GREAT LAKES RESTORATION CROSSCUT

Report to Congress



Office of Management and Budget

December 2016

The Great Lakes Watershed



FY 2017 Great Lakes Restoration Crosscut

This report represents an accounting of Federal funding for Great Lakes restoration activities. This report is provided to Congress in response to Section 738 of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2014 (Division E of Public Law 113-76, the 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act.

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2017 Budget continues the Administration's commitment to Great Lakes environmental restoration by requesting \$731 million for high priority programs and projects in the Great Lakes watershed. This is a \$157 million decrease (-18%) from FY 2016 levels.

FY 2017 funding levels will allow for a robust Great Lakes program reflective of the region's environmental significance. Funding will support a number of critical restoration activities, including projects for aquatic invasive species including Asian carp, toxics and contaminated sediments, nonpoint source pollution, and habitat protection and restoration.

This crosscut presents information on Federal funding from FY 2012 through the FY 2017 Budget for Great Lakes restoration work in the following formats:

- Total Federal funding by agency, including national and Great Lakes programs and projects;
- Agency funding for national programs;
- Agency funding for Great Lakes Programs; and
- Agency funding for Great Lakes projects

It is important to note that for national programs, in many instances the numbers shown for FY 2017, and in some cases FY 2016, are extrapolated either from past funding provided to the region, or by using a percentage of land in the Great Lakes basin relative to the rest of the State. The funding ultimately provided to the Great Lakes basin through national programs may differ from these estimates.

A few other funding notes are necessary. All Federal agency dollars are reported in millions; programs and projects that have not received at least \$500,000 in funding over the period of FY 2012 to FY 2017 are excluded, and rounding errors may occur. FY 2013 totals represent funding levels after sequestration. Finally, FY 2017 allocations shown for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative are provisional and final allocations may differ.

Table 1--Federal Agency Totals

(Budget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budget
Great Lakes Restoration Initiative	300	284	300	300	300	250
Department of Agriculture	177	225	195	179	182	170
Department of the Army	84	114	114	157	89	46
Department of Commerce	40	38	38	40	40	39
Department of Homeland Security	2	1	2	1	0	0
Department of the Interior	70	63	64	67	71	71
Department of State	26	21	26	27	27	22
Department of Transportation ¹	4	4	4	4	0	0
Environmental Protection Agency	220	202	217	211	179	133
Total, All Agencies	923	952	960	986	888	731

In all tables, funding amounts are rounded to the nearest million. Rounding errors may result.

All tables exclude programs and projects that have received or requested less than \$500,000 across FYs 2012-2017.

¹ While DOT does not make any direct programmatic funding contributions to Great Lakes Restoration, States use DOT funds for a variety of environmental mitigation activities that undoubtedly contribute to restoration efforts. DOT funding amounts are estimates and are not based on reported data.

Table 2--Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, Agency Allocations

get authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	2017 Budget
www. of to be an after light	524990108 S	WEDLE.	1477900-	1120 mil		
Department of Agriculture	35	27	32	31	31	27
[Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service]	1	1	1	1	1	1
[Natural Resources Conservation Service]	27	24	21	23	19	19
[U.S. Forest Service]	7	6	6	6	10	7
Department of the Army	36	32	29	49	29	10
[Army Corps of Engineers]	36	29	32	49	29	10
Department of Commerce	16	26	35	25	16	6
[National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration]	16	35	26	25	16	6
Department of Health and Human Services	2	1	2	2	2	1
[Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease				E.		
Registry and Center for Disease Control]	2	1	2	2	2	1
Department of Homeland Security	3	2	1	2	2	1
[Coast Guard]	3	1	2	2	2	1
Department of the Interior	67	60	76	73	73	45
[Bureau of Indian Affairs]	5	4	4	5	6	4
[Fish and Wildlife Service]	46	49	40	41	44	27
[U.S. Geological Survey]	13	13	20	22	20	10
[National Park Service]	4	3	3	3	4	3
Department of State	3	3	3	3	3	3
[Great Lakes Fisheries Commission]	3	3	3	3	3	3
[International Joint Commission]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Department of Transportation	4	3	3	1	2	1
[Federal Highway Administration]	1	1	1	0	0	0
[Maritime Administration]	3	2	2	1	2	1
Environmental Protection Agency	134	129	119	115	142	104
Multiple Agencies ¹						53
AOCs						30
Asian Carp				20		13
Nutrient/Sediment Reduction						1
Habitat						4
Foundations for Future Restoration						6
Total, All Agencies	300	284	300	300	301	250

5

¹ Agency GLRI funding identified as "Multiple Agencies" is included in agency totals through FY 2016. Agency GLRI allocations for Asian Carp and a portion of the funding for AOC, Nutrient/Sediment Reduction, Habitat, and Foundations for Future Restoration activities have not yet been determined for FY 2017. ² FY 2015 and FY 2016 Enacted Agency totals may differ from the Initial Agency Allocations included in the FY 2017 Congressional Justification due to modified agency allocations made in April 2016.

Table 3--Department of Agriculture, National Programs

udget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Actual	FY 2013 Actual	FY 2014 Actual	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budget
Natural Resources Conservation Service						
Conservation Operations	20	24	16	16	16	16
Conservation Reserve Program	0	0	0	0	0	3
Conservation Security Program	10	9	6	2	1	0
Conservation Stewardship Program	15	25	23	30	32	24
Environmental Quality Incentives Program	40	46	39	38	38	41
Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program ¹	7	7	0	0	0	0
Grasslands Reserve Program ¹	1	0	0	0	0	0
Wetlands Reserve Program ¹	12	12	0	0	0	0
Wildlife Habitats Incentive Program ^{1,2}	0	1	0	0	0	0
Agricultural Conservation Easement Program	0	0	15	18	21	14
Total, NRCS	105	124	99	103	107	98
Total, FSA Rural Development Water/Wastewater Loans and Grants ^a	49 12	51 39	47 40	46 20	45 20	45 20
Total, RD Forest Service	12	39	40	20	20	20
Capital Improvement and Maintenance	5	4	4	4	4	4
Forest Legacy	1	1	0	1	1	0
Forest Stewardship	2	2	1	1	1	1
Knutson-Vandenberg Fund	1	1	1	1	1	1
Land and Water Conservation Fund	1	2	2	2	2	0
National Forest System	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total, FS	11	11	9	10	10	7
Total, USDA	177	225	195	179	182	170

¹ These programs were eliminated or consolidated into other programs.

 ² FY 2014 includes approximately \$40,000 as an initial program allocation for technical assistance dollars to work on prior year contracts. Repealed program utilized the Transitional Provision from the Farm Bill - that allows prior work with prior (Farm Bill - 2008) funding.
³ FY 2014 and FY 2015 are estimates based on previous years' data. Actual funding is based on applications received.

Table 4--Department of the Army, National Programs

(Budget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budget
Army Corps of Engineers						
Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration ¹	0	1	1	2	0	1
Beneficial Use of Dredged Material ¹	1	1	1	0	0	1
Dredged Material Disposal Facilities	0	7	2	6	0	0
Environmental Infrastructure	3	0	5	12	12	0
Estuary Protection Program	0	0	0	0	0	0
Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program ²	21	16	14	22	12	10
Restoration of Environmental Quality ¹	0	0	0	0	0	1
Wetlands Permitting ³	12	12	12	12	12	12
Total, Department of the Army	38	37	36	55	36	25

¹ FY 2016 Enacted represents the final work plan. FY 2017 Budget amount represents nationwide total. Portion for Great Lakes is unknown. ² Funds reflect those allocated to programs in Great Lakes that may include other areas.

³ Estimate of expenditures for regulatory activities within Great Lakes watershed (involves all or part of five district offices)

Table 5--Department of the Army, Great Lakes Programs

Budget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budget
Army Corps of Engineers						
Great Lakes Fishery and Ecosystem Restoration	2	5	0	0	0	0
Great Lakes Tributary Model	1	1	1	1	1	1
Surveillance of Northern Boundary Waters	5	5	5	5	6	6
Total, Department of the Army	9	11	6	6	6	6

Table 6--Department of the Army, Great Lakes Projects

Budget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budget
Army Corps of Engineers						
Chicago Sanitary & Ship Canal Dispersal Barriers	22	24	36	50	30	12
Indiana Shoreline Erosion	0	0	1	0	2	0
Interbasin Control Great Lakes, Mississippi River, Aquatic Nusiance Species	3	5	3	1	1	3
McCook and Thornton Reservoirs	12	36	31	46	14	0
Presque Isle Peninsula	0	1	2	0	0	0
Total, Department of the Army	37	66	72	96	47	15

Table 7--Department of the Army, Great Lakes Projects-- Detail

(Budget authority in millions)	FY 2017 Budget	Description	Status	Authorized Funding Level (\$M)
Army Corps of Engineers				
Chicago Sanitary & Ship Canal Dispersal Barriers	12	System of electric barriers to deter movement of aquatic nuisance fish species between the Illinois River and Lake Michigan.	Three barriers are constructed and operational - Barrier I (which initially was a Demonstration Barrier), Barrier IIA and Barrier IIB. A permanent upgrade of Barrier I, authorized by WRDA 2007, is currently under construction. The permanent upgrade of Barrier I was funded to completion in FY 2016, and scheduled to complete sometime during FY 2017. The \$12 million provided for in the FY 2017 budget will be used to operate and maintain the existing barriers while the permanent upgrade of Barrier I is completed.	no limit
Interbasin Control Great Lakes, Mississippi River, Aquatic Nuisance Species	3	Comprehensive study on a wide range of alternatives for preventing the migration of aqautic nuisance species between the Mississippi River and Great Lakes watersheds.	Feasibility study underway to evaluate potential ANS controls at the Brandon Road Lock and Dam.	no limit

Total, Department of the Army

15

Table 8--Department of Commerce, National Programs

(Budget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budget
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	n					
Aquatic Invasive Species Program (AISP)	1	0	0	0	0	0
Coastal Zone Management Grants	15	14	15	15	14	14
National Center for Coastal Ocean Science External Competitive Research ¹	1	1	1	1	0	0
Coastal Science, Assessment, Response and Restoration	0	0	0	0	1	1
National Estuarine Research Reserves	1	1	1	1	1	1
Marine and Aviation Ops charter vessel for Algal Bloom projects	1	1	0	0	0	0
Sea Grant	10	10	10	12	12	12
National Marine Sanctuaries	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total, Department of Commerce	30	28	28	30	30	29

¹ Funding is an estimate based on historical trends. Actual funding amounts will be determined based on final appropriations as well as the number and quality of proposals received by NOAA.

Table 9--Department of Commerce, Great Lakes Programs

(Budget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budget
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administ	ration					
Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory	10	10	10	10	11	11
Great Lakes Habitat Restoration ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total, Department of Commerce	10	10	10	10	11	11

¹ FY 2017 funding is an estimate based on historical trends. Actual funding amounts will be determined based on final appropriations as well as the number and quality of proposals received by NOAA.

Table 10--Department of Homeland Security, National Programs

Budget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budget
Coast Guard						
Marine Environmental ProtectionBallast Water/Invasive Species	1	0	0	0	0	0
Environmental, Compliance and Restoration Toxics and Contaminated Sediments	1	1	2	1	0	0
- Total, Department of Homeland Security	2	1	2	1	0	0

Table 11--Department of the Interior, National Programs

udget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budge
U.S. Geological Survey ¹						
Ecosystems/Status and Trends Program	4	3	3	3	3	3
Ecosystems/Fisheries Program	4	4	4	4	4	4
Ecosystems/Environments Program	1	1	1	1	1	1
Ecosystems/Invasive Species Program (Asian Carp)	3	3	3	5	5	5
Natural Hazards/Coastal and Marine Geology	1	1	0	0	0	0
Ground Water Resources Program	0	0	0	0	n/a	n/a
National Water Quality Assessment Program	3	2	1	3	n/a	n/a
National Streamflow Information Program	1	1	1	1	n/a	n/a
Cooperative Water Program	3	3	3	3	n/a	n/a
Water Availability and Use Science Program	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1	1
Groundwater and Streamflow Information Program	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2	2
National Water Quality Program	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3	3
Total, USGS	18	18	16	19	19	19
Fish and Wildlife Service						
Clean Vessel Grant Program	1	1	1	1	1	1
Coastal Wetlands Grant Program	3	0	2	2	2	-2
Ecological Services	3	10	10	10	10	10
Fire Management/Roads	2	2	2	2	2	2
Fish and Wildlife Management	4	4	4	4	4	4
Fish Hatcheries	4	4	4	4	4	4
Aquatic Invasive Species (Asian Carp) Habitat Conservation (FY 2013 through FY 2015 in	2	3	3	3	5	5
Ecol. Serv.)	8	0	0	0	0	0
Law Enforcement	2	2	2	2	2	2
National Wildlife Refuge System	13	11	11	11	12	12
Total, USFWS	42	36	38	38	42	42
National Park Service						
Competitive Park Projects (Water Management Plans)	0	0	1	0	0	0
Operating Program	7	7	7	7	8	8
Total, NPS	7	7	8	7	8	8
			62	65	69	69

12

Table 12--Department of the Interior, Great Lakes Programs

(Budget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budget
Fish and Wildlife Service						
Great Lakes Consent Decree	1	1	1	1	1	1
Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration	1	0	0	0	0	0
Total, Department of the Interior	2	1	1	1	1	1

Table 13--Department of State, Great Lakes Programs

(Budget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budget
Great Lakes Fishery Commission	24	19	24	25	24.6	20
International Joint Commission	2	2	2	2	2	2
Total, Department of State	26	21	26	27	27	22

Table 14Department of Transportation,	, National Progra	ms		1		61
(Budget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budget
Department of Transportation ¹	4	4	4	4	0	0
Total, Department of Transportation	4	4	4	4	0	0

¹ While DOT does not make any direct programmatic funding contributions to Great Lakes Restoration, States use DOT funds for a variety of environmental mitigation activities that have undoubtedly contributed to restoration efforts. DOT funding amounts for FY 2012- FY 2015 are estimates and are not based on reported data. FY 2016 and FY 2017 estimates have been reduced to \$0 to show that DOT has not received, awarded or obligated funding to directly restore the Great Lakes Watershed. However, States continue to use DOT funds that may indirectly contribute to restoration efforts.

Table 15--Environmental Protection Agency, National Programs

udget authority in millions)	FY 2012 Enacted	FY 2013 Enacted	FY 2014 Enacted	FY 2015 Enacted	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Budget
Clean Water State Revolving Fund ¹	169	157	164	164	157	110
Section 105 Clean Air Grants ¹	1	1	1	1	1	1
Section 106 Clean Water Grants ¹	17	17	16	16	16	17
Section 319 Nonpoint Source Grants ¹	4	3	3	5	3	3
Superfund Remedial ^{2, 3}	27	23	31	24	TBD	TBD
Wetlands State Grants ¹	2	2	2	1	2	2
Total, Environmental Protection Agency	220	202	217	211	179	133

¹ FY 2015 and FY 2016 represent estimates based on previous allocations. Final amounts may differ.

² FY 2013 through FY 2014 numbers have been updated to reflect actual obligations. Obligation data do not signify investment or disinvestment trends in cleanups in the Great Lakes Watershed, but rather annual resource use at individual sites as they move through the Superfund cleanup process.

³ FY 2015 and FY 2016 data are not provided as they are enforcement confidential and do not reflect "approved" plans.