

From: CEQ [<mailto:Outreach@ceq.eop.gov>]
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2013 5:10 PM
Subject: State Sequestration Impacts



Friends and Colleagues,

Yesterday, the White House released state-by-state reports detailing the devastating impact of sequestration on jobs and middle class families across the country. If Congressional Republicans fail to compromise to avert the sequester by March 1st, cuts will severely undermine our ability to ensure our air and water are clean, and our parks and public lands can stay open. Many of the 398 national parks across the country would be partially or fully closed, with shortened operating hours, closed facilities, reduced maintenance, and cuts to visitor services. These closures will hurt the many small businesses and regional economies that depend on nearby national parks to attract visitors to their region.

Agencies have sent [letters to congress providing some detail](#) on what cuts may look like, and how they plan to deal with them. The following are a few examples of what is on the chopping block:

At the **Environmental Protection Agency**, sequestration would force the shutdown of critical air monitoring sites that protect the public from harmful air pollution, and would significantly reduce the EPA's ability to monitor compliance with environmental laws, possibly resulting in 1,000 fewer inspections in FY 2013.

The **Department of Energy** is the largest supporter of physical sciences in the United States and sequestration would force curtailment in DOE-operated facilities, potentially impacting over 25,000 researchers and operations personnel, including a reduction in research grants to graduate and post-graduate students that could negatively impact our energy's sector global economic and technological competitiveness. In addition, cuts in DOE's Vehicle Technologies Program would significantly delay the Administration's goal of creating a modern, energy efficient fleet of cars for the 21st century.

At the **US Department of Agriculture**, sequestration could curtail conservation technical and financial assistance to about 11,000 producers and landowners, limiting benefits to water quality and quantity, soil erosion, and wildlife habitat that service the public. Assistance to states for pest and disease prevention, surveillance, and response also faces potential cuts, which could lead to more extensive outbreaks and economic losses to farmers and ranchers.

Below is a synopsis of support for clean air and clean water that is threatened in each state by sequestration. (Click on the states to see full fact-sheet):

STATE	Potential loss of environmental funding to ensure clean water and air quality, as well as prevent pollution from pesticides and hazardous waste	Funds that states could lose in grants for fish and wildlife protection
Alabama	\$2,000,000	\$1,000,000
Alaska	\$1,800,000	\$2,100,000
Arizona	\$2,100,000	\$1,100,000
Arkansas	\$1,600,000	\$842,000
California	\$12,400,000	\$1,900,000
Colorado	\$2,000,000	\$1,200,000
Connecticut	\$2,000,000	\$398,000
Delaware	\$1,100,000	\$359,000
District of Columbia	\$1,000,000	\$64,000
Florida	\$5,200,000	\$1,100,000
Georgia	\$3,500,000	\$979,000
Hawaii	\$1,300,000	\$359,000
Idaho	\$1,200,000	\$857,000
Illinois	\$6,400,000	\$974,000
Indiana	\$3,300,000	\$739,000
Iowa	\$2,400,000	\$661,000
Kansas	\$1,800,000	\$772,000
Kentucky	\$2,100,000	\$774,000
Louisiana	\$2,500,000	\$884,000
Maine	\$1,400,000	\$496,000
Maryland	\$3,100,000	\$467,000
Massachusetts	\$4,000,000	\$472,000
Michigan	\$5,900,000	\$1,500,000
Minnesota	\$3,000,000	\$1,600,000
Mississippi	\$1,758,000	\$606,000
Missouri	\$3,745,000	\$1,184,000
Montana	\$1,237,000	\$1,186,000
Nebraska	\$1,294,000	\$686,000
Nevada	\$1,156,000	\$764,000
New Hampshire	\$1,500,000	\$359,000
New Jersey	\$4,891,000	\$472,000
New Mexico	\$1,260,000	\$877,000
New York	\$12,869,000	\$1,201,000
North Carolina	\$3,606,000	\$1,265,000
North Dakota	\$1,244,000	\$624,000
Ohio	\$6,865,000	\$981,000

<u>Oklahoma</u>	\$1,655,000	\$998,000
<u>Oregon</u>	\$1,882,000	\$1,052,000
<u>Pennsylvania</u>	\$5,705,000	\$1,448,000
<u>Rhode Island</u>	\$1,253,000	\$359,000
<u>South Carolina</u>	\$1,763,000	\$646,000
<u>South Dakota</u>	\$1,150,000	\$735,000
<u>Tennessee</u>	\$2,211,000	\$1,216,000
<u>Texas</u>	\$8,467,000	\$2,235,000
<u>Utah</u>	\$1,289,000	\$847,000
<u>Vermont</u>	\$1,068,000	\$359,000
<u>Virginia</u>	\$2,997,000	\$826,000
<u>Washington</u>	\$3,301,000	\$924,000
<u>West Virginia</u>	\$2,013,000	\$488,000
<u>Wisconsin</u>	\$3,875,000	\$1,479,000
<u>Wyoming</u>	\$1,107,000	\$787,000

Sincerely,

Rohan Patel

Associate Director for Public Engagement

Kevin Samy

Special Assistant, Public Engagement

White House Council on Environmental Quality
Executive Office of the President

