United States Senate
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
WASHINGTON, DC 20510–6025
http://appropriations.senate.gov

May 17, 2017

The Honorable Mike Enzi
Chairman
Committee on Budget
United States Senate
Washington D.C. 20510

The Honorable Bernie Sanders
Ranking Member
Committee on Budget
United States Senate
Washington D.C. 20510

Dear Chairman Enzi and Ranking Member Sanders,

On March 10, 2017, I submitted to you my views and estimates on the Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Resolution related to those matters within the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee. Because the Trump Administration had not yet communicated a budget proposal to Congress, I provided you with an attachment to my letter detailing the impact of a hypothetical 13 percent across-the-board cut to select non-defense discretionary programs. I arrived at 13 percent by calculating the impact of a planned $54 billion cut in non-defense discretionary programs that President Trump had already announced, adjusted for expected proposed increase in veterans' funding and border security. I promised to update that analysis once Congress received a more detailed budget proposal from the Trump Administration.

On March 16, 2017, President Trump sent his "budget blueprint" to Congress (or the so-called "skinny" budget). While the budget blueprint still lacks significant detail, it provides more information than was available on March 10. Unfortunately, nothing in the Administration's budget proposal alleviates the serious concerns expressed in my original letter about the proposed cuts to non-defense discretionary programs. To the contrary, the cuts for many programs proposed in the Trump budget blueprint are much deeper than the estimated 13 percent, and many more important programs are proposed to be eliminated altogether. Proposing such draconian cuts constitutes a fundamental lack of understanding of the role such programs play in securing our nation, creating jobs across the nation (including in rural America), caring for our veterans, promoting our health and the environment, and helping our vulnerable citizens.

Even without these proposed cuts, Fiscal Year 2018 would be particularly challenging. It has been over five years since passage of the Budget Control Act (BCA) of 2011. Instead of leading to comprehensive fiscal reform, we have been operating under budget caps that have had a disproportionate effect on discretionary spending. Discretionary programs have been cut by $2 trillion. These cuts have negatively affected our nation's infrastructure, our health and education systems, programs to assist veterans who have faithfully served this country, environmental protections, job training programs, and the readiness of our armed forces. For both defense and non-defense programs, sequestration will have consequences for average Americans for a generation.

The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 and the Bipartisan Budget Agreement of 2015 provided temporary relief, but in Fiscal Year 2018 we are set to return to the post-sequestration budget caps, which are $4.9 billion below FY 2017 levels. The non-defense discretionary cap is $2.9 billion below last year's level, and the defense cap is $2.0 billion below last year's level. In addition to the $2.9 billion in cuts to non-defense discretionary budget authority, we anticipate an estimated $12.8 billion hole due to scorekeeping adjustments and required spending over which Congress has little control. I provided a detailed chart outlining these cuts in my March 10 letter. <u>In other words, unless there is a cap increase, non-defense discretionary programs will have to absorb cuts of $15.7 billion dollars below the Fiscal Year 2017 level, or a roughly 3 percent cut</u>.

It is in this context that the Trump administration seeks to slash an <u>additional</u> $54 billion from non-defense discretionary programs to pay for a $54 billion increase in defense spending. This is simply unacceptable. It is essential that we not only reject President Trump's ill-considered proposal to cut $54 billion from non-defense discretionary programs, but we must have parity between defense and non-defense programs. To the extent that Congress provides relief from the post-sequestration funding levels for defense programs, we must provide the same relief for domestic and international assistance programs.

Bipartisan agreement on maintaining parity between defense and non-defense discretionary programs was the basis for two separate budget deals that provided much needed relief from sequestration under the BCA. Continuing parity in Fiscal Year 2018 and beyond is the best way to ensure a bipartisan path forward in the new Congress and address the needs of our nation.

As promised, I have updated the attachment to my March 10 letter to reflect the actual cuts proposed by the Trump Administration. I continue to believe that if implemented, these cuts would have very serious and negative consequences for our economy, our environment, and our national security.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Patrick Leahy

Vice Chairman Patrick Leahy

FY18 Updated Views & Estimates

Table of Contents

AGRICULTURE

Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP): CSFP provides supplemental food to the low-income elderly population. A 26 percent cut, as proposed in the Trump budget (or nearly $62 million) would result in a caseload reduction of approximately 170,000. According to USDA, of the elderly population who are eligible, only 41 percent receive SNAP benefits. This means that 59 percent of low-income elderly people rely on other sources for food assistance. This is why programs such as CSFP are so important – they help fill that void.

Rental Assistance (RA): The Trump budget cuts RA by 26 percent. Such a cut would eliminate rent subsidies for very low- and low-income rural multi-family housing residents. These residents are generally elderly, disabled, and female-headed households, with minimal housing alternatives. This cut ($365 million) would cause more than 75,000 rural households to face untenable rent increases and possibly eviction.

Elimination of the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program: The Trump budget eliminates the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program, which provides funding for international school feeding programs in developing countries in order to improve food security, reduce hunger and malnutrition, and improve literacy. This program is often the only reason children go to school, especially girls. This program is currently feeding over 2 million children in some of the world's poorest countries. In fact, the meal eaten at school is often the only meal a child will receive during the day. The McGovern-Dole program is making a difference in children's lives. It is literally saving lives.

Rural Single Family Housing Direct Loans: The Trump budget cuts USDA's single family housing direct loan program by 26 percent. Such a cut would result in a program reduction of $260 million. This program allows families in rural America to purchase homes with no down payment and low mortgage interest rates. Almost 1,900 very low and low-income rural families would lose the opportunity to obtain safe and affordable housing and become successful homeowners. Eligible families cannot have incomes exceeding 80 percent of the area median family income, and must be unable to obtain credit from conventional credit sources. This program is heavily over-subscribed; FY17 funding is expected to be exhausted by this summer.

Elimination of Food Aid: The Trump budget would eliminate Food for Peace (FPP) Title II funding, which would be catastrophic. People currently on the verge of starvation would likely die without this life saving food assistance. In FY16, this program reached an estimated 40 million people, and in FY 2017 it will likely reach an estimated 45 million people. Eliminating FFP would equate to 3.4 billion fewer meals provided per year or 286 million meals per month. This program has provided food, mostly in the form of U.S. commodities, to poor countries throughout the world for more than 50 years, and has benefited more than 3 billion people in 150 countries since its inception. It also benefits U.S. farmers and shippers, helps combat global hunger, reduces conflict, promotes democracy, and provides food security.

According to the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, from 2014-2016, 10.4 percent of the world's population are undernourished. 2017 is currently seeing unprecedented food assistance needs. In February, the UN declared a famine in South Sudan. Almost 5 million South Sudanese are facing severe food insecurity and are not able to meet their basic food needs. This level of famine is threating 3 more countries including Nigeria, Yemen, and

Somalia. In Yemen 2.2 million children are acutely malnourished. Just this year, across 45 countries, some 70 million people will require emergency food assistance. This is an increase of 40 percent over 2015. The world is witnessing a humanitarian crisis not seem for over 70 years. This is not the time to eliminate live saving food now when it's needed the most.

Elimination of the Water and Waste Program: The Trump budget would eliminate the Water and Waste (W&W) program, which provides low-interest loans and grants to small, remote rural communities, for construction and repair of clean water and sanitary waste disposal systems. In FY16, the W&W program provided over $1.7 billion in loans and grants. These loan and grants assisted over 1,000 rural communities and 2.4 million rural residents.

Elimination of the Rural Business Service (RBS): The Trump budget would eliminate the Rural Business Services, which offers loans and grants to rural businesses to promote job creation and income generation. Often commercial credit is not available for new business start-ups or expansions in rural areas except at unaffordable interest rates or impossible terms. RBS programs work to mitigate credit barriers to rural business growth, and in FY16, provided almost $1 billion in loans and grants. Without these programs rural communities will lose opportunities to expand employment and increase incomes.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA): Most of the $1.5 billion or 16 percent cut proposed for the Department of Commerce impacts NOAA. This includes a $250 million cut to grant programs, including elimination of the popular Sea Grant program, which funds coastal research at 33 universities; NOAA education programs, which bring tangible oceans and weather science into classrooms, museums, and aquariums across the country; and coastal resiliency grants, which help communities become more resistant to natural disasters. The Coastal Zone Management Program, Pacific Salmon Coastal Recovery Fund, and National Estuarine Research Reserve System programs are also eliminated. These programs are not subsidies to states, but job-creating programs that protect our coastlines and the U.S. businesses that depend on them. Each dollar of Sea Grant funding, for example, returns $8.57 in economic impact to the community, and the program creates or retains more than 20,000 jobs each year.

Weather operations funding is preserved at or close to the enacted level of $1 billion, but forecasting will be compromised by cuts to weather data collection and research, even if operational funding is flat. The FY 2018 budget includes an unspecified cut to next-generation polar satellites, called Polar Follow On, and planned observations in the early 2020s. In addition, information in the press about the full May budget suggest that NOAA's research line, including research into weather and climate modeling, will be cut by cut an additional 10-15 percent beyond the cuts reflected in the budget blueprint. One third of the U.S. economy depends on adequate weather forecasting, including the farming, travel, tourism, and shipping industries. In 2016 alone, there were 15 weather and climate disaster events with losses exceeding $1 billion. Funding cuts for data collection, research, and satellite infrastructure will compromise lives and livelihoods.

Economic Development Administration (EDA): The Trump budget would eliminate this popular infrastructure program, which supports economic growth and helps distressed communities attract private investment. In FY 2016, EDA grants in all 50 states created or retained 25,000 jobs and generated $4.7 billion in private investments. More than 60 percent of EDA's infrastructure funding goes to rural communities.

Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP): The Trump budget proposes to eliminate this popular National Institute of Standards and Technology program, which operates in all 50 States, helping small and medium manufacturers become more efficient and productive. In FY 2016, MEP centers helped 25,000 small- and medium-sized manufacturers create or retain nearly 87,000 jobs and generate $9.3 billion in new or retained sales.

Minority Business Development Administration (MBDA): The Trump budget would eliminate MBDA. MBDA supports minority businesses, creating or retaining nearly 30,000 jobs each year. These centers, located in 24 States, helped minority-owned businesses secure $4 billion in contracts and $2 billion in capital in FY 2015.

Decennial Census: The Trump budget cites an "increase" of $130 million to $1.5 billion total funding for the Census Bureau. This is only a $30 million increase compared to FY 2017. In FY 2018, Census will conduct the "end-to-end" Census test of all aspects of the planned 2020

Census operations, including new cost-saving measures like Internet response and satellite address canvassing. Cutting this test and other FY 2018 preparations could force the Census Bureau to revert to expensive and inefficient pencil-and-paper data collection in 2020, costing taxpayers up to $5 billion more in the long run.

Trade promotion: The Trump budget will increase funding for trade enforcement at Commerce's International Trade Administration (ITA), but this will be offset with a corresponding cut to export promotion activities, including the Foreign Commercial Service. Trade promotion creates jobs by supporting small businesses and improving the U.S. trade imbalance with countries like China. Even small funding cuts could have a devastating impact on the U.S. trade imbalance. For example, ITA's recent focus on recruiting foreign companies to manufacture in the U.S. – less than 2 percent of ITA's annual budget – has increased investment in the U.S. by more than $18 billion over 5 years, creating and saving thousands of American jobs.

State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP): The Trump budget eliminates SCAAP, funded at $210 million in FY 2017. SCAAP reimburses state and local governments for the costs of incarcerating unauthorized immigrants.

Legal Services Corporation (LSC): The Trump budget would eliminate funding for the Legal Services Corporation. LSC was funded at $385 million in FY 2017. Eliminating LSC would exacerbate the growing problem of unrepresented litigants in civil cases before state courts. According to The Justice Index, a project of the National Center for Access to Justice at the Cardozo Law School, more than 80 percent of litigants appear without lawyers in matters as important as evictions, mortgage foreclosures, child custody and child support proceedings, and debt collection cases in state courts. The Conference of Chief Justices of State Supreme Courts tells us large numbers of unrepresented litigants not only clog the courts and take more court time, but also result in unequal justice with cases being decided on technical errors not the legal merits. LSC represents litigants in a wide range of important matters from domestic violence, custody, landlord-tenant, and foreclosure to veterans benefit cases.

ENERGY & WATER

Applied Energy Programs: The Trump budget provides a combined $2 billion reduction to four applied energy research and development programs – Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Fossil Energy, Nuclear Energy, and Office of Electricity – with a combined FY 2017 funding level of $4.174 billion. This represents a 48 percent cut to these programs at a funding level of $2.174 billion. This reduction would devastate applied energy research at the national laboratories, including the layoff of at least 2,600 researchers across 6 facilities in Tennessee, Washington, Colorado, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California. In addition, grants to universities would be reduced by more than $200 million in the Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy program alone. This reduction will damage U.S. economic competitiveness and national security.

Science: The Trump budget cuts funding for the Office of Science by 17 percent or $900 million. The Office of Science is the lead Federal agency supporting fundamental scientific research for energy and the Nation's largest supporter of basic research in the physical sciences. Such a reduction would result in the layoff of approximately 2,700 researchers at national laboratories in Tennessee, New York, Washington, Illinois, and California. In addition, the request would severely limit the availability of user facilities, such as light sources and neutron sources, accessed by companies and universities to develop new products and make basic science discoveries. If this cut is applied uniformly across the Office of Science, it would result in a reduction of approximately $225 million in grants to universities and other research institutions.

APRA-E: The Trump budget also eliminates funding for the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (ARPA-E) program, which provides grants for cutting edge and potentially transformational energy technologies. Since its inception in 2009, ARPA-E has been appropriated $1.5 billion, but attracted an additional $1.8 billion private funding and led to the creation of 56 new companies.

Regional Commissions: The Trump budget eliminates funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Delta Regional Authority, the Northern Border Regional Commission, and the Denali Commission, which received a total of $202 million in FY 2017. These organizations provide funding for infrastructure, job training, and economic development in areas of persistent poverty in the U.S. More than 37 million people would be affected in the 698 counties where the agencies work – in Appalachia, the Mississippi basin, rural northern New England, and Alaska – places where the poverty rate is 33 percent higher than the national average.

FINANCIAL SERVICES, GENERAL GOVT

Internal Revenue Service: The IRS collects the revenues that fund more than 95 percent of Federal operations, public services, and vital programs. The Trump budget cuts $239 million from the IRS. This represents a 2 percent cut below the FY 2017 enacted funding of $11.235 billion.

Current funding is now $911 million, or more than 7 percent, below the FY 2010 funding of $12.15 billion. Factoring in inflation, the last time the funding for the IRS was that low was in the mid-1990s. IRS resources already fall far short of the needed funds to assist taxpayers, combat refund fraud and identity theft, upgrade antiquated information technology, and pursue tax cheats. Cutting IRS below a baseline of already depleted funding means even deeper cuts to human capital (75 percent of IRS budget is salaries/expenses) and aging information technology systems. A cut of this magnitude means a higher budget deficit for FY 2018 and beyond, continued deferral of critical IT upgrades imperative for protecting taxpayer data and to combat identity theft and refund fraud, and unacceptable setbacks in taxpayer service. It would pose greater risk to voluntary compliance that underpins sound tax administration.

Chronic underfunding creates untenable long-term risk for our voluntary U.S. tax system. A 1 percent drop in the voluntary compliance rate costs the U.S. government an estimated $30 billion a year in lost revenue.

Treasury's Community Development Financial Institutions Fund (CDFI): The Trump budget eliminates funding for CDFI grants, which are given to small community banks in low-income neighborhoods. These grants are leveraged 10:1 with additional private funds to provide nearly $2 billion in development each year, and used to rebuild neighborhoods through development of much needed resources like community centers, affordable housing units, and grocery stores; they create jobs by financing small businesses, and they provide credit and capital to individuals at rates much lower than predatory pay-day lenders that may be the only other alternative. Without these grants, CDFIs would continue to serve their customers but would not only have to cut back considerably on the number and value of their investments because of the lack of additional financing, but they would need to cut back on the most complicated investments. This would result in less economic development, fewer small businesses created or expanded, fewer jobs created and retained, and less access to capital for individuals and neighborhoods that need it the most.

Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP): Information in the press about the full May budget suggest that the Trump budget will cut ONDCP from an FY17 enacted level of $388 million to $24 million, a reduction of $364 million (94 percent) below the FY 2017 enacted level. ONDCP's staffing would be cut in half (from 65 FTE to 33 FTE) at a time when the agency is responsible for providing the unfunded mandate of supporting the President's new Commission on Combatting Drug Addiction and the Opioid Crisis. ONDCP's largest and most popular grant programs would be eliminated – the High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas (HIDTA) program, currently funded at $254 million, and the Drug-Free Communities (DFC) program, currently funded at $97 million. It appears unlikely the that Trump Budget would fund a new appropriation provided in FY 2016 for community-based coalition enhancement grants, authorized by the recently-enacted Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act (CARA), which were funded in FY 2016 at $3 million. While the Administration may argue that ONDCP's two grant programs are duplicative, that is not the case since there is no other program like HIDTA that targets small anti-drug cases and no other community program like DFC that targets drug prevention toward the nation's youth.

Healthcare, lost productivity and criminal justice costs associated with addiction are estimated to cost $193 billion annually, whereas every $1 invested in prevention yields a savings of up to $10. An independent evaluation of the DFC program found that among middle school students in DFC-funded communities, past 30-day use rates for prescription drugs and marijuana declined by 21.4 percent and 13.5 percent, respectively. Among high school students in DFC-funded communities, past 30-day use rates for prescription drugs and marijuana decreased by 14.5 percent and 4.4 percent, respectively. The DFC program provides a dollar-for-dollar match for every Federal dollar (up to $125,000/year for 5 years). The FY 2017 funding level will allow about 83 new DFC grants in addition to the 617 continuing grants for a total of 700 grants in 2017 to reduce youth drug use.

The 28 existing HIDTAs dismantled 2,880 drug trafficking organizations in 2014, the majority of which were part of multi-state or international operations. In the process, HIDTAs seized more than $1.1 billion dollars from drug traffickers, removed 2,447,885 kilos of illicit narcotics from the market, and provided intelligence assistance to more than 26,832 investigations. The combined value of the illegal drugs seized and the cash and assets taken from traffickers equates to a return on investment of $75.34 for every HIDTA $1 budgeted in 2016 (excluding funding for treatment and prevention).

At a time when the nation is struggling with an opioid epidemic, this is not the time to decimate the lead agency for effective coordination of drug control programs and its programs. Heroin, fentanyl, methamphetamine, and cocaine overdoses have claimed 438,314 lives since 2005. DFC and HIDTA provide a significant and positive impact on communities and a valuable return on investment, and are critical anti-drug programs that must be maintained.

HOMELAND SECURITY

Transportation Security Administration: The budget proposes a passenger fee increase of $1, from $5.60 to $6.60, for a one-way ticket. TSA estimates this increase will generate $530 million in additional revenue to offset discretionary spending. President Obama proposed a similar increase in FY 2017 and it was immediately rejected. It is highly likely that this proposal will again not be enacted, resulting in a $530 million cut to TSA's discretionary budget. This would leave TSA vastly understaffed to provide effective security without significantly inconveniencing the flying public. TSA would reduce the number of staffed checkpoint lanes by a minimum of 345 per day. Given how deep this cut would be, the reduction in staffed lanes would most likely exceed 600 lanes during a significant portion of daily operations. As a case example, Chicago O'Hare would see the number of staffed checkpoint lanes decrease from 57 to 47 and would see over 20,000 passengers per day possibly missing flights due to wait times significantly in excess of 10 minutes. As a result of significant understaffing and extended wait times, checkpoint queues would also become a major security vulnerability due to the number of people awaiting screening in the public area of the airport.

FEMA grants: The Trump budget cuts FEMA grants by $667 million, or 24 percent, which will hamper the ability of States and localities to mitigate, prepare for, and respond to terrorism and extreme disasters and the raise the costs of recovery from such events. The FY 2017 enacted level was $2.767 billion.

- Preparedness and response grants support intergovernmental emergency response and recovery activities through 32 core capabilities – such as intelligence/information sharing, interoperable communications, and mass care during natural disasters and terrorist attacks. State and local governments report through the National Preparedness Report that only 3 of 32 core capabilities have reached acceptable levels of performance. This lack of basic capacity, in addition to an inability to meet emerging threats such as active shooter and cybersecurity attacks, leaves the Nation behind in preparedness for known risks.
- Mitigation grants incentivize smart new building and prudent retrofitting projects to prevent catastrophic damage to property. Not only are lives saved through such projects but mitigation reduces disaster recovery costs for the Federal government in the amount of $4 for every $1 invested. We current spend over $7 billion a year in recovery costs through the FEMA Disaster Relief Fund.
- Cooperative agreements provide seed funding for quality, accurate flood maps. These maps are necessary to ensure infrastructure projects can move forward safely for Federal, state, and local facilities and communities.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT

EPA Grants to States Cut Nearly in Half: The Trump budget cuts $470 million – or 44 percent – of yearly funding provided directly to each State to run their environmental protection agencies and carry out basic pollution control activities. Every single State in the country would see massive cuts to funds that provide ongoing support for State agency implementation of longstanding Federal environmental laws, including:

- Supervision of public water systems to help prevent mistakes like lead poisoning of children in Flint, Michigan – cut by $46 million.
- Radon Poisoning Prevention in schools and homes – cut by $3.6 million.
- Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention, which disproportionally impacts children in low-income communities – cut by $6.3 million.
- Clean Air programs to reduce ozone, particulate matter, and other toxic substances we breathe – cut by $103 million.
- Remediation of the 43,000 water bodies nationwide that are impaired by excess runoff and toxics – cut by $77 million.
- Water quality monitoring and pollution control – cut by $104 million.
- Hazardous waste disposal programs – cut by $45 million.

50 EPA Public Health & Environmental Programs Eliminated: Geographic programs with proven track records in improving water quality are eliminated entirely, affecting several regions of the U.S. including:

- Great Lakes ($300 million)
- Gulf of Mexico ($8.5 million)
- Lake Champlain ($4.4 million)
- Chesapeake Bay ($73 million)
- Puget Sound ($28 million)
- Long Island Sound ($8 million)
- South Florida ($1.7 million)

Air and water quality grants targeted to vulnerable areas are completely eliminated, including:

- Targeted Airshed grants, which provide special support to the areas in the U.S. with the worst air quality ($30 million).
- Alaska Native Villages grants, which support critical drinking water and sewer systems in rural and remote parts of Alaska ($20 million).
- U.S.-Mexico Border grants, which make critical investments in drinking water and sanitation improvements on the southwest border, including Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and California ($10 million).

National programs with wide-ranging impacts are also eliminated, including:

- Endocrine Disruptor Screening program, which evaluates the impact of chemical exposure on human health.

- Energy Star program, which has saved Americans $430 billion on their utility bills since 1992 by helping consumers identify energy efficient products.
- STAR Grants, which spur innovative approaches to water quality and infrastructure through small business contracts and competitive grants.

Climate Programs Eliminated: The Trump budget eliminates ALL of EPA's climate programs, including voluntary incentives, international partnerships, climate monitoring and research, and other climate-related activities that work to prevent further impacts on public health and environmental quality ($159 million).

Scientific Research Gutted: The Trump budget cuts EPA research funding in half, from $513 million to $250 million. This research supplies basic evidence and assessments on threats to public health and the environment and also identifies new technologies and other solutions to these threats.

Gives Big Polluters a Pass: The Trump budget proposes a gift for big polluters by cutting funding for enforcement by 23 percent, from $555 million to $419 million, taking cops off the beat from holding polluters accountable for criminal and civil violations of longstanding environmental laws.

Superfund Sites Left Contaminated: The Trump budget cuts the Superfund program by 30 percent, from $1.1 billion to $762 million, abandoning planned cleanup of scores of contaminated and polluted sites in nearly every state in the U.S.

EPA's Scientists, Researchers, and Economists: The Trump budget proposes to fire 3,200 scientists, researchers, economists, and policy experts, dropping EPA staffing to 1985 levels. These cuts would come on top of the 11 percent staffing cut between 2010 and 2016 – which already took EPA back to 1989 staffing levels.

National Park Service Staffing: According to initial estimates by the Park Service, national parks had a record-breaking 330 million visits in 2016 – 8 percent more than the previous year. Visitors depend on National Park Service rangers, law enforcement officers, firefighters and maintenance staff to provide visitor services, keep them safe, and maintain national parks for their enjoyment. If these positions are not filled, basic services at national parks will be severely compromised.

While the Trump budget does not provide a specific funding level for the National Park Service, applying a 12 percent across-the-board cut—a *pro rata* distribution of the cut absorbed by the U.S. Department of the Interior—would likely put more than 1,000 seasonal ranger positions on the chopping block—crippling the agency's ability to meet the needs of millions of visitors and protect our nation's most significant natural resources. Smaller parks—many in rural or underserved areas—may be forced to close or curtail services and larger parks will also lose key services at a time when visitation of national parks is at an all-time high.

Tribal Programs/Indian Education: The Trump budget fails to provide specific details regarding how the Federal Government plans to uphold its treaty and trust obligations to American Indians and Alaska Natives, including providing a quality education for Native children. It is very concerning that the budget blueprint hints at making unspecified reductions to certain tribal programs – particularly when the entire budget for the Interior Department is reduced by 12 percent. While difficult to ascertain details of the proposal, if the Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) is forced to absorb a *pro rata* distribution of the Department's 12 percent cut, we estimate it could have the following impacts to formula funding used to provide basic educational services at 183 Bureau of Indian Education schools:

- A 12 percent cut to the Indian School Equalization Program would cut more than $48.0 million from core education programs.
- The cut means approximately $1,100 less <u>per child</u> to educate students in schools funded by BIE. Every single school in the BIE system could lose funding for basic educational services – less funding to hire teachers and principals and provide textbooks and classroom supplies.
- These cuts are the equivalent of eliminating funding for nearly 5,000 children in the system; however, BIE schools will have to absorb the cuts and still educate the same number of children. BIE-funded schools currently serve more than 41,000 children.
- The cut is particularly troubling because BIE schools are already failing. Students that attend BIE-funded schools regularly underperform their peers who attend public schools on basic proficiency exams in reading and mathematics. High school graduation rates from BIE schools (53 percent) are significantly below the national average (81 percent). Further cuts will only allow these students to fall further behind.

<u>Federal Wildland Firefighting</u>: The Trump budget funds wildland fire suppression programs at the Forest Service and Department of the Interior at the 10-year rolling average of fire suppression costs rather than budgeting for the agencies' anticipated needs. Annual firefighting costs currently exceed the 10-year average by about 30 percent. Solely appropriating the 10-year average will likely lead to the agencies running out of firefighting funds before the end of the fiscal year and borrowing from other programs as a contingency to keep fighting fires. The Obama Administration recognized this fact and proposed a Disaster Cap amendment that would have paid for the top 1 percent of catastrophic fires in the same way we budget for other natural disasters—using those funds to provide an additional amount above the 10-year average based on a more accurate, 2-year forecasting model. The Trump budget blueprint shows no sign of proposing any solutions to this escalating problem and in fact appears to walk away from the commitment to fund agencies' full projected funding needs.

LABOR, HHS, & EDUCATION

<u>Supporting Student Success</u>: More than 90 percent of our Nation's elementary and secondary students attend public schools. Instead of investing in their success, the Trump budget prioritizes unproven private school voucher proposals over investments that research shows is a key to student success, such as a high quality teacher in every classroom, strong leadership in every school building, and student supports before and after school.

- **Title I grants to school districts:** The Trump budget prioritizes $1 billion for a proposal rejected previously by the Senate to allow resources to follow a student to the public school of their choice. If enacted as proposed, it would lead to a cut in funding under Title I for all eligible school districts other than those participating in this proposed program. Compared to the FY 2017 level, the amount of the proposed reduction could cut $558 million from all other Title I eligible school districts.

  - Title I grants are the foundation of Federal assistance to public elementary and secondary education and target additional support to schools, particularly in high poverty communities. More than 80 percent of the Nation's school districts and more than half of the nation's public schools receive Title I funds.
  - If Title I grant funding is cut by more than $500 million because of the shift of funding to the school choice proposal, public school systems would reduce staffing by an estimated 5,000 educators who provide services in Title I schools. The loss of so many educators would deny extra support to almost one million students in the nation's public schools that helps them meet state college and career-ready standards.

- **Supporting Effective Instruction State grants:** The Trump budget would eliminate this program which was just strengthened and reauthorized as part of the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act and received $2.1 billion in the 2017 appropriations bill. The program provides formula grants to states and school districts to support the recruitment, retention, and development of effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders.

- **21st Century Learning Centers program:** The Trump budget eliminates this $1.2 billion program which provides additional learning time activities for students in low-performing schools before and after school and during the summer. This proposal would eliminate support for roughly 1.8 million students attending programs when research shows that those attending high quality afterschool programs do better in school and have better graduation and labor market outcomes. In addition, such programs are a critical support for working parents needing a safe and healthy environment for their child while they are unable to be at home.

<u>College Access and Affordability</u>: The Trump budget undermines federal efforts to make postsecondary education more accessible and affordable. The budget proposes to cancel $3.9 billion in resources available in the Pell Grant program to balance misguided priorities in the budget such as paying for the building of a wall on the border with Mexico rather than using these funds to raise the Pell grant maximum award or expand access to the program through year-round Pell Grant eligibility.

- The Trump budget doubles down on the Pell cancellation proposal by proposing the elimination of the $733 million Supplemental Education Opportunity Grant (SEOG) program which provides extra need-based grants to roughly 1.6 million students of up to $4,000 per year. Pell grant recipients are a priority for these funds. In 2013-2014, 71 percent of dependent undergraduate student recipients of this aid had family income levels of less than $30,000 and 76 percent of independent students receiving SEOG had family incomes of less than $20,000.
- The Trump budget also cuts $262 million from the TRIO and GEAR UP programs that serve low-income, first-generation college students to help them progress academically from middle school through college graduation. For TRIO, the proposed 10 percent cut would deny support to roughly 92,000 individuals.
- Finally, while the Trump budget states that it protects $492 million in funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), it proposes to eliminate SEOG, cut TRIO and GEAR UP, and cancel balances in the Pell Grant program, all of which would siphon money from minority students preparing for or in postsecondary education. The United Negro College Fund noted recently that the elimination of SEOG would negatively impact more than 55,000 HBCU students who rely on this assistance to make it through college.

Job Training and Employment Service Programs: If DOL Job Training and Employment Services programs are cut by at least 30 percent, as proposed in the Trump budget, an estimated 4 million adult, youth, dislocated workers, and veterans would lose access to employment and training services next year. The Training and Employment Services appropriation funds a nationwide system of education, skills training, and employment services that support and increase the employment and earnings of current and future workers, particularly low-income persons, dislocated workers, and at-risk and out-of-school youth. This would be a significant cut to the nation's core worker training programs, which Congress reauthorized on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis in the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) of 2014.

Senior Nutrition Programs: If Senior Nutrition programs are cut by 18 percent, as proposed in the Trump budget, an estimated 37 million fewer meals would be served to seniors next year, increasing hunger and food insecurity for our nation's most vulnerable older adults. This includes both congregate and home-delivered meals. The Administration for Community Living nutrition programs provide seniors' access to healthy meals, nutrition education and nutrition counseling. These programs are targeted to adults age 60 and older who are in the greatest social and economic need, helping millions of older Americans remain healthy and preventing the need for more costly medical interventions. Roughly 5,000 nutrition service providers together serve over 900,000 meals a day in communities all across the United States.

Head Start: The Trump budget calls early child care and education a priority, which according to HHS means receiving less than the overall average 18 percent cut across all programs. If Head Start funding is cut by, for example, 13 percent, an estimated 155,000 children would lose early childhood services. The program, which received an $85 million *increase* in FY 2017, provides comprehensive services to promote school readiness to approximately 1 million of our nation's most vulnerable, low-income children and their families.

STATE, FOREIGN OPS

Overview: Based on the information available, the Trump budget contains $39.1 billion in discretionary funding for the Department of State, USAID, and Treasury International Programs, a 26 percent cut compared to the $53.07 billion topline for the SFOPS budget in FY 2017. Including the FY 2017 Security Assistance Appropriations Act (SAAA) to counter ISIL, the skinny budget is a 32 percent cut to the FY 2017 total of $57.37 billion.

A 26 percent cut would deeply impact the ability of the Department of State and USAID to effectively oversee and manage programs that protect U.S. personnel and facilities overseas, support partners around the world to promote stability in volatile regions, and pursue development outcomes that build markets for U.S. exports on which the U.S. economy depends. Some programs will be cut less, others much deeper than 26 percent, and some programs and agencies have been slated for elimination.

Global Health: The budget states that funds are included to "maintain support" for PEPFAR and the Global Fund, as well as malaria programs and the U.S. commitment to the Global Alliance for Vaccine and Immunization (GAVI). Those funding levels total more than 81 percent of the Global Health Programs account. The Administration makes no mention of how it proposes to fund the other 19 percent of the account (equal to $1.7 billion in FY 2017). The health programs that fail to make the Administration's list include bilateral efforts to combat tuberculosis, polio, and pandemic diseases like Ebola and Zika; support reproductive health (including to prevent unsafe abortions and maternal deaths) and life-saving nutrition programs; and help build public health systems in poor countries so they can care for their own people. Members of both parties routinely seek increases for global health programs because of their proven effectiveness in saving lives and controlling epidemics.

Development Assistance: A 26 percent cut would eliminate funding ($779 million compared to FY 2017) for programs that support water and sanitation, basic education, democracy and governance, women's leadership, energy development, and economic growth throughout Central America, Africa, South Asia, and Southeast Asia. The elimination of the account altogether and its consolidation under the Economic Support Fund account would shift the focus of remaining programs away from long-term development outcomes.

International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement (INCLE): A 26 percent cut to the INCLE account ($339 million compared to FY 2017) is roughly equivalent to eliminating INCLE programs in South and Central Asia and the Near East. Among other purposes, these funds help improve our partners' judicial systems and professionalize law enforcement, combat human and wildlife trafficking, protect border security, interdict the flow of illicit drugs and other contraband, and combat organized crime and corruption, which directly advances U.S. national security.

Foreign Military Financing Program (FMF): A 26 percent cut to FMF ($1.6 billion compared to FY 2017) is roughly equivalent to eliminating FMF for every country in the world except Israel and Egypt. However, the budget suggests that rather than eliminating FMF the Administration will convert portions of it to a loan program. This would require poorer countries to reimburse the United States (which past experience has shown they are unable to do) for assistance that is in our security interest to provide to them. More likely, this will erode the State Department's foreign relationships and increase demands on DOD, when providing this type of assistance is not their core mission. Otherwise these countries will take their business elsewhere and U.S. industry will be the loser.

Humanitarian Assistance and Food Aid: The budget makes steep cuts to funding for the State Department and USAID, as well as international food aid which is eliminated from the Department of Agriculture budget. These programs provide food, water, medicine, and shelter to victims of wars and natural disasters, and also benefit U.S. farmers who grow the food. A 26 percent cut of these programs ($1.5 billion compared to FY 2017, not including additional funds to address famine), which have strong bipartisan support, will mean many thousands of lives lost among refugees from Syria, Sudan, and other desperate victims of disasters. According to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), a 24 percent reduction in the U.S. contribution would force them to cut food, water, and other basic relief to over 2.2 million vulnerable people in conflict zones in Africa, the Middle East, and Ukraine.

Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining, and Related Programs: A 26 percent cut ($252 million compared to FY 2017) is roughly equivalent to eliminating the Antiterrorism Assistance program, Counterterrorism Financing program, and Terrorist Interdiction Program, which have been strongly supported by both Republicans and Democrats in Congress.

State Department Operations: Secretary Tillerson has announced his intention to eliminate 2,300 State Department personnel, including through buyouts, which would negatively impact any number of Department activities, including financial management and program oversight.

USAID Operations: The budget would necessitate the elimination of 30-35 of USAID's field missions white cutting its regional bureaus by roughly 65 percent, significantly hindering USAID's ability to conduct oversight of programs and necessitating the elimination of some programs in countries where USAID is often the most influential part of the U.S. Government.

International Peacekeeping: The budget would pay only 25 percent of international peacekeeping costs versus our assessment of 28.5 percent, a difference of more than $250 million, which would increase arrears already created by the 25 percent cap in the FY 2017 Omnibus.

International Organizations: Although not specified in the budget, Administration officials have told us they expect a cut of 50-67 percent to international organizations (at least $500 million compared to FY 2016), which would quickly put us deeply in arrears and lead to the eventual loss of our voting rights. Without a voice and vote in these institutions we will cede our leadership to China and other nations that often do not share our values or interests.

Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC): OPIC has been slated for elimination, even though the organization earns more money for the American taxpayer than it spends. OPIC works with private sector businesses helping them gain access to foreign markets, and for a cost of $83 million returned over $350 million to the Treasury in FY16.

Environment programs: In response to written questions after his confirmation hearing, Secretary of Defense Mattis acknowledged that “[c]limate change is impacting stability in areas of the world where our troops are operating today”. The budget would eliminate funding for the Global Climate Change Initiative ($983 million in FY 2016), and contribute to potentially catastrophic long-term consequences for the United States and the world.

International Financial Institutions: Reneging on hundreds of millions of dollars in pledges to the World Bank and other international financial institutions that the U.S. was instrumental in creating is not strong leadership, and China will fill the vacuum.

Independent agencies: The budget would eliminate funding for relatively small organizations like the Inter-American Foundation, the U.S. African Development Foundation, the U.S. Institute of Peace, and others, which total a fraction of a percent of the international affairs budget. These entities help advance U.S. interests in a variety of ways, including by leveraging external funds and delivering assistance directly to poor communities by working at the local level, and ensuring nonpartisan analysis and policy development, in coordination with the Departments of State and Defense, in the pursuit of U.S. national security interests.

Exchange Programs: The budget will eliminate funding ($394 million in FY 2017) for professional, educational, cultural, and youth exchanges, except for the Fulbright Program. Defunding these successful exchange programs that break down stereotypes and build lasting relationships is self-defeating and ignores the contributions exchange participants make to the U.S. economy.

Offices of Inspectors General (OIG): Cuts to the State and USAID Inspectors General may seem penny wise but are pound foolish. A 26 percent cut would force the OIGs to reduce staff and/or areas on which the OIGs currently focus their resources, leading to reduced returns on investments.

- An example of the benefits of funding for the OIG includes the fact that since FY 2015 the USAID OIG has reported savings of over $11 million related to its work overseeing Counter-ISIL assistance alone, and has questioned more than $220 million in costs in FY 2016 globally which will lead to further improvements to programs and recovered taxpayer funds.
- If the State OIG is cut by 26 percent, it will be unable to pay payroll and program costs for its current workforce, including program costs necessary to meet the 5-year inspection mandate and providing oversight of Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding.

In addition, to the programs listed above, there are programs that are important to advancing U.S. foreign policy interests that garner less attention, including funding for visa processing and American citizen services overseas; the core operations of U.S. foreign assistance agencies including information management and cybersecurity; and a range of programs – from Internet freedom to energy development – that contribute to stability in areas where the U.S. has diplomatic, military, and economic interests. All of these will be severely affected by a 26 percent cut.

Such cuts would also erode the State Department's ability to protect U.S. personnel and property abroad, including the maintenance of diplomatic facilities that serve as U.S. outposts for a range of national security purposes abroad, including programs conducted by DOD, DOJ, DOE, USDA, CDC and others.

TRANSPORTATION, HUD

The Trump Administration is proposing a 13 percent reduction to the budgets of both the Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), resulting in a total reduction of $8.9 billion in domestic discretionary spending in FY 2018, as compared to the levels enacted for FY 2017. The Administration also proposes the elimination of 2 independent agencies, the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH) and NeighborWorks, which will result in additional cuts of $178.5 million. Specific cuts are listed below.

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA): The Administration is signaling its support for the FAA to move into a new independent, non-governmental organization. As part of that transition, the Administration recommends suspending investments in certain FAA activities until that new organization is established in order to allow for the new leadership to determine how future operations should be managed. Shifting FAA's operations to a privatized entity will result in large commercial airlines managing air traffic operations, compromising safety, oversight, and modernization. A privatized system will also lead to increased costs for the traveling public, and reduce rural access to our aviation system.

While specific details on the FAA's new organizational structure have not yet been provided, the Administration proposes a $141 million cut in funding for the FAA, including cuts to Facilities and Equipment by $115 million ($2.855 billion in FY 2017 to $2.740 billion in FY 2018), and Research and Development activities by $26 million ($176 million in FY 2017 to $150 million in FY 2018). The cuts to discretionary spending for the FAA will result in the degradation of FAA facilities and terminate important safety and efficiency research at the FAA's William J. Hughes Technical Center in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

Essential Air Service (EAS): EAS provides subsidized, regularly scheduled air service to 169 eligible communities across the country, including 59 communities in Alaska. Eliminating the discretionary funding for this program will reduce funding levels by 69 percent, from $254 million in FY 2017 to only $79 million in FY 2018. Without EAS service, over 90 communities in rural areas would lose access to air transportation.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA): The Trump Administration proposes to only fulfill FTA Capital Investment Grant (CIG) agreements that have already been signed and to force local governments to pay for new projects, eliminating Federal partnership for transit construction projects. Specifically, the Administration seeks to reduce funding for FTA's CIG program from $2.530 billion in FY 2017 to only $1.252 billion in FY 2018 – a cut of $1.278 billion, or 51 percent. This would mark the lowest appropriated level in more than a decade. At this lower funding level, 166,140 jobs would be lost, and projects in the pipeline in Texas, California, Maryland, Minnesota, Washington, Arizona, Indiana, Florida, Missouri, and New Mexico would be unable to proceed. This cut will affect 57 projects currently in the CIG pipeline, which communities are counting on in order to address the growing congestion on our nation's highways. In fact, from 2002 to 2012, delay times experienced by travelers worsened by nearly 20 percent. Congestion now wastes 6.7 billion hours and 3 billion gallons of fuel nationwide, at a cost of $154.2 billion per year – a new record. According to DOT, public transit saves 4 billion gallons of gasoline, prevents 37 million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions, and saves travelers 646 million hours of commute time per year.

Communities across the country are seeking to address population growth and congestion challenges through transit projects that are funded through the CIG program, a multi-year discretionary grant program. These projects, which are generated by local governments, have undergone a rigorous evaluation process, have consolidated significant local match funding and political support, and deserve funding. America cannot address the growing demands of transit systems and congestion around the country without funding the projects needed to meet that demand.

Federal Railroad Administration: The Administration is proposing to eliminate all Long Distance train operations, resulting in a cut of $630 million to Amtrak's National Network. This will result in the elimination of intercity passenger rail service to 219 communities that have few options for affordable intercity transportation. Long Distance trains are the only intercity trains operating in 23 of the 46 states that Amtrak currently serves. Since 1998, Long Distance ridership has grown by 20 percent without the introduction of new services, frequencies, or equipment.

Cutting Rental Assistance for Low-Income, Elderly, and Disabled Residents: The FY 2018 budget blueprint funds HUD's rental assistance programs at $35 billion to serve 4.5 million low-income households – resulting in a $5 billion cut and 500,000 fewer households served, as compared to FY 2017 levels. This critical source of funding provides rental assistance for low-income residents and ensures that administering agencies have the resources necessary to assist families, the elderly, and the disabled in securing and maintaining housing that is safe and affordable. Cuts to discretionary spending have already left fewer low-income Americans with access to affordable housing. For example, there are still roughly 16,000 Section 8 housing choice vouchers, which were lost through sequestration, and have not been restored. This means 16,000 eligible low-income individuals and families who anticipated assistance under the Section 8 program in 2013 were either turned away or deferred to a lengthy wait list, and have yet to access a housing voucher. Based on the latest assessment of worst-case housing needs, 7.7 million very low-income Americans already pay more than 50 percent of their income on rent, live in substandard housing, or both. As it stands, HUD is only able to serve one in four eligible low-income households. Funding rental assistance at this level would result in a combined loss of hundreds of thousands of affordable units for vulnerable individuals and families. Although the Administration's blueprint does not outline cuts to rental assistance programs in detail, we can assume that, of the $6.2 billion reduction to HUD's overall budget, rental assistance programs could be cut by $2.1 billion.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG): The Trump Administration's budget blueprint would eliminate funding for CDBG in FY 2018. This program empowers cities, counties, and States to invest in locally-driven projects that spur private investment and address economic development challenges. CDBG also creates jobs, makes essential infrastructure projects possible, and addresses unique housing needs that benefit elderly, disabled, and economically-vulnerable communities. Funded activities range from neighborhood to statewide planning, wastewater and sewer projects, flood control, development of community centers, libraries and fire stations, as well as rehabilitating homes for the elderly and disabled homeowners. If eliminated, conservative estimates show that more than 16,300 fewer jobs would be created or retained, 3.2 million fewer people would benefit from public improvement projects, 67,000 fewer low- to moderately-low income households would be assisted, and 7.9 million fewer people, including the disabled and victims of domestic violence, would benefit from critical public services in FY 2018, as compared to FY 2017. It is also estimated that for every $1 provided in CDBG, nearly $3.65 is leveraged through other public and private sources. This means that if CDBG were eliminated, nearly $11 billion of additional public and private resources for economic development projects across cities, counties, and States would be lost in FY 2018.

<u>HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program</u>: The Trump Administration's budget blueprint proposes to completely eliminate the sole federal resource for affordable housing production, a total cut of $950 million from FY 2017. The HOME program is the primary Federal funding source that allows States and local governments to create and sustain affordable housing for low-income individuals and families. Sequestration cuts in FY 2013 resulted in $948 million for the HOME program, a historic low. Programmatically, this level of funding would result in 41,500 fewer low-income households being served through the program, 16,000 fewer jobs being created or preserved, and a reduction of more than $3.95 billion in anticipated public and private investment in FY 2018, as compared to FY 2017.

<u>Choice Neighborhoods</u>: The Trump Administration's budget blueprint proposes to completely eliminate Choice Neighborhoods, a critical resource for community-led transformation and a key tool for state and local governments to redevelop severely-distressed HUD-assisted housing. This program builds upon the successes of HOPE VI, which facilitates partnerships among local agencies, organizations, and businesses in order to address local issues that span all types of housing, including crime, access to jobs, and good schools. As a result of the Administration's proposal, 29 states that have developed 60 neighborhood transformation plans – that were previously awarded more than $23 million in Choice Planning grants – will not be considered for Choice Implementation grants in FY 2018. Choice Neighborhoods is a critical means for leveraging public and private investment in high poverty neighborhoods.

<u>Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. (NeighborWorks)</u>: The Trump Administration proposes to eliminate all funding for NeighborWorks in FY 2018, a cut of $140 million from the FY 2017 enacted level. NeighborWorks promotes local, community-based solutions to development and affordable housing issues in urban, suburban, and rural areas in concert with more than 240 local and regional nonprofit organizations. In FY 2016, NeighborWorks organizations provided affordable housing assistance to 360,100 families, counseled and educated 115,000 customers seeking housing assistance, helped secure loans for 21,000 new homeowners, repaired 55,600 homes, and created and maintained more than 53,600 jobs. These results were made possible by effectively leveraging NeighborWorks' appropriation at a ratio of 91 to 1.

<u>U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness (USICH)</u>: The Trump Administration proposes to eliminate USICH, the only Federal agency tasked with preventing and ending homelessness. USICH was established under the Reagan Administration as part of the landmark McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act of 1987 and has since worked across the Federal government and private sector to coordinate homeless assistance nationally. In 2010, Congress directed

USICH to develop *Opening Doors*, the first strategic plan requiring cross-Federal coordination in an effort to prevent and end homelessness nationally and to identify cost-effective solutions that help communities meet their goals to reduce homelessness. As a result, veteran homelessness has been reduced by 47 percent, chronic homeless by 27 percent, and overall unsheltered homelessness by 25 percent. The FY 2017 Omnibus provided $43 million for new interventions targeting youth experiencing homelessness, building on the more than $40 million investments made in FY 2016. To identify cost-effective and responsive strategies to preventing and ending youth homelessness, the Council will lead the coordination between HUD and the Departments of Education and Health and Human Services in their implementation of their youth-specific activities.