

## **CUTTING FUNDING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCIES**

Rejected: 199-229

### **SUMMARY:**

The House rejected an amendment that would have indiscriminately cut funding across the federal government, including for the Department of the Interior, Environmental Protection Agency, and other agencies that carry out crucial environmental work. (*July 19, 2022, Roll Call No.367*)

### **BACKGROUND:**

Funding is critical for Federal agencies to meet the biodiversity and climate crises with the urgency and scale that they demand. The annual Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill provides funding for a number of important agencies including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which implements the Endangered Species Act and manages the National Wildlife Refuge System, and the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management, who recover imperiled species with habitat on the Federal public lands that they administer.

Following a decade of insufficient funding imposed by the draconian spending caps of the Budget Control Act, the Interior bill received a 4.6% increase in Fiscal Year 2022. This increase, while badly needed, was less than the rate of inflation and below the average increase of 6.7% across all nondefense discretionary spending that year. This translated to little to no practical increase for many key environmental programs, which continue to lack the resources even to keep pace with inflation and restore historic capacity that was lost in recent decades. In summer 2022, the House considered an Interior funding bill for Fiscal Year 2023 that would increase funding across these agencies by 18%, which would make meaningful progress toward properly funding federal species protections and recovery efforts.

A set of 13 Republican-sponsored amendments were offered to the consolidated FY23 appropriations "minibus" package, H.R.8294, to be voted en bloc. The amendments would have indiscriminately cut funding for agencies and programs across the entire Interior bill. Rep. Allen's (R-Ga.) amendment would have cut funding by 5%; Rep. Hern's (R-Okla.) would have cut funding by 22%; and Reps. Norman's (R-S.C.) and Perry's (R-Pa.) would have cut funding by 5%. These amendments would have recklessly hindered a wide array of priorities carried in the legislation relating to wildlife conservation.

### **OUTCOME:**

On July 19, 2022, the House rejected en bloc amendment #1, 199-229. "No" was the pro-conservation vote.