



SUSEPA: GENERAL FACT SHEET

WHAT THE PROPOSED BUDGET MEANS FOR THE U.S.

- President Trump's budget fails working people by abandoning our nation's responsibility to care for its citizens.
- Trump wants to drastically cut or eliminate federal programs that ensure the public's health and safety, help our struggling neighbors secure better jobs and safe housing, and promote democracy around the world.
- In many cases, the Trump administration is simply sending the bill for these vital programs to cash-strapped state and local governments, or even to businesses themselves – who in turn would have to pass the costs onto taxpayers to keep these programs running.
- The severity of the budget cuts proposed by President Trump could require mass layoffs of employees at federal departments and agencies.

WHAT THE PROPOSED BUDGET MEANS FOR EPA

- The budget slashes EPA's funding by 31 percent, or \$2.6 billion, and would eliminate more than 20 percent of EPA's workforce, about 3,200 jobs.
- Much of EPA's work would be shifted to cash-strapped states and local governments.
- Funding for more than 50 programs would be eliminated, including programs restoring the health of the Great Lakes and the Chesapeake Bay and the popular Energy Star program that has helped save businesses and homeowners more than \$362 billion on their utility bills over the past 22 years.
- Budget would slash funding for cleaning up hazardous waste sites (Superfund sites) by 30 percent.
- The EPA's budget has shrunk substantially since 2009, with more than 20 percent of its budget slashed in recent years.
- Fifty-six republicans voted against a 17 percent cut of the EPA's budget in 2016.

ROLLING BACK REGULATIONS HURTS AMERICANS AND THE ECONOMY

- Environmental regulations have led to less than 1 percent of extended mass layoffs in the U.S. over the last few decades.
- The Office of Management and Budget found that from 2000-2010, the benefits of regulation outweighed the costs by a magnitude of seven.
- The EPA's Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 was found to have an economic cost of \$53 billion in 2010, but amounted to \$1.3 trillion value in benefits – 25 times the cost.
- The EPA's Clean Power Plan will result in \$155 billion in electricity savings between 2020-2030.
- Over 30 years – in industries facing EPA regulations – there were some net job increases, and “no significant job losses” due to regulations.
- During President Obama's eight years in office, at a time with numerous new EPA regulations, there was a 5 million net gain in private sector jobs created. During President George W. Bush's eight years, with far less regulations issued, there was only a net gain of around 300,000 private sector jobs.

HOW REGULATIONS HAVE HELPED AMERICANS

- In 2010, 86,000 ER visits were prevented because of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments. That figure is expected to increase to 120,000 in 2020.
- The Clean Power Plan is projected to prevent 90,000 childhood asthma attacks and stop around 3,600 premature deaths every year – and will not compromise economic growth.
- In 2010, 13 million lost work days and 3.2 million school loss days were prevented because of the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments. That figure is expected to increase to 17 million and 5.4 million respectively in 2020.
- In 2010, around 160,000 lives were saved by the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990, and by 2020, the Clean Air Act amendments will prevent more than 230,000 early deaths.

WHAT AMERICANS THINK ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT AND REGULATIONS

- A 2016 American Lung Association survey found that 66 percent of respondents want to see more strict air pollution standards – compared to only 26 percent who do not.
- According to Pew, a majority of Americans – 59 percent – believe that stricter environmental laws and regulations are “worth the cost.”
- A poll of small business owners found that 80 percent favored the EPA’s protection of upstream headwaters and wetlands – and 71 percent said clean water is “necessary for jobs and a healthy economy.”
- According to Gallup, 56 percent of Americans say “protection of the environment should be given priority,” compared to 37 percent that said “economic growth should be given priority.”
- Only 12 percent of surveyed Americans say the U.S. government is doing too much to protect the environment. Nearly five times that amount – 57 percent – say the government is doing “too little.”
- More than half of Americans – 56 percent – say the “quality of the environment in the country as a whole” is getting worse.