

House Appropriations Committee
Budget Hearing- Fiscal Year 2027 Interior and Environment
April 27, 2026

Witnesses:

- [Mr. Lee Zeldin](#), Administrator – Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- [Ms. Page Hallen Hanson](#), Chief Financial Officer and Chief Administrative Officer - EPA

Highlights:

The hearing examined President Trump’s FY27 budget request for the [Environmental Protection Agency](#), which proposes a roughly 50% reduction in EPA funding and major structural changes to programs supporting states, Tribes, water infrastructure, enforcement, research, and pesticide regulation. While EPA highlighted discrete investments and enforcement actions benefiting Tribes and farmers, many Members argued these do not compensate for deep, systemic funding reductions.

Key Points:

- Major Proposed Cuts to Tribal Programs
 - The FY27 proposal includes an approximately **83% reduction** in [State and Tribal Assistance Grants](#) (STAG), including funding that supports Tribal water infrastructure, environmental program capacity, and treaty-related responsibilities.
 - Multiple representatives stressed that Tribes face higher-than-average exposure to water and air pollution, making EPA funding especially critical in Indian Country
- Water Infrastructure and Tribal Communities
 - Administrator Zeldin stated that EPA recently announced \$90 million in FY26 funding for small, rural, and Tribal water systems, emphasizing continued support despite the FY27 proposal.
 - Members countered that one-time or prior-year funding does not offset long-term structural cuts to Tribal assistance and revolving loan programs.
- Tribal Consultation and Treaty Obligations
 - Members of the committee raised concerns about whether EPA adequately consulted Tribes on reorganizations, budget cuts, and regulatory changes affecting treaty-protected resources, such as fisheries and culturally significant foods (e.g., wild rice/manoomin).
 - EPA committed to providing the committee with documentation of Tribal consultation efforts and referenced reissuing EPA’s Tribal policy, though specifics were requested in follow-up.
- Pesticides and Farm Impacts
 - EPA’s handling of glyphosate and involvement in legal arguments that could preempt state pesticide labeling and use restrictions. Concerns were raised that

reduced funding and staffing could slow pesticide reviews or weaken protections for farmworkers, consumers, and rural communities.

- Administrator Zeldin conveyed the EPA's efforts to reduce a large pesticide review backlog, as well as the launch of a proposed \$30 million prize challenge aimed at developing alternatives to pre-harvest desiccation, framed as supporting farmers while reducing pesticide reliance.
 - EPA highlighted enforcement actions blocking over 1.6 million pounds of illegal pesticide imports, often entering rural agricultural markets without safety oversight, which was framed as protecting farmers and consumers.
- Regulatory Uncertainties
 - Members emphasized concerns about regulatory uncertainty, particularly regarding the [Waters of the United States](#) (WOTUS), pesticide approvals, and chemical reviews.
 - EPA argued the FY27 budget and deregulatory initiatives would provide greater predictability and lower compliance costs for farmers and agribusinesses.