
National Strategy to Address Impacts of Global Warming & Ocean Ac	NA	5.0
Department of Agriculture, Forest Service		
Forest Service Wild and Scenic River Management	NA	9.0
Creation of River Management Plans	NA	3.0
Completion of Wild and Scenic River Studies	NA	3.0
Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management		
Wild and Scenic Rivers Management	NA	7.0
Completion of Wild and Scenic River Studies	NA	5.0
Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service		
Wild and Scenic River Management, Restoration, and Studies	NA	1.8
Department of Interior, National Park Service		
Wild and Scenic River Studies	NA	1.0
Wild and Scenic Rivers Managed as units of the National Park S	1.5	16.0
<i>Total, Wild and Scenic River Management</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>50.8</i>
<b><u>Coastal Louisiana Restoration</u></b>		
Atchafalaya Restoration	NA	10.0
Science and Technology Program	NA	10.0
Beneficial Use of Dredged Material	NA	100.0
Coastal Wetland Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act	NA	60.0
Violet Diversion Project Design	NA	12.0
Mississippi River Sediment Pipelines	NA	75.0
Myrtle Grove Restoration Design	NA	7.0
<i>Total, Coastal Louisiana Restoration</i>		<i>274.0</i>

# APPENDIX A

**FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE**  
(dollars in millions)

	<b>2008</b>	<b>2010</b>
	<b>Enacted</b>	<b>Recommended</b>
<b><u>Everglades Ecosystem Restoration</u></b>		
Army Corps of Engineers		
Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Program (CERP)	NA	158.7
C-111	NA	25.0
C-51	NA	17.0
Kissimmee River Restoration	NA	40.0
CERP Critical Projects	NA	5.0
Modified Water Deliveries to Everglades National Park	NA	50.0
Department of the Interior (FWS, NPS)		
CERP - Fish & Wildlife Service and National Park Service	NA	10.0
Critical Ecosystem Studies Initiative (CESI)	NA	6.0
South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force	NA	1.3
USGS Integrated Research, Planning, and Interagency Coordination	NA	8.0
Department of Commerce (NOAA)		
NMFS, NOS, OAR Programs	NA	6.0
<i>Total, Everglades Ecosystem Restoration</i>		<i>327.0</i>
<b><u>Open Rivers Initiative</u></b>		
Open Rivers Initiative	NA	20.0
Department of Commerce - NOAA's Community Based Restoration C	6.0	10.0
Department of the Interior - FWS' Fish Passage Program	5.8	10.0
<i>Total, Open Rivers Initiative</i>	<i>11.8</i>	<i>40.0</i>
<b><u>Penobscot River Restoration Project</u></b>		
Penobscot River Restoration Project	NA	10.0
Department of Commerce - NOAA's Habitat Restoration Center	10.0	6.0
Department of the Interior	0.5	3.0
Department of Agriculture	0.0	1.0
<i>Total, Penobscot River Restoration Project</i>	<i>10.5</i>	<i>20.0</i>

# APPENDIX A

FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE  
(dollars in millions)

	2008 Enacted	2010 Recommended
<b><u>Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Hydropower Relicensing</u></b>		
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Energy Projects	NA	57.5
Department of Commerce - NOAA/NMFS Habitat Conservation		
Hydropower Relicensing	NA	12.4
Implementation of Hydropower Requirements under the EPAct c	NA	2.8
Department of the Interior - FWS Habitat Conservation, Project Planning		
Hydropower Relicensing	NA	2.4
Implementation of Hydropower Requirements under the EPAct c	NA	1.5
Bureau of Indian Affairs - FERC Activities, Trust Services		
Hydropower Relicensing	NA	2.0
Bureau of Land Management - Land Resources/Wildlife and Fisheries		
Hydropower Relicensing	NA	1.1
Implementation of Hydropower Requirements under the EPAct c	NA	0.3
National Park Service - Hydropower Recreation Assistance		
Hydropower Relicensing	NA	1.5
Implementation of Hydropower Requirements under the EPAct c	NA	0.2
Department of Agriculture - USFS Lands Budget		
Hydropower Relicensing	NA	11.6
Implementation of Hydropower Requirements under the EPAct c	NA	0.8
<i>Total, FERC Hydropower Relicensing</i>		<i>94.0</i>
<b><u>Long Island Sound Restoration</u></b>		
Long Island Sound Restoration Act	4.8	10.0
Long Island Sound Stewardship Act	0.0	6.0
<i>Total, Long Island Sound Restoration</i>	<i>4.8</i>	<i>16.0</i>
<b><u>Chesapeake Bay Restoration</u></b>		
Environmental Protection Agency	23.0	32.0
Chesapeake Bay Targeted Watershed Grants	8.0	12.0
Department of Agriculture (NRCS)	0.0	10.0
Army Corps of Engineers	2.0	4.0
Department of Commerce (NOAA)	1.4	3.0
Chesapeake Bay Oyster Restoration	1.9	6.0
<i>Total, Chesapeake Bay Restoration</i>	<i>36.3</i>	<i>67.0</i>
<b><u>Lacey Act Amendment</u></b>		
Department of Agriculture/APHIS		
Lacey Act Amendment - Prevention of Illegal Logging	NA	6.0
Streamlined declaration database	NA	5.0
Additional data analysts	NA	0.5
Educational Resources	NA	0.5
Department of Interior - FWS Office of Law Enforcement		
Staff for Lacey Act plant enforcement, inspections, investigation	NA	1.7
<i>Total, Lacey Act Amendment</i>		<i>13.7</i>

# APPENDIX A

FUNDING SUMMARY TABLE  
(dollars in millions)

	2008 Enacted	2010 Recommended
<b>Great Lakes Ecosystem Restoration Projects</b>		
Environmental Protection Agency		
Great Lakes Legacy Act	35.0	54.0
Great Lakes National Program Office	21.8	25.0
Great Lakes Watershed Restoration Grants Program	NA	1.0
Clean Water State Revolving Fund	NA	490.1
Army Corps of Engineers		
Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration	0.9	10.0
Great Lakes Tributary Modeling Program	0.8	1.5
Department of the Interior - FWS	0.5	16.0
Department of the Interior - USGS	NA	13.2
Department of State		
Great Lakes Fishery Commission	16.7	23.0
International Joint Commission	NA	7.2
Department of Agriculture (NRCS)	0.4	5.0
Department of Energy	NA	3.0
Department of Commerce	NA	15.0
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	NA	1.5
<i>Total, Great Lakes Restoration</i>	<i>76.2</i>	<i>665.5</i>

# APPENDIX B

## PROGRAM CONTACTS

### ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

*American Rivers*  
Peter Raabe  
praabe@americanrivers.org  
202-347-7550

*Audubon*  
April H.G. Smith  
april.hg.smith@audubon.org  
202-861-2242

*World Wildlife Fund*  
Catherine Kozak  
catherine.kozak@wwfus.org  
202-861-8112

### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

#### FARM BILL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

*Audubon*  
Brian Moore  
bmoore@audubon.org  
202-861-2242

*Defenders of Wildlife*  
Sarah Chieffo  
schieffo@defenders.org  
202-772-0270

#### FOREST SERVICE

*The Wilderness Society*  
Cecilia Clavet  
cecilia\_clavet@tws.org  
202-429-2664

*National Wildlife Federation*  
Patrick Fitzgerald  
FitzgeraldP@nwf.org  
202-797-6821

*Defenders of Wildlife*  
Mary Beth Beetham  
mbeetham@defenders.org  
202-772-0231

### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

*Natural Resources Defense Council Consultant*  
Heather Taylor  
heathertayl@mac.com  
202-423-4794

*Physicians for Social Responsibility*  
Michelle Boyd  
mboyd@psr.org  
202-667-4260

### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

*American Rivers*  
Peter Raabe  
praabe@americanrivers.org  
202-347-7550

# APPENDIX B

## PROGRAM CONTACTS

### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

*World Wildlife Fund*  
Catherine Kozak  
catherine.kozak@wwfus.org  
202-861-8112

### DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

#### **BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**

*The Wilderness Society*  
John Garder  
john\_garder@tws.org  
202-429-2641

*Defenders of Wildlife*  
Mary Beth Beetham  
mbeetham@defenders.org  
202-772-0231

#### **BUREAU OF RECLAMATION**

*American Rivers*  
Peter Raabe  
praabe@americanrivers.org  
202-347-7550

#### **FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE**

*Defenders of Wildlife*  
Mary Beth Beetham  
mbeetham@defenders.org  
202-772-0231

*World Wildlife Fund*  
John Gervers  
latir@aol.com  
202-236-3940

#### **LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND**

*The Wilderness Society*  
Alan Rowsome  
alan\_rowsome@tws.org  
202-429-2643

*Defenders of Wildlife*  
Mary Beth Beetham  
mbeetham@defenders.org  
202-772-0231

#### **NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**

*National Parks Conservation Association*  
Craig Obey  
cobey@npca.org  
202-454-3392

*The Wilderness Society*  
Kristen Brengel  
kristen\_brengel@tws.org  
202-347-7550

#### **U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY**

*American Rivers*  
Peter Raabe  
praabe@americanrivers.org  
202-347-7550

# APPENDIX B

## PROGRAM CONTACTS

### DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

*Friends of the Earth*  
Collin Peppard  
cpeppard@foe.org  
877-843-8687

### DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY

*World Wildlife Fund*  
Catherine Kozak  
catherine.kozak@wwfus.org  
202-861-8112

### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

*American Rivers*  
Peter Raabe  
praabe@americanrivers.org  
202-347-7550

*National Tribal Environmental Council*  
Bob Gruenig  
bgruenig@ntec.org  
505-242-2175

*Natural Resources Defense Council*  
John Loy  
jloy@nrdc.org  
202-513-6241

### NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

*Conservation Law Foundation*  
Sean Cosgrove  
scosgrove@clf.org  
202-421-3585

*Oceana*  
Beth Lowell  
blowell@oceana.org  
202-833-3900

*World Wildlife Fund*  
Roberta Elias  
eliasr@nwf.org  
202-495-4648

*Environment America*  
Michael Gravitz  
mikeg@environmentamerica.org  
202-683-1250

*Natural Resources Defense Council*  
Laura Pagano  
lpagano@nrdc.org  
415-875-6100

*Marine Conservation Biology Institute*  
Kassandra Cervený  
Kassandra.Cervený@mcbi.org  
202-546-5346

*Marine Fish Conservation Network*  
Ken Stump  
kstump@conservefish.org  
202-543-5509

*Natural Resources Defense Council*  
Leila Monroe  
lmonroe@nrdc.org  
415-875-6100

*Save Our Wild Salmon*  
Gilly Lyons  
gilly@wildsalmon.org  
503-230-0421 ext. 17

# APPENDIX B

## PROGRAM CONTACTS

*Coastal States Organization*

Andrea Geiger  
ageiger@coastalstates.org  
(202) 508-3860

**U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID)**

*World Wildlife Fund*

Catherine Kozak  
Catherine.kozak@wwfus.org  
202-861-8112

**DEPARTMENT OF LABOR/DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION/NASA**

*National Wildlife Federation*

Patrick Fitzgerald  
fitzgeraldp@nwf.org  
202-797-6821

**CROSS-CUTTING PROGRAMS**

*Audubon*

Brian Moore  
bmoore@audubon.org  
202-861-2242

*National Fish and Wildlife  
Foundation*

Ashlie Strackbein  
Ashlie.Strackbein@nfwf.org  
202-857-0166

*American Rivers*

Peter Raabe  
praabe@americanrivers.org  
202-347-7550

*Audubon*

April H.G. Smith  
april.hg.smith@audubon.org  
202-861-2242

*Chesapeake Bay Foundation*

Joshua Saks  
jsaks@cbf.org  
202-544-2232

*National Parks Conservation Association*

Chad Lord  
clord@npca.org  
202-223-6722

*SaveOurEnvironment.org*

Stephanie Young  
stephanie@saveourevironment.org  
202-429-3947

*Defenders of Wildlife*

Mary Beth Beetham  
mbeetham@defenders.org  
202-772-0231

Alaska Wilderness League  
American Lands Alliance  
American Rivers  
Audubon  
Clean Water Action  
Chesapeake Bay Foundation  
Coastal States Organization  
Conservation Law Foundation  
Defenders of Wildlife  
Endangered Species Coalition  
Environment America  
Environmental Defense Fund  
Friends of the Earth  
League of Conservation Voters  
Marine Conservation Biology Institute  
Marine Fish Conservation Network  
National Parks Conservation Association  
Natural Resources Defense Council  
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation  
National Tribal Environmental Council  
National Wildlife Federation  
Oceana  
Ocean Conservancy  
Physicians for Social Responsibility  
Save Our Wild Salmon  
The Wilderness Society  
The World Wildlife Fund