

**To:** Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Harvey, Reid[Harvey.Reid@epa.gov]; Kocchi, Suzanne[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov]; Koerber, Mike[Koerber.Mike@epa.gov]; Krieger, Jackie[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov]  
**From:** Dunham, Sarah  
**Sent:** Tue 6/6/2017 8:49:19 PM  
**Subject:** RE: biomass paper

Thanks—this looks great.

**From:** Gunning, Paul  
**Sent:** Monday, June 05, 2017 1:05 PM  
**To:** Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Harvey, Reid <Harvey.Reid@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>; Koerber, Mike <Koerber.Mike@epa.gov>; Krieger, Jackie <Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: biomass paper

Sarah – thanks for the feedback. We have added a couple of bullets to address these issues. I have attached a clean and a “highlighted additions” version. Please let us know if you have any questions or need anything else.

Thanks

Paul

**From:** Dunham, Sarah  
**Sent:** Friday, June 02, 2017 4:31 PM  
**To:** Harvey, Reid <Harvey.Reid@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Gunning, Paul <Gunning.Paul@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: biomass paper

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

# Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

**From:** Harvey, Reid  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 01, 2017 5:43 PM  
**To:** Dunham, Sarah <[Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov](mailto:Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Gunning, Paul <[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov](mailto:Gunning.Paul@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** biomass paper

Here's the biomass piece for your review, reflecting input from OAQPS, OAP, and OGC. Paul **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy** can follow up with you if you have revisions or questions.

Thanks,

Reid

**To:** Harvey, Reid[Harvey.Reid@epa.gov]; Kocchi, Suzanne[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]  
**From:** Dunham, Sarah  
**Sent:** Fri 6/2/2017 8:31:23 PM  
**Subject:** RE: biomass paper

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

**From:** Harvey, Reid  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 01, 2017 5:43 PM  
**To:** Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Gunning, Paul <Gunning.Paul@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** biomass paper

Here's the biomass piece for your review, reflecting input from OAQPS, OAP, and OGC. Paul **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy** and can follow up with you if you have revisions or questions.

Thanks,

Reid



**To:** IPAD mini Serial number **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy**  
**From:** Dunham, Sarah  
**Sent:** Tue 11/8/2016 10:16:50 AM  
**Subject:** Fwd: Final MR package sent to OMB  
[EO12866 CPP Model Trading Rules 2060 A47 Final Rule 20161103.docx](#)  
[ATT00001.htm](#)

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Harvey, Reid" <[Harvey.Reid@epa.gov](mailto:Harvey.Reid@epa.gov)>  
**Date:** November 4, 2016 at 9:20:49 AM EDT  
**To:** "Dunham, Sarah" <[Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov](mailto:Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov)>, "Krieger, Jackie" <[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov](mailto:Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov)>, "VonDemHagen, Rebecca" <[VonDemHagen.Rebecca@epa.gov](mailto:VonDemHagen.Rebecca@epa.gov)>, "Gunning, Paul" <[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov](mailto:Gunning.Paul@epa.gov)>, "Snyder, Carolyn" <[Snyder.Carolyn@epa.gov](mailto:Snyder.Carolyn@epa.gov)>, "Moss, Jacob" <[Moss.Jacob@epa.gov](mailto:Moss.Jacob@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Final MR package sent to OMB

This is the material that was uploaded to OMB yesterday.

House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies Holds Hearing on the EPA Fiscal 2018 Budget

CQ Congressional Transcripts

©2017, Provided under license from Bloomberg Government.

Bloomberg Government  
Support: 1-877-498-3587  
www.bgov.com

All materials herein are protected by United States copyright law and/or license from Bloomberg Government, and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, published or broadcast without the prior written permission of Bloomberg Government. You may not alter or remove any trademark, copyright or other notice from copies of the content.

LIST OF PANEL MEMBERS AND WITNESSES

CALVERT:

The committee will come to order. Good morning.

Today, we continue to keep all those affected by yesterday's events, including our colleague, Steve Scalise, in our thoughts and prayers. We applaud the Capitol Police for their continued efforts to be the first line of defense to serve and protect all members, public servants and visitors here to the Hill. We have a few of them here today with us, thank you for all the work that you do. We thank you.

Now, turning our attention to the hearing, we are joined by the 14th administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Scott Pruitt. On behalf of our members, congratulations on your confirmation. You have joined a distinguished group. We look forward to hearing your vision and working with you to provide the resources necessary to manage an important agency. We are also joined by Holly Greaves, senior advisor to the administrator. I believe this is your first time testifying before the subcommittee as well. Welcome to both of you.

Before we dive into the specifics, Administrator Pruitt, you have a tough job here today. Overall, the president's fiscal year 2018 budget proposes to shift \$54 billion from non-defense spending to the defense-side of the ledger. Those are tough top-lines to meet and many tough choices were necessary in order to meet those targets.

Earlier this morning, I, along with Chairman Frelinghuysen, Ranking Member Lowey, Ms. McCollum and other members of this subcommittee discussed the defense budget at a hearing with Secretary Mattis. That conversation further underscored the need for additional funding to support our troops and overall U.S. readiness. I certainly wholeheartedly support that goal. However, enacting \$54 billion in non-defense program cuts in one fiscal year is an untenable proposition.

The proposed cuts of this magnitude put agencies and important tasks at risk. I suspect that may be a common critique that you probably hear from other Cabinet officials and may hear from Congress throughout the budget process. And that's why it is necessary I hope that at some point, that the administration, the Senate and the House come together and come up with a budget agreement before we can have a common goal that we can work with. Nevertheless, we appreciate your being here today to defend the budget that proposes to reduce the agency's funding by \$2.4 billion.

In many instances the budget proposes to significantly reduce, or terminate, programs that are vitally important to each member on this subcommittee. For example, the Diesel Emission Reduction grants, or DERA, are essential to improving air quality in my home state of California. So too are the targeted airshed grants. But the budget fails to support the targeted airshed grants. And the DERA grants are proposed to receive an 83 percent reduction.

The Superfund Program, while considered an infrastructure priority for the president, is reduced by 31 percent. This reduction will most certainly impact new cleanups and slow ongoing cleanups. These are all proposals that we are unlikely to entertain. Further, the budget proposes to significantly reduce other important state grants, while asking states to continue to serve as the principle leads to implement

delegated environmental programs. Finally, most geographic programs are proposed for termination. This is perhaps not how you personally would craft EPA's budget, but it is the budget you have to defend here today.

I am pleased the budget supports a healthy investment in water infrastructure, a priority of this subcommittee. The budget maintains funding for the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds at current levels, and continues to fund the new WIFIA program. These are both programs that create construction jobs in every state and every congressional district. As you know, I strongly support the WIFIA program given the ability to leverage additional sources of funding. It could be a game-changer to stem the growing backlog of needs for improved water quality, and a nice complement to the SRFs.

Turning to policy, we all want clean air and clean water and a strong robust economy. My constituents in California demand both, a healthy environment and job creation. It's not an either/or proposition. In Southern California, we have made tremendous improvements in our air quality over the past number of decades. It's important that we continue to look for ways to clean our air. I supported EPA's decision last week to re-calibrate the implementation of the 2015 ozone standards, so that we can ensure our clean air efforts are carried out in an effective manner. I remain as committed as ever to providing resources to support proven programs that actually reduce particulate matter and ozone and in doing so, improve health outcomes in impacted areas.

At last year's EPA budget hearing, the subcommittee raised concerns that statutory obligations were given insufficient attention, while new regulations were prioritized. I think it's fair to say that you bring a refreshing new perspective to the position. We look forward to hearing that perspective today. It's my hope that moving forward, we can work together in coordination with our state, local, and tribal partners to find sound solutions to tackle the challenges before us. I know all members are eager to discuss various issues with you, so I will save additional remarks for the period following your testimony.

I am pleased now to yield to my friend, and our distinguished ranking member, Ms. McCollum.

MCCOLLUM:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And good morning, Administrator Pruitt.

The Environmental Protection Agency is responsible for protecting human health, the environment, ensuring clean air and clean water for families and children. The budget you have come with before us today to support would endanger the health of millions of Americans, jeopardize the quality of our air and water and wreak havoc on our economy.

The Trump administration's fiscal year 2018 budget abandons EPA's responsibilities to the American people by proposing a \$2.4 billion cut, a 30 percent cut. The last time the EP appropriations was this low was 1990. The administration has set the agency back 30 years, ignoring the complex environmental challenges we face today. Mr. Trump campaigned last year on an agenda that included allowing companies to pollute our air, our water, and our land. He embraced climate deniers, ridiculed science and promised to surrender America's global leadership on climate change.

Now, Mr. Trump is President Trump. And he is putting his anti- environment agenda into action. Executive orders have directed the government to ignore significant costs of pollution and climate change to our economy. Republican passed legislation that have been signed into law that stops a EPA rule, to keep coal mining waste out of our water. And that waste is toxic. The most recent and most reckless action in my opinion, was the withdraw from the Paris Climate Agreement, which has made the United States a rogue environmental nation, when it comes to working on the planet's climate challenge.

This budget is the latest expression in the administration's willful denies of climate science. The EPA's website, and I quote from it, says "The earth is currently getting warmer because people are adding heat trapping greenhouse gases to the atmosphere." That's the end of the quote. Yet, this budget ignores that science and cuts funding for climate change programs, 91 percent. This budget cut also includes cuts so deep that 47 programs are eliminated, many are widely supported and relied upon by industry. One example is Energy Star, which has saved customers an estimated \$430 billion on their utility bills since 1992. Realtors, manufacturers, builders, retailers, they all want the EPA to continue this program.

The budget also promotes eliminating enormously successful geographic programs as the Chair

mentioned like the Great Lakes, Puget Sound, Chesapeake Bay, which are economic generators for local communities. For every \$1 invested in Great Lakes restoration, there is \$2 return and benefits. These programs give the American taxpayer a great deal in return, and they also protect their resources while creating jobs and promoting growth.

The Trump administration has shown its contempt for science, both through this budget and to policy decisions. The budget proposes to cut the EPA's Office of Research and Development by \$237 million or 46 percent. This office provides the foundation for credible science to safeguard human health from environmental pollutions.

Administrator Pruitt, under your leadership, the EPA dismissed worked done by scientists in the Office of Research and Development, when you canceled the ban on harmful pesticides. I have a letter from the American Academy of Pediatrics, which they asked the EPA to protect vulnerable children and pregnant women from the exposure to this pesticide, because this pesticide damages children's brains. Yet the evidence was disregarded, evidence from doctors and scientists. Now, this budget was stifled the very office that provides a scientific analysis within the EPA.

The budget also cut state agencies funding, proposing that the grants be cut 44 percent, that's \$469 million. These cuts will cripple states' ability to implement core environmental programs that protect public health. But I would be remiss if I did not call attention to the agency's workforce. This budget proposes to cut nearly 3,800 employees. These are front-line scientists, experts and enforcement officers who protect the American people from toxins, carcinogens, radioactive waste, lead in water, and other dangerous chemicals.

We tend to forget that we owe them a debt of gratitude every time we turn on the tap water in which we drink from. It is safe. And as we know, Mr. Chairman, President Trump can propose this destructive budget and Administrator Pruitt can come here and defend or promote it, but it is Congress and this committee who will determine the EPA's funding.

On May 5th, President Trump signed into law fiscal year 2017, Omnibus Appropriation Bills, 178 Democrats and 131 Republicans voted together to fund the EPA at a level which sustains the agency, supports the skilled federal workforce, and protects public health.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for working with Democrats to achieve that very positive outcome for our nation. And as we move forward, I know we will once again rely on each other to have a positive working relationship. And I know I can count on you. However, I want to be clear, I will not support an interior environment appropriations committee that funds EPA below the 2017 current level.

And let me close with this example of why I feel so passionately about it. Radon is responsible for about 21,000 lung cancer deaths every year. Radon is the number one cause of lung cancer among non-smokers. Mr. Pruitt, this budget proposes to eliminate funding for the EPA's radon program which educates Americans and save lives. And this committee, both Democrats and Republicans, has always worked together to support radon. So, as a member of Congress, I believe we cannot allow the harm be done to American people that this budget would inflict.

And I thank the Chairman for the time. And I yield back.

CALVERT:

I thank the gentlelady. Mr. Pruitt is going to be here shortly. But in the meantime, I want to recognize Ms. Lowey. Thank you.

LOWEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member McCollum for holding this hearing. And welcome, Administrator Pruitt. I have been eagerly awaiting your testimony before this subcommittee. I'll get straight to it.

The fiscal year 2018 budget request for EPA is a disaster. You requested \$5.655 billion, a staggering \$2.4 billion below the fiscal year 2017 enacted level, a cut of more than 30 percent. While you claim most of these cuts will be part of a substantial reduction in workforce, which surely impact EPA's ability to fulfill its



critical mission of protecting the air we breathe and the water we drink. Between your disturbingly close ties to the oil and gas industries, your past work to directly undermine the EPA and skepticism that human activity plays a role in climate change, I suppose it's surprising you didn't propose to eliminate the agency altogether.

Let's be clear, members of Congress from both sides of the aisle, scientists, business leaders, and the vast majority of Americans agree man-made climate change is real and it poses a threat to our planet that must be confronted quickly and seriously. Here are the facts. Facts, carbon emissions are creating holes in our ozone layer and contributing to changing and often dangerous weather patterns around the world. Climate change has manifested as catastrophic events that threaten our national security and the livelihoods of American families.

Yet this administration is burying its head in the sand and according to a new poll conducted by Washington Post ABC News, 59 percent oppose President Trump's decision to withdraw from the Paris Agreement, which has insured a unified global response to combat rising carbon dioxide levels in our atmosphere. A substantial 55 percent of people surveyed feel that this decision has hurt U.S. leadership in the world.

Your budget request further demonstrates a willful ignorance to the pressing threat that climate change poses. Among the most egregious reductions and eliminations are a reduction of over 300 million for the hazardous substance superfund, the elimination of over a dozen regional programs including the Long Island Sound geographic program and a nearly 50 percent reduction in scientific research and development.

We have a moral responsibility to safeguard our planet and ensure that our children and grandchildren have a healthy future. This budget would fall short of this obligation. I do hope that Congress will reject in a bipartisan way, this dangerous budget and instead, adopt spending bills that would invest in combating climate change, keeping our air and our water clean and creating jobs -- creating jobs for the 21st century economy, especially green jobs of the future.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CALVERT:

OK. Mr. Pruitt -- Administrator Pruitt, thanks for being here today and please -- you're recognized for your opening remarks.

PRUITT:

Well, good morning, Chairman Calvert, Ranking Member McCollum, members of the subcommittee. It's good to be here with you this morning. And I thank you for the opportunity to discuss the EPA's proposed budget.

Joining me at the table, as you indicated, Mr. Chairman, Holly Greaves. She serves as a senior advisor to me on budget and audit. I do want to join you, Mr. Chairman, in expressing my prayers for your colleagues with respect to what occurred yesterday. I pray for the recovery and the protection (inaudible) and I just want to share that with you and members of the committee.

CALVERT:

Thank you.

PRUITT:

With the budget being the focus of our discussion today, I thought it would be important to note the very important work we're doing at the agency to bring it back to its core mission. Specifically as part of our back to the basic agenda, we are focused on air attainment and improving air quality, clean water and fixing our outdated infrastructure, cleaning up contaminated land through Superfund and Brownfield programs, and carrying out the very important updates that this Congress passed last year, the TOSCA statute, getting rid of the chemical backlog that existed with which you're very familiar.

More generally, when I began the agency, I have set three core principles by which we were going to operate and make decisions. The first is the focus on the rule of law. We are reversing an attitude and an approach that one can simply re-imagine authority under statutes passed by this body. I firmly believe that federal agencies exist to administer laws as passed by Congress. It is Congress that has constitutional authority to pass statutes and give agencies the direction on the environmental objectives that we seek to achieve as a nation. Any action by the EPA that exceeds that authority, grant to it by Congress, by definition, cannot be consistent with the agency's mission.

Along with respect for the rule of law, we are focused on process. Over the last several years, the agencies engage in rule-making to consent decrees, practices, guidance documents, regulations and litigation is something that we will not continue at the EPA. We will make sure the process is respected and implemented, so that people across the country can have voice, due process, as we adopt regulations and impact the environment in a very positive way.

And finally, we're emphasizing the importance of cooperative federalism, respecting the rule of the states. As you know very, very well, the one-size-fits-all strategy to achieve environmental outcomes doesn't work. What may work in Arizona may not work in Tennessee. And I recognize that the states have unique environmental challenges and needs. And I will continue to engage in meaningful discussions with you about how shared environmental goals related to these outcomes can be achieved.

With respect to the budget and these principles and priorities that I've outlined, I believe that we can fulfill the mission of our agency with a trimmed budget, with proper leadership and management. We will work with Congress, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member McCollum, to help focus on national priorities with respect to the resources that you provide. And we will continue to focus on our core missions and our responsibilities, working cooperative with the states to improve air, water, and land.

As I've indicated, clean air goes to the heart of human health. And we are focused on increasing it to compliance and assistance and enforcement. We have made tremendous progress as a country, through significant investment, regulations, and industry, and citizens across this country working together. In fact, since 1980, total emissions of the six criteria pollutants that we regulate under the program had been a drop by almost 65 percent. In ozone levels, as you know, have dropped 33 percent. We should celebrate this progress, but we should also recognize that there's work to do.

Presently, in this country, about 40 percent of our citizens live in nonattainment with respect to ozone, roughly 120 million people. So we do have much work to do. And it should be the focus of the EPA to find ways to help increase the number of people living and working in areas that meet those air quality standards. The president has made it clear that maintaining infrastructure is critical to this country.

At EPA, that means ensuring to make investments in drinking water and wastewater infrastructure. We will continue to partner with the states to address sources of drinking water contamination. These efforts are integral to infrastructure because source water protection can reduce the need for additional water treatment and avoiding unnecessary cost.

And like President Trump, I believe that we need to work with states to understand what they think is best in how to achieve these outcomes, and what actions they are already taking to do so. The EPA should only intervene with states with willingness to comply with law or do their job with regard to keeping the water safe and clean.

With regard to contaminated land, we're going to punish bad actors, and that means that our job is to punish those who violate laws to the detriment of human health and environment. EPA's enforcement efforts have produced billions of dollars in cleanup commitments from violators and billions of pounds of pollution have been prevented, as a result of those enforcement activities.

As states are the primary implementers of the many enforcement action programs, we will work with our state partners to achieve compliance and enforcement goals. And we will focus our resources on direct responsibilities. When we don't stay with the law, we trade inconsistency and uncertainty for the regulatory community. Regulatory certainty is key to economic growth. We need outline exactly what is expected across this country because when we do our job well, we create good environmental outcomes.

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member McCollum, members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to share briefly these priorities. And I look forward to working with you as we move forward to this budget process, to protect human health, ensure that we have clean air, land, water. I thank you. And I look

forward to your questions.

CALVERT:

Thank you. And thank you for your opening statement. Before we move to questions, I like to remind committee members that we have a full committee markup of the bill scheduled for two pm this afternoon. Therefore, in order for us to finish, hearing by one o'clock, for allowing a break between these, I encourage members to abide by the five-minute rule for questions and answers today.

So with that, I know that Mr. Simpson needs to leave by noon to go to our friend's funeral. So if it is OK with Mrs. McCollum and other committee members, I would like to recognize Mr. Simpson. He can ask his questions.

(UNKNOWN)

I think that's very appropriate, Mr. Chairman.

CALVERT:

Thank you.

SIMPSON:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I thank the Ranking Member and thank you, Administrator Pruitt for being here today.

First, I want -- I got a couple of specific questions. One of them is the EPA has jurisdiction and oversight of the pesticide review process through the Office of Pesticide programs. Last year, Congress passed the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act.

(AUDIO GAP)

SIMPSON:

In recent years, we've seen lower levels of funding leading to an erosion of timely reviews. While on the positive side, the OPP hasn't cut -- wasn't cut as much in this budget as other programs within the EPA. The president's budget proposes to cut well below the congressionally mandated minimum.

With a strong Office of Pesticide programs, job creators in my district and other places in the country, such as the potato industry, would not have the access to essential crop production tools, how can we ensure that OPP has the revenues to run effectively and within the timelines under your current budget proposal.

PRUITT:

Well, thank you, Congressman. And you're right, the budget does not increase fees or oppose any new pesticide fees. It expands the scope of activities that can be funded with current user fees, but the reauthorization of it I think is very important as we head into the budget discussion.

I have mentioned in my opening comments that the update the TOSCA last year, there are three new rules that were obligated to issue this year. Those rules are on track just to let you know. And secondly, the backlog of chemicals that existed when we came into this position -- when I came to this position, we are going to have the backlog of chemicals entirely addressed by the end of July. That was a priority that I set when I came into the position. We reassigned FTEs to really focus upon that. There were members of our team, both at ORD, as well as in the chemical office that worked very diligently. And I want to commend their efforts to reduce this backlog.

But your question is very important with respect to it and these fees that are necessary for us to carry out those very important functions.

SIMPSON:

OK.

PRUITT:

And I agree with your assessment there.

SIMPSON:

I appreciate that. One other program that have been proposed to be eliminated in this budget, the previous administration, the Obama administration proposed to eliminate two. And we've kept it funded at a level of about \$12.7 million. That's the rural water technical assistance program.

As you know, coming from Oklahoma, like Idaho, there are many rural communities that don't have -- don't have the access to technical assistance for their water system and so forth. And the rural water technical assistance program is very important to these communities for being able to get that assistance, that they would be able to afford otherwise.

PRUITT:

We look at water structure across the country. It's clear that in rural communities and in tribal communities that the partnership that has existed historically between the EPA, the U.S. government, and those communities is very, very important to ensure its safe drinking water, respectively. And that is something, as we go to this process, I would like to work with you on that other issue.

SIMPSON:

One final question. This is the real question. Many Western states face undue hardship from overreaching or duplicative federal regulations, including the proposed water's rule, the proposed circular financial assurance rule for hard rock mining, the arsenic standards, which are below background levels in many Western states, and the state regional standards implemented under the Clean Air Act. I'm pleased that the administration has taken steps to provide relief from the circular financial shirt assurance rule. It's very much appreciated on my part of the country.

For regional, western states have had a very hard time getting EPA to approve their state implementation plans. Instead EPA would overrule them and impose a federal implementation plan. How do you view the EPA's role in working with the states on these important issues, what can we expect, and what is your perspective on the arsenic standards?

PRUITT:

This is a very important questions. As we look at the statutes that the Congress has enacted, Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, the partnership that have been put into statute, in my in my estimation has been disregarded for the last several years. It is not particular to one administration. I think it just evolved in that direction. You have given specific authority to states to partner with the EPA to achieve good air quality and good water quality. And we're committed to making sure that those sets are properly reviewed and there are answers provided in a meaningful timeframe.

We actually have a backlog. And this is something that -- I mentioned the chemicals to you, we have a backlog of over 700 stabilization plans that have not been responded to at all by the agency. Now, that's unacceptable. We need to provide input to those states across the country on what they've submitted in every category in the Clean Air Act, or otherwise, and provide answers in that regard. And we will work very diligently to achieve that, Congressman.

SIMPSON:

Thank you. I appreciate that. And we look forward to working with you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CALVERT:

Thank you. I thank the gentleman. Ms. Lowey.

LOWEY:

Thank you very much. Administrator Pruitt, the budget proposes to eliminate the endocrine disruptors program.

PRUITT:

Right.

(CROSSTALK)

LOWEY:

It's called the endocrine disruptors program. Are you aware of it?

PRUITT:

Yes, ma'am.

LOWEY:

OK.

PRUITT:

I didn't hear you very well. I apologize.

LOWEY:

No problem.

PRUITT:

Yes.

LOWEY:

I'm happy to discuss it. To this program, EPA screens pesticide, chemicals, environmental contaminants to determine their potential effect on human hormone systems, altered reproductive function in males and females, abnormal growth patterns and neurodevelopmental delays in children, increases incidence of breast cancer and changes to immune function. I knew Theo Colburn. She's recently passed. But I wouldn't be surprised if hearing cuts in this program, she comes back to talk to us. Her work truly changed the way we consider chemical safety.

Because of endocrine disruptive research, BPA is banned in baby bottles and PCBs have been dredged out of the Hudson River in New York. This is the perfect example of senseless cuts that will cost us more in the long run with threats to public health and safety that are costlier in treasure and possibly in lives. We have so much more to learn about what chemicals in the environment is doing to us. How do you justify eliminate funding for this program, aren't you alarmed by the link between exposure to chemicals in the environment, and consumer products and changes to hormones, health and development of people and animals? What should EPA's role be?

PRUITT:

Congresswoman, I do share your concerns. In fact, as we studied this particular proposal, our hope is

that we can absorb the remaining functions of the EDSPE and you know, within the office of the existing chemical safety and pollution office we have, using currently available to your testing, battery systems and models to achieve that. But that you raised a very, very important question. It is something that that the program was established in 1996, as you know, has had a significant impact. And it is something that as we study the proposal and talk with Congress, it's with -- this is our approach presently. But we look forward to your input on how maybe this can be restored and/or addressed in a different way.

LOWEY:

That's great news. And I won't even ask my next question. I want to thank you for your consideration. This is such an important program. And I do hope that you will address all of our concerns today, so that...

(CROSSTALK)

LOWEY:

So we can continue to have an EPA that protects us. I want to tell you that as a mother, grandmother of eight, I really worry about issues like this. And it would be so irresponsible, if we don't continue to move forward.

So thank you so much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(CROSSTALK)

PRUITT:

If I could, that office as I indicated, the TOSCA updates that Congress provided last year, the work that's been going on in our chemical office has really been extraordinary since coming into this position. There was the backlog that I mentioned to you on the new chemicals, Congresswoman, that they've worked extremely diligently to address. It's quite something that in about 120 or so days that that backlog is going to be entirely addressed. That sends a good message I think to citizens across the country, that it is a priority.

I think it also provides certainty to industry that as new chemicals enter the flow of commerce, that the EPA is going to do its job within the timeframe set by this body, and provide confidence that we can get those things done in an efficient way.

LOWEY:

I'm delighted to hear about your focus on efficiency. But why would you recommend cutting the endocrine disruptors program that saves lives?

PRUITT:

As I have indicated, Congresswoman, our objective and goal is to address it in the way that I've shared. And I look forward to working with you in regard.

LOWEY:

I hope we can work together and make some changes in these recommendations. Thank you.

PRUITT:

Thank you.

CALVERT:

I thank the gentlelady. Next is the chairman of the full committee, Mr. Frelinghuysen.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Mr. Secretary, we haven't made acquaintance, but good morning. It is a pleasure to be here. I want to thank Mr. Calvert for the time. I'm here just to remind everybody for power of the purse arise here -- is here on Capitol Hill, so we obviously respect the proposal for your department. But ultimately, it will be this committee and our Senate counterparts that will determine the final outcome.

And may I say, I share at times some of the animus that is aimed at your agency by a variety of different groups. But I sort of have -- share some of that frustration because of the huge bureaucracy. But I also come from the nation's most densely populated state, New Jersey. And we are home to a historical background, which shows us to have more Superfund sites than any of the state of the nation. I'm probably one of the few members in Congress that actually highlights our history. I visit the sites in my district. I work very closely with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, and you have a damn good team that comes out of Region 3 New York.

I know there's been a proposal here to reduce substantial funding for this program. I think you're aware that 70 percent of the program is money for the program comes from the polluters. The polluters pay. About 30 percent comes from the American taxpayers. I would just like to say that I think it's good to sort of move with precaution and caution before you take any, too many dramatic steps.

PRUITT:

This area of Superfund is absolutely a priority for this administration. I think there's a significant amount of opportunity that we can achieve for the benefit of citizens in clean up contaminated sites. I think as I got into the agency and evaluated the entire portfolio, when you look at the roughly 1330 Superfund sites across the country, there are many that have been on the site that that national party was for decades, languishing for direction, leadership answers. In some instances, about how we're going to remediate sites.

I mean, one example, that I've highlighted quite extensively is a site just outside of St. Louis, the Westlake facility, that was listed on the national party list in 1990. The site is very unique in the sense it has 8,000 pounds of uranium, co-mingled with about 38,000 tons -- I'm sorry, 8000 tons and 38,000 tons of solid waste. And it has been distributed over a fairly large geographical area. It was listed in 1990.

And here we are 27 years later, and there's not been a decision on whether the cap, the site, or to excavate the site and to remove the uranium. That's just poor leadership. That's not serving the citizens in the St. Louis area at all or this country. And so, what we're doing with respect to the portfolio is we're renewing our focus and to provide clear direction on how we're going to remediate and achieve good environmental outcomes.

And so, funding could be an issue, and it is something that I look for to talking to Congress about. But you've indicated that the circle statues actually -- the objective is to hold potentially responsible parties accountable to make sure that they fund the remediation effort. And so our goal is going to be accountability for those PRPs, to provide certainty on the topic clean up, and make sure that those timelines are met, as we try to get sites cleaned up across the country. But if funding ever becomes an issue with respect to orphan sites, as an example, because we have orphan sites that exist within the portfolio, we will address those with you, and make you aware of those concerns.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

I look forward to working with you. This is important -- we have a lot of people in a narrow space and we are committed to clean air, clean water. This is one of the issues that is important to our entire delegation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

PRUITT:

Thank you.

CALVERT:

Ms. McCollum.

MCCOLLUM:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Pruitt, I take you -- I take your sincerity in answering Ms. Lowey's question about you know wanting to look into answering her question about how the endocrine disruptors are going to be funded and researched in the future. But I'm quite baffled about how you are going to have any tools in the toolbox to do that.

Once again, the EPA, it is reduced by \$2.4 billion, 30 percent below 2017. Endocrine disruptors zeroed out, radon zeroed out, Superfund slashed, Brownfield slashed. So you can have a conversation with us and say where you're going to look and you're going to make sure that these things are going to happen. But I don't see how it can happen when we're cutting the EPA's overall budget by \$2.4 billion.

For example, the pesticide ban, which I mentioned in my opening statement and its chlorpyrifos. Everybody says it differently because nobody knows how to say it right, right? But it is important that we do learn how to say it right because this chemical is very dangerous. In December of 2014, the EPA completed a human revised health risk assessment. And it was very highly sophisticated. It was a thoroughly prepared review. I know you said one of your goals is the rule of law, but I think when science is looking at what to do about pesticide and toxic toxins in our chemical, they have do no harm as their first goal.

The EPA determined that there is serious concern for long-term health and neurodevelopment affected the result of prenatal and positive -- and possibly, early life exposure. The agency could not come up with any level that was safe on this toxin. And they do come up with some toxins that they do find safe levels with. But on this one, they couldn't find anything.

So I'm curious to know, you know, you were there a month, and then this is reviewed, how did you come to find yourself disavowing going backwards, not looking at any of the scientific peer review on this pesticide? And then, with all the other cuts and the cuts in research, how am I going to have confidence that the best science was used that we do no harm to women who are pregnant, we do no harm to children who are born with you know possibly having all these toxins lingering in their systems?

PRUITT:

You know, you mentioned several programs that you were concerned about, Superfund and others. And I think there are some of those programs from a management perspective will be easier for us to address the proposed cuts and others. I mean, with the Superfund program, as we are just talking, 70 percent of that portfolio approximately is privately funded. And you know, we have collected over billions of dollars since the inception of the program to address cleanup.

In my estimation at this point, on that kind of program, Ranking Member McCollum, is that it is more about decision-making, leadership, and management than about money presently. Now, that particular program, there are others that you cited that it may be more funding than management in leadership.

With respect to the decision on chlorpyrifos, the USDA had a completely different perspective. And in fact, it had made the EPA aware of that, as the process was ongoing. And we based that decision like we base every decision. It was based on meaningful data, meaningful science. And it was a decision that we felt was merited based upon that and a collection of information we consider.

MCCOLLUM:

Can you provide this committee with the pure science from the other agencies as well as the science from this agency?

PRUITT:

We will provide that, yes.



MCCOLLUM:

I want their peer-reviewed science by comparable scientists, not someone's (inaudible). Can you go back though -- and with the cuts that I mentioned, and with the questions that you're being asked to, you know, will you stand up and make sure peer-reviewed science is happening with the cuts to over 3,000 employees. How does -- how does that happen? I mean I can -- I can wish for a lot of things, but in reality I have to figure out how I make those things happen in -- with using real dollars, real employees.

So, you told me rule of law was your first and foremost concern. I have to tell you rule of law is very important. I'm a person who obeys a lot, but the EPA's mission is to protect public health first and foremost in my opinion. Do you disagree with that?

PRUITT:

Not at all. And I think with respect to the science at our agency, ORD and the program offices, it's important that we prioritize the mission of those respective offices insofar as how we're going to use the science. The science should be in support rulemaking.

The primary function of the EPA is to carry out statutory requirements and mandates that Congress has required from the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act to Tosca and across the board and engage in rule-making and administration of those statutes and...

MCCOLLUM:

So, does this go to the change that's happened on EPA's website before January 30, 2018? Standards were science-based, peer-reviewed science safe levels of pollutants. That language has disappeared from the mission statement, and now it states, what is economically -- excuse me -- economically and technology available standards. So, that's a significant change for me. Is that what you're talking about with the rulemaking?

PRUITT:

No. What we have a responsibility to do in rulemaking is build a record and base a decision on informed decisions from science to those across the country that engage in the EPA process to make us aware of how rules are going to impact them and that's going to continue in each of our respected program offices from clean water to clean air, the air office across the board. I mean science is going to be key to what we do. It's going to be key to inform rulemaking.

Each of the program offices, Congresswoman, actually have scientist embedded in those program offices as well. So, the proposed cuts to ORD we are going to be able to carry out our core mission of supporting rulemaking that's based on sound science that's transparent and peer-reviewed and is based upon real data that is not monitored but actually collected -- excuse me -- is monitored and collected.

MCCOLLUM:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I know that there are others that have questions. I have two other questions I need to get to later. But at this point, I will yield back my time.

CALVERT:

I thank the gentlelady. Next, Mr. Rogers.

ROGERS:

Thank you. And Mr. Administrator, welcome to the hearing. Most people don't know that the director -- the administrator is a native Kentuckian, native of Danville, Kentucky, and a graduate of Georgetown College in Georgetown, Kentucky and then ran off to Oklahoma, where he was educated at -- in Tulsa and went to law school, but welcome and we're proud of you, Mr. Pruitt.

PRUITT:

Thank you.

ROGERS:

I want to talk to you about the culture of overreach in that agency. Time and again, over the last few years, federal courts have held that the department -- agency was overreaching its legal authority, engaging in activities that are not authorized by the United States Congress, that became a practice that repeated itself time and again, but it had devastating impacts on certain parts of the country, including mine, in the coalfields where the war on coal led by the EPA resulted in some 10,000 or 12,000 miners losing their jobs and their home in my region alone. So, we don't take kindly to that type of thing.

What will you be doing to change the culture of overreach in that agency where the employees, both career and political, engaged in overstepping their authority time and time again? What can we expect?

PRUITT:

Well, the ranking member made reference to this as well. And I think that when I mentioned rule of law it's not intended to be something that's academic at all. It has real -- when you disrespect rule of law -- and what that funnily means is we take statutes passed by Congress and act in a way that's not authorized, it creates uncertainty.

You mentioned the litigation that resulted from many previous actions of the last several years and we can go from clean power plan to others, the (inaudible) rule, as an example, subject to stays by the U.S. Supreme Court and Six Circuit respectively. What that creates in the marketplace, again, is uncertainty to know what's expected of citizens and industry to achieve good environment outcome.

So, when we talk about rule of law, it's not intended to be, again, academic. It's intended to be practical because when the agency carries out its functions consistent with the authority that you provided those types of lawsuits go away and you can actually provide the kind of certainty to citizens and working together and partnering to achieve good environmental outcomes.

So, when I mentioned that, we're going to stay within our lane. We're going to stay within the authorities provided by Congress. And if you have not spoken to an issue, if you have not given authority to the agency, we're not going to reimagine it. We're not going to create it. We're going to let you know what those deficiencies arise.

We've talked about Superfund a couple times here today. If there are concerns that we have as far as being able to carry out our responsibilities on the circle (ph) program, the Superfund program, and we think that there's a legislative response that is necessary, we will advise you and -- because we need the help of Congress to achieve this good environmental outcomes as well.

ROGERS:

And what about your staffing size? In your budget request, you indicate quite clearly about the reduction in personnel. Can you elaborate on that?

PRUITT:

Well, I think with respect to the proposed cuts on personnel, that is something that we plan to achieve through attrition, continuation of the hiring freeze, and the initiation of voluntary buyouts. About 20 percent of the agency is eligible for retirement today. That's going to increase over the next several years.

As you know, we've talked about in this budget of having up to 25,000 per employee that seeks to retire. And so, that's how we're going to address the proposed cuts to personnel. About half of our employees are in the regions across the country. Half of the employees approximately are in Washington, D.C.

The regional concept is very important because you want offices dispersed across the country, partnering with states, and those across the country to ensure that we're working together in a partnership format.

So, this regional concept is very important. But as far as the personnel reductions, those are the steps we're taken to address the proposed budget.

ROGERS:

Thank you.

CALVERT:

Thank you, Chairman. Mr. Kilmer?

KILMER:

Thanks, Chairman, and thanks for being with us.

PRUITT:

Good morning.

KILMER:

Good morning. I actually appreciate the chairman's comments and the ranking member's comments at the opening of this hearing, raising concerns about some of these proposals and how it affects your agency's mission of protecting the environment and human health.

I could spend five minutes. I could spend 500 minutes talking through some of the concerns I have in that regard, and I have five. But my hope and my expectation is that this committee will do better and we'll do that in a bipartisan way.

I'm not going to ask you to defend what I consider to be indefensible proposals. I want to talk about specific issue. You know, my colleagues on this committee have often talked about the role the EPA plays in effective local economy. In my region, we actually want the EPA to be engaged on an economic issue, in an environmental issue. We can't afford the EPA to check out on Puget Sound Recovery.

Our region has 3,200 people whose livelihoods are tied to shellfish growing. Those are jobs that generate over \$180 million in revenue in our state. They depend on clean water. They depend on Puget Sound. You talked about going back to basics and part of that is a focus on clean water. They depend on that and this budget jeopardizes that for them.

You know, our Marine industry supports the fishing fleets and our seafood preprocessors, billions of dollars in revenue, over 57,000 direct jobs in our region. You know, tourism and recreation dollars, people come to our area to fish. They come to see orcas. They depend on clean water and a healthy Puget Sound.

So, money -- and I'll also add money spent on Puget Sound recovery has a direct impact on jobs and the economy in my state. Democrats and Republicans, business leaders, the conservation leaders all agree on that. Every dollar the EPA invests on Puget Sound leverages \$24 in state and tribal and local funding to try to clean up this challenge. So, if the administration is committed to growing the economy and bolstering jobs in rural areas, what I would say is that's not reflected in this budget.

You have said this is a back to basics approach intended to return responsibility to the states. And I want to remind you of the obligations the federal government in this regard. There are 19 tribes with treaty rights -- treaty reserve rights to fish in Puget Sound. Do you acknowledge that obligation?

PRUITT:

Yes.

KILMER:

There are multiple federally protected species, including orcas and Chinook salmon that are -- that call

Puget Sound their home. Do you acknowledge the presence of those protected species in Puget Sound?

PRUITT:

Yes. And if I could, with respect to -- as you know, there was an application for a no discharge zone for the entire Puget Sound. And I actually am very sympathetic and sensitive to that application because of the things you're describing.

KILMER:

So, the EPA has also mandated obligations under the Clean Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and multiple other obligations. Do you acknowledge that those are statutory obligations of your agency?

PRUITT:

Absolutely.

KILMER:

So, listen. I'm all for partnership with the states and I agree with the fact that there isn't one-size-fits-all. But my question is this. Why should states and rural communities be stuck holding the bag for the federal government?

PRUITT:

They shouldn't. And that's something as we've seen over the last several years this cooperative model. And this is -- this goes back decades as you know to achieve good environment outcomes. We need to rely upon the expertise, the information, the resources of those at the local level and the state level to partner the EPA, but the EPA has a very important role, a very important role.

There are air quality issues across state lines. There are water quality issues that crossed state line. There are responsibilities that you've identified that are statutory. We are going to carry out those responsibilities along with the states and ensure that there's a partnership.

You know, my first weekend -- literally my first weekend after having been sworn in, we had 18 to 20 governors, Democrats and Republicans, in my office on Sunday and we talked about these very issues from Superfund to air attainment to remediation, how do we achieve those things together. And from Democrats and Republicans, they said to me, "Thank you for listening and having -- so we can have a voice in the process." It hasn't happened for a number of years. We can learn, but we shouldn't abdicate responsibility, to your point and we won't -- we won't abdicate responsibility.

KILMER:

But the -- but the budget you've produced zeros out funding to support this effort.

PRUITT:

More specifically, which effort?

KILMER:

Puget Sound recovery.

PRUITT:

Well, as I indicated, the Puget Sound application for no discharge is something I'm very, very interested and concerned about, but also the grant program is similar to others, the Great Lakes initiative, the Long Island initiative that that was mentioned earlier, those are important. Those are important partnerships

that had existed for number of years. And as we go through this process together, I want to work with you to achieve good outcomes in each of those areas.

KILMER:

So, I would just emphasize I think it is important that the federal government not leave states holding the bag. You know, you look at state agencies, you know, between a quarter and a third of state agency environmental agency budgets depend on federal support and I don't know how we can expect states to take on more of your agency's obligations with less money.

PRUITT:

Let me say too that we need to also recognize that with respect to SIPS, we're talking about this earlier, a backlog of over 700 where states have done their job, where they had actually submitted to the agency a plan to achieve better air quality, and the agency simply has not responded. So, we can do better in many areas to improve that partnership. You mentioned some, but I think that's important as well.

KILMER:

Thanks, Chairman. I yield back.

CALVERT:

Thank you. Mr. Joyce?

JOYCE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome again, Mr. Pruitt and Ms. Greaves.

I want to tell you that I'm a little bit concerned also about the impact of the Mulvaney Budget on the efforts to clean up the Great Lakes and leverage them as an economic asset for our region. I say in just for Mr. Mulvaney having been -- having been a former member.

For example, in my home state of Ohio, three million people receive their drinking water from Lake Erie and tourism along the lake generates more than \$14 billion in spending annually and nearly 125,000 jobs. Forty million tons of cargoes are shipped annually through the Ohio's eight federally authorized ports out on Lake Erie.

We see these types of benefits in other states that border on the Great Lakes. And for this reason, our Great Lakes delegation has strongly supported the Great Lakes restoration initiative. This program has been highly successful. It is facilitating collaboration among our states and the federal government, local communities and industry is making real progress in solving some the most serious problems facing our lakes.

It is also helping communities revitalize degraded waterfront areas, creating jobs, and new economic development. For example, in my district, cleaning up the contaminated sediments in the Ashtabula River allowed for return of normal commercial act shipping and recreational boating and sustaining the economic viability of the city's port.

For us, cleaning up the Great Lakes isn't just about correcting mistakes from the past, but creating new opportunities in a brighter future for our shoreline communities. The president's budget -- sorry, I misspoke there -- the Mulvaney budget, if enacted, would cripple our collective efforts, halt the progress we are making, and undermine the investments we have made to date.

Funding out of the GLRI has been instrumental in implementing costly cleanup project such as the Ashtabula River. Simply put, this work wouldn't happen without federal support, which is leveraged financial contribution from states, industries and communities.

For example, more than 40 percent of the cost of the contaminated sediment cleanup has been provided by non-federal partners. This money will be left on the table and many cleanup project will not move forward if the GLRI is eliminated.

In addition, the bulk of our efforts to prevent the introduction of the Asian carp would cease and target the nutrient reduction actions would not be possible, likely resulting in millions of pounds of phosphorus entering the Great Lakes and contributing to harmful algal blooms.

It is clear the funding is vital to sustain and effectively federal, state, and local partnership to restore the Great Lakes. However, equally important, is the EPA's role as coordinator of the overall restoration program.

Federal leadership is indispensable in addressing problems that cut across state and national borders, coordinating work among multiple federal, state and tribal agencies, providing technical support, establishing science-based goals, and managing bi-national efforts of Canada.

EPA has played this role over the past several years and has been key to the success of the GLRI. Can you explain to us how this -- how this function will be maintained if the GLRI is eliminated?

PRUITT:

Well, you've said it well and thank you for your comments and your summary. This body, for a number of years, has recognized the importance of the initiative. And we, at the agency, had recognized that as well. And as we start in this process and continue the process, we look forward to working with you to address the objectives, the water quality objectives. And you mentioned invasive species as well, we want to make sure that the states affected, the commerce is a part of the Great Lakes, is preserved and we address that going forward in this budget.

JOYCE:

Will the Great Lakes' interagency task force and Great Lakes advisory board be maintained?

PRUITT:

I think, Congressman, as we go through this, I think what's important is to recognize the priority of the initiatives that have been historically prioritized this body. We are going to work with you to ensure those priorities are addressed in whatever form it takes.

JOYCE:

Will the cost share approach to cleaning up the contaminated sediments under the Great Lakes Legacy Act continue?

PRUITT:

You know, I think that from estate perspective, you know, we have talked to many of the governors that are impacted by these issues and we're engaged in the discussions with them on how we can have a shared approach, a more vibrant shared approach.

But as far as the funding that has been proposed to be reduced and/or eliminated on this budget, I'll just echo what I've already shared with you, Congressman. We recognize the importance of the Great Lakes. We recognize the importance of -- to the citizens in that region and we're going to work with Congress to ensure that those objectives were obtained.

JOYCE:

We can appreciate the fact that your agency has provided the leadership in what I think is the way government should work, agencies all working together on a common goal, sharing information, and getting to an end result. And the money that we got there, it was needed for over a period of years.

And last year, in the water bill (ph), we managed to past 300 million for five years so that the agencies won't have to worry about the stop/start approach of having to, you know, not know what money coming in next year so why start the research this year. That's moved us backwards. From the 70s to where we're at now, the Great Lakes has made tremendous difference in your leadership or your agency's

leadership and that is tantamount to making it happen.

PRUITT:

I think you said it well in your in your summary and your comments it's money but it's also the facilitation. It's the coordination that the agencies provided historically to each of those interested parties and stakeholders, both private as well states, and that's important that we recognize that continue it.

JOYCE:

Well, simply put, the Mulvaney budget appears to largely remove the federal government as a partner in all our work to resolve and manage the Great Lakes. Is that fair?

PRUITT:

I think there are functions that the agency can perform outside of, again, the funding and appropriations. We've cited some of those. As an example, the Chesapeake Bay TMBL, you know, that's an example of states coming together to address non-point source and the agency provided leadership and management and facilitation in that area. I think that similarly true to the Great Lakes area as well. Obviously, money is important, but I think this leadership role is important as well and that's going to continue.

JOYCE:

You know, it's not just Lake Erie, which we're proud. Congresswoman Kaptur, I'm sure, will be following up with some questions on you regarding this about the Great Lakes, I don't view it as just a lake or a series of lakes. I view this as a national treasure, obviously.

And so, given the national significance of the Great Lakes, is it fair to expect the states and local communities to shoulder the burden of caring for them?

PRUITT:

We view those states as partners and stakeholders and we'll continue to view them in that fashion as we go forward. And it's important that we facilitate, show leadership, but work with each those stakeholders to achieve good outcomes.

JOYCE:

I appreciate you moving me up in line, Mr. Chairman. I know I have exceeded my time. Thank you very much for your time here.

CALVERT:

Thank you. Next, Ms. Pingree?

PINGREE:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Thank you Administrator Pruitt for being with us here today. It's my first chance to get to know you a little bit, and I hope we can find ways to work together, although you've heard a lot of us on the committee have deep concerns with the president's budget. So, I hope we can coerce you into making some changes in this budget as we move along.

I need to say like some of my colleagues have before me, we certainly disagree with the administration's stand on the Paris Accord and I come from the state of Maine where people have a lot of concerns about climate change and it has an effect on our lives everyday.

I also want to just mention I was with a group of bipartisan group of my colleagues in Germany a couple weeks ago when the announcement was made. And a lot of our colleagues in the Bundestag and the

government over there were just so shocked that we would make this decision and also worried that they couldn't trust the United States anymore to keep with an agreement.

And I want to echo those sentiments, but I want to get into little more specifics because sometimes I think we put these environmental issues and talk about them in sort of idea of its environmental extremists against businesses and then someone who comes from the state of Maine and understands the importance of the environment and the economy working together and how much I hear about it from my constituents. Climate change to us is very real. It's not an environmental platitude.

I live in a lobster fishing area. In fact, I would say probably that the highest lobster landings in the world are in my -- in Penobscot Bay where I live. So, I see lobster fishermen everyday. And they look at me with this fear in their eyes of saying, you know, "What are we going to do? The ocean is warming around us. We're watching the migration of lobsters up into the coast. And once they get to Canada, they're going to belong to them, not us. We don't -- we don't get them back." We've seen the disappearance in the shrimping industry.

And as my colleague, Mr. Kilmer said, between the fishing industry and tourism, these are important to our identity, they're important economically, and I can't go home and say to people this isn't really happening. I can't go home to say the people in the shellfish industry, "Ocean acidification doesn't exist, you know, don't worry about it. It's going to go away."

And we may sometimes disagree on this committee about the causes of climate change, but doing something about it is critical and we can't back out of these agreements. I also represent a huge coastline and with sea level rising, we may not see it everyday just the way they do in Miami Beach, but we see it when people try to get a mortgage or sell their home or get insurance. These are economic issues.

And when you talk about uncertainty in the marketplace, whether it's fishermen or farmers or people live in coastal communities, these are the people I deal with everyday and they're looking at this with fear and concern. And they're saying to me -- and I'm saying to myself, "What am I going to tell my grandchildren if we don't do something about it."

So, that's my first concern. The second one -- and I feel a little bit like Mr. Kilmer, I could go on for 500 minutes and I feel confident the chair won't let me do that kind as he is, but there's the economic question for tourism states, for fishing states, for natural resources states and maybe you say one size doesn't fit all, and it's not the same in Oklahoma, and I understand. It's different when the fossil fuel industry is in your backyard. But I represent one of those states that's in the tailpipe of the fossil fuel industry and I want to talk a little bit about clean-air.

We have deep concerns about the cuts in this budget and your approach to this. And I'm looking for anyway I possibly can to work with you, but people my area have deep concerns. You are attorney general that sued the Environmental Protection Agency, that disagreed with these ideas, that was ahead of the Republican Attorney General's Association that got a lot of money from the Fossil Fuel Association.

And I know we all -- we're the most dependent oil -- we're the most oil dependent state in the nation. So, we know how hard it is to get over our fossil fuel dependence and we're deeply concerned about cuts potentially to energy independence because if we can't have more solar and more wind we can't have that healthy balance and we're deeply concerned about the rollback of clean-air rules in the cuts in this administration.

We have one of the highest rates of child who has asthma and that is -- that's just a tragedy. The fact that so many people in our state have to deal with the impacts of being at the end of the tailpipe about coal-fired power plants and the dirty air coming to our state.

What do you think it's like to see the highest rate of emergency room admissions because of asthma or to have ozone alerts in the middle of our tourism season? We just can't say that people, "Don't come visit our state because the oil -- I mean the air is to be dirty right now."

Again, you talked about -- you said uncertainty in the marketplace. This creates a lot of uncertainty. So, you've heard a lot of our concerns. You said we should celebrate that the downturn in CO2 levels. Well, those are because we've had higher fuel efficiency standards and because we've invested more in clean energy, but your budget does all the opposite. It also cuts on your commitment to our states. And we can't leave states holding the bag. About 100 employees at our Department of Environmental Protection are funded through the federal government. We don't get that money back if you take it all away.



So, obviously, I've piled on you with a million concerns and it's only a few, but I think I represent what I'm hearing everyday. And I don't see how more cooperation or more efficiency replaces those 4,000 employees you're about to cut or cuts -- put some of the money back in these programs we care about.

**PRUITT:**

Let me say first that I look forward to us, as you indicated, working together. I appreciate you saying that. And it's something that I endeavor to do as well. With respect to attainment issues, it actually is a priority of our administration to focus on achieving better attainment outcomes.

As you know, when you look at the asthma -- you mentioned asthma -- the two criteria pollutants that we regulate out of the NAAQS program, there are several -- six, but two of them predominately impact asthma, particulate matter and ozone. We -- the PM 2.5 standard is better than any that are in Europe and we are making, I believe, tremendous progress toward achieving good health outcomes for our citizens.

But Congresswoman, I really believe that we can do more. When I say celebrate progress, I just think we have to recognize that we have prioritized it is a country, that we should recognize the success that we've achieved, but it doesn't mean that we stop. It means that we work with the states to get better data, not model data but monitor data, real time data and then -- and then focus on compliance and assistance with those states to achieve better outcomes and the attainment program.

With respect to CO2, you know, I want to say to you, the president, when he announced withdrawal from the Paris Accord said something else as well. He said that he wanted to continue engagement on this issue. I just left G7. I spent four days in Bologna with my counterparts and we started bilateral discussions. I started bilateral discussions with them with respect to our continued leadership with respect to CO2 reduction.

And that's another area that we need to recognize the progress we've made. You mentioned, you know, the progress we've made through government regulations predominately the mobile source area, but innovation and technology has brought about a tremendous amount of CO2 reductions, particularly hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling, conversion of natural gas that powers our power grid.

And what we should be focused upon as a nation, as we generate electricity using various forms of energy from coal to natural gas to oil to hydro to renewables, we need to focus on using the latest technology that reduces emissions in a very meaningful way and focus on leading international discussions exporting that type of innovation technology.

This is not a sign of disengagement. The president made that clear. It's a sign of saying that we're going to approach it from a way of demonstrating real action for reducing CO2 through the uses that -- through the implementation of what we've done in the past several years.

**PINGREE:**

I appreciate your thoughts and I hope it is not a sign of disengagement and that we are to continue to be focused on CO2. I'm not at all clear how we do that if we reduce the funding for all these areas and I hope you can continue talking to me about that because ...

**PRUITT:**

If I may -- I mean in this regard -- I mean it's very important that Congress really hasn't -- Congress do not address this from a stationary source perspective. I mean we have tremendous regulation in the mobile source category. The auto sector has done -- taken significant steps to reduce GHG emissions and has done extraordinary job.

But as far as the stationary sources, when you look at the Clean Air Act, I don't know how many of you were here 1990 when the Clean Air Act was amended, but if you ask members that amended that act in 1990, including Congressman Dingle, he described regulation of CO2 and GHG under Clean Air Act amendments of 1990 as being a glorious mess if that's how -- you know, that framework is used.

We have to ask the question to EPA. And this is the reason I mentioned this in my opening comments.

We can't just make up our authority. We can't just make up processes to address whatever objectives that have been identified. We have to be received authority and direction and process from this body.

So, as we evaluate steps that we're going to take at the agency, it will be focused upon what are the tools in the toolbox that we have. And if there is a deficiency of those tools, we will let you know and advise you accordingly because I think it's very important that we recognize that.

(CROSSTALK)

PINGREE:

I just hope that we can discuss the clean power plant again because that was not stationary clean air.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CALVERT:

I thank the gentlelady. I'm going to recognize Mr. Cole in a minute. But since we brought up clean air, I haven't asked any questions. I'm going to just really briefly say that the Clean Air Act is obviously very important to me and certainly to my state and certainly my area.

In fact, as you know, Mr. Administrator, that California was probably the -- not probably -- it was the first state to start cleaning up its own air before 1963. Before the Clean Air Act was even envisioned. California had already started stepping forward to the cleanup its air and to step up with pollution.

As a matter of fact, you know, there's a history of bipartisan cooperation. It was actually Jerry Lewis who was a congressman here who helped create the south coast air quality base. And so, certainly, there's a lot of concern about clean air. That I chaired with my governor Reagan back when he was a governor back in 1966 and the provisions in California to deal with that.

And in fact, one thing that's important to California is our waiver. We've had these waivers for over 50 years. And so, I want to ask a question, do you plan to continue the Clean Air Act preemption waiver that the agency granted to California?

PRUITT:

Currently, that's -- I'm sorry -- currently, the waiver is not under review. You're right. This has been something that has been granted. Going back to the beginning the Clean Air Act, because of the leadership the California demonstrated, it was actually preserved, as you know, in the original writing of the Clean Air Act.

So, it's important we recognize the role of the states in achieving good air quality standards and that's something that we are committed to the agency. And the waiver is not currently being reviewed by the EPA.

CALVERT:

OK. Thank you. Mr. Cole?

COLE:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And I'm going to start with a point of personal privilege, if I may, because I think I've probably known the administrator longer than anybody on this panel, for well over 20 years. I was Secretary of State when he was elected to the State Senate in 1996, if I remember correctly. And then frankly, I was one of many people that have urged him to run for attorney general in Oklahoma in 2009. He did that and he won that campaign and he did the job so well that nobody filed against him for reelection as either Republican or Democrat.

So, I can just assure my colleagues on the panel we may have disagreements over budgets or policies or what have you, but you will find that to the administrator is unflinching professional, is unflinching

courteous, will look for ways to work with you not against you, and will handle himself in an absolutely aboveboard and ethical manner.

And he's got some pretty good people around him too. I see his chief of staff back there. I've known Ryan for a lot of years too. He worked for Senator Inhofe. He was his chief of staff. So, he's got a good team. He will do a tremendous, tremendous job. So, it's a privileged to see you in this position, my friend.

No, I'm not actually...

(AUDIO GAP)

COLE:

... and he made the point I thought very succinctly. It was a bad deal for the United States. It just simply was, with all due respect to my friends that have a different opinion. If it was a good deal, they would have put in front of United States Senate and actually turn it into law rather than run the risk of having it overturned, which should again President Obama chose to do that, and that was his choice.

But when he had success with different views, that evaporated pretty rapidly. And I want to commend the president for making it crystal clear, as you did in your testimony, that he's really ready to engage, ready to sit down, but we're going to have to have a deal that is better for the United States, the American people, than the one we had.

So, I think you caught a lot of flak for it and I know you played a big role in it. I'm proud of the role you played, proud of the advise that you gave president, and frankly, I'm very proud to how you ably you defended that decision. I have seen you on television and in print. You clearly know your stuff as you always did as a legislator and as attorney general in our home state. So, I'm very, very proud of you.

Now, that's enough praise for me. I actually want to congratulate you one other thing. I can assure you you're going to be the first EPA administrator that's come before this committee in eight years that actually gets more money than they asked for, you know -- and that doesn't mean you'll get as much as you've had, but you'll do better than you've asked for.

And look, my friend, Mr. Joyce, alluded to it and my friend, the chairman and I were upstairs a minute ago talking to Secretary Mattis about the defense budget and we understand budget wars and budget games and decision was made appropriate in my view to plus a defense and a decision was made to take all of that out of nondefense. I think that was an inappropriate decision.

You know, President Obama used to have a linkage of spending one to one. Any increase in defense, we have to create increase domestic. That's a false narrative, you know. I actually think defense has the priority, but there is no such relationship. It's just as false to do a one to -- you know, every one we do, we're going to cut one. You'd look at each individual function and you try to make the right decision.

Now, your job is to do exactly what you're doing. You work for the president of the United States. I would expect you to defend the budget of the president of the United States. I suspect you're private counsel to the Office of Management and Budget. It may have been a little bit different. I know some of your colleagues in the cabinet.

I can tell you they didn't agree with every decision. But when decisions are made, your job is to go defend it. But the final decision rest here. It does rest and the Constitution is pretty clear. I wouldn't -- would never, you know, advise you about constitution of the United States. You know better than I do.

But in the end, we have -- we have the spending authority. So we will look at this and it's important that we have the president's priorities. But at the end of the day, Congress will make the decision and I think you're going to better than you thought than you asked for. So, that might be a good thing.

I will tell you I am concerned -- I'll give you three areas. My colleagues, we all have our particular areas of concern, but you'll find one of the great common themes on this subcommittee is a bipartisan cooperation on Native American affairs.

So, when I see the Indian Environmental General Assistance Program cut by \$2.5 million dollars and I see states and tribal assistant grants cut by \$678 million and I see \$69 million cut in the pollution control program, the Clean Water Act, which, you know, has a section on tribal guidance. That worries me and it worries me and I want to ask you this in a serious way because we talked about burden sharing and

that's, you know, that's fine.

I think that's appropriate, frankly, and I know that you will process seriously because I know who you are. But there's a big difference between states and localities that have taxing powers and Indian tribes that don't. You know, they may or may not have revenue, but they cannot tax. We do not give them that power.

So, when you make these cuts, how will they make up those money, particularly given the biggest recipients tend to be the poorest tribes in the most isolated landmasses and areas with the most limited economic tools available and with citizens of by any measure in terms of their economic opportunities or educational opportunities, their employment prospects are at the very bottom of the heat as we measure those sorts of things.

PRUITT:

Well, first, thank you for your kind comments and I have known the congressman for a number of years and he is a friend. He is someone I partnered with on many endeavors. And he, too, has served in the state of Oklahoma and this country in a very, very wonderful fashion, and I appreciate your leadership.

And with respect to the issues that you've raised, I think the -- it's particularly important with respect to rural communities across the country in addition to tribal communities, as you've indicated, the tribal nations, Congressman, that we recognize a very important role that the EPA plays in water infrastructure, air attainment, facilitation around those, and also the technical assistance. And as we go to this budgeting process, I look for to working with you, the chairman, the ranking member to address those concerns.

COLE:

We will. And again, I know you'll be open to that. We worked on Native American issues before in our own state, but I'll also remind you that this is, as one of colleague referred, these are treaty obligations. They were not -- they're not generous grants. We make certain commitment. So maintaining those commitments in advancing in this Committee has is something we're also serious about.

I'll ask you one last question because I've taken a lot of time, if I may. It's not a question I know a great deal about. I want to preface it's something that was brought up to me and my constituents actually in light of this hearing, but it's my understanding you're currently doing a review of glyphosate, which I understand is a pesticide/herbicide sold as something called Roundup.

And in the past, it's been -- they kind of label it. It might have carcinogens. But I understand there's a new study that has not yet been released, called the Agricultural Health Studies over at the Health and Human Services. But for some reason, it's been held for two years and it comes to a very different conclusion.

So, I'm just curious, as you do your review, could you look into that and could you see if that study is there and just make sure that your people as they make their determination have access to that data?

PRUITT:

I will. And I will say that I've had interagency discussions with Secretary Purdue at the Department of Agriculture, Secretary Price, as you've mentioned, at HHS. These were -- it's important that we collaborate and work together around these issues and we will -- we will do that and report back.

COLE:

OK. I appreciate that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Looking forward to working with you.

CALVERT:

Mr. Stewart?

STEWART:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And sir, we look forward to working with you. I know that people who know you have tremendous respect for you and we think that we were lucky to have you position as you are.

I have to mimic what Mr. Cole said, if I could, and I'll do so quickly. And that was in regard to the Paris agreement and it was exactly the right decision. And I say if someone is serious about climate change, if they really feel that it's the existential threat that faces our country, you can't defend the Paris agreement because it wasn't a serious effort. It wasn't a serious document. It had no compliance. It's costs trillions of dollars to every country except for China. There was no way to force -- no enforcement mechanism.

And as I'm going to get to in a minute, when I get my question, the negative impacts of it actually had impacts on us here in the U.S., which I'll show you a moment. I did a media interview early in the day and I said I felt like the EPA had their boot on the throat of America. If not their boot on the throat, please at least just be on her chest. And that's all we're hoping for here is a little bit of a relief from this -- what we believe, as a chairman said, the sense of regulatory overreach.

I have to -- one more premise, if I could, and that is I think many times people start a conversation with me they say, "You're a Republican. Therefore, you don't care about the environment." I think it's just a nutty premise. I mean, there's a reason I live out West because I love rock climb and ski. I love to sit in my backyard and look out all the mounds. I don't want live through ozone. I don't want to live through haze. I think all of us are committed to try to protect this beautiful place that God has given us. The question is how to best do that and at what cost.

Now, to my question, if I could, Administrator, you know the while the country has made significant progress in reducing pollution, especially ozone levels, those of us in the West are kind of hosed by this whole thing. I mean I live -- I have -- I represent downtown Salt Lake City, but it also represents very rural parts of Utah, Zion National Park, Bryce National Park, Yellowstone National Park, for example.

These are very remote places. And yet, they are out of compliance with ozone. And there's not a thing in the world they can do about it. It's not like those factories spewing or a lot of cars that are -- that are driving through there and creating the pollution and the particular matter. It's naturally occurring.

And the second thing, coming back to Paris Agreement now if I could, Princeton and Noah have said that 65 percent of the particulate matter is coming from overseas, which is why it was nuts to allow China to continue dispute till 2030 while we pay the price for that.

So, now, here we are. We have these rural communities who are noncompliant with ozone and can't get compliant. There's not a thing in the world they can do. The Native Americans living there 500 years ago would have been not in compliance with the rules that have been proposed by the previous administration.

My question to you is, will you work with us on that? You can't punish us for something that we can't control.

**PRUITT:**

You know, it's a very important question because when you look at background ozone levels an example our ability to measure with precision background ozone is very important because what we ought to be focused upon with respect our NAAQS around ozone is an example, is the margin above the background.

As you've indicated, there are certain communities across the country that if you took out all activity, all economic activity, it's still would be noncompliance and nonattainment under the Clean Air Act. That is something that we are reviewing administratively, but I will say to you that that we need the help of Congress to address that and we'll advise you accordingly on the ability to baseline ozone or background ozone and focus on areas above that that I think are important to address attainment issues.

And one other thing, the cross state air pollution rule and the ability to make sure that states are sharing, you don't want one state contributing to the non-attainment of another state. You want to make sure that there is accountability and that steps are being taken in one state to address it downwind.

So, that is a very important objective and role we have as an agency. The agency's endeavor to do that in the past and that cross state air pollution rule was actually stricken by the courts. And so, we're trying to make sure that that doesn't happen again. But you mentioned that is a very important priority and it is

because we don't want the process of one state contributing to the nonattainment of another. We want to have shared responsibility there.

STEWART:

Well, I'll just conclude by saying, A, we don't want one state contributing to another, nor do we want one nation contributing to another, which is clearly happening. And the second thing is if you say we -- you may need the help of Congress when all hope is lost because we -- I'm pessimistic about being able to, you know, convince some of my colleagues that, you know, because the narrative will be, you know, Republicans want to weaken clean air standards, and that's not true. We're just simply trying to reflect the reality that there is nothing these communities can do.

PRUITT:

You know what's interesting? It's not just the air. You mentioned transboundary with other nations. It's not just air that we have those challenges, but it's also mercury in our fish. There's -- there are many issues around our environmental standards that we need more cooperation, more partnership from our neighbors to the south and our neighbors to the north.

STEWART:

Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

CALVERT:

Thank you, gentleman. Ms. Kaptur?

KAPTUR:

Thank you, Mr. Chair, and also Madam Ranking Member. I apologize for being late. We had a concurrent hearing, which I also had to be at. So, Administrator Pruitt, welcome.

PRUITT:

Good morning.

KAPTUR:

My first question, I want to follow on Congressman Joyce's excellent remarks and say, would you accept an invitation to travel east of the Mississippi River to the Great Lakes and join Congressman Joyce and myself with a bipartisan group of elected officials to discuss the compromised health of Lake Erie?

PRUITT:

It would be a pleasure to join you in a bipartisan effort to do that. In fact, I've spent some time in Region Five already around other issues, a Superfund issue, there in Chicago, but we talked about Great Lakes initiative and importance of that while was in Region Five and look forward to continuing discussion with you and others in the committee.

KAPTUR:

Thank you very much. We'll make it convenient. We'll make it easy. We will not serve you Asian carp. We will serve you perch or pickle(ph).

PRUITT:

Thank you.

KAPTUR:

Let me just say that ...

(UNKNOWN)

Wola (ph) is better.

KAPTUR:

America really can't afford to shortchange our environment and human health. I would assume you share that belief. The budget submission, however, that is before us is simply unacceptable and it cuts environmental protection by if one just for inflation by over a third and it's the lowest budget request we've had in 40 years.

And our part of the country is experiencing threats to the Great Lakes, the largest body of freshwater on earth. Lake Erie is the shallowest so it's experiencing it first. It drains the largest watershed in the Great Lakes.

And we have increasing population in our country. Now, we're at 326 million. The world is at 7.5 billion. They're not making any more freshwater. But we understand what environmental stress is all about and why the Environmental Protection Agency is so important, so important for the future this country. So, we thank you for your service.

In your confirmation, you committed to support the Great Lakes restoration initiative. So, the following questions you can answer yes or no. We make it easy. Can you please clarify when you said EPA's 2018 budget submission to the White House and OMB, did your budget leave EPA with the \$300 million in funding for the Great Lakes restoration initiative, whole or zeroed out?

PRUITT:

In that process, Congresswoman, as far as the submission to the agency in the past back, that's something that it's been a little while since we -- those numbers -- I looked at those numbers, but we, in our discussions with OMB, talked about the importance of the Great Lakes initiative.

KAPTUR:

I had a hunch. OK. Your budget submission recommends also taking out \$50 million of the GLRI's current fiscal year funding for 2017 that we just passed and giving that to Treasury 50 million. Does that mean you will not be able to complete work -- and you probably can answer this -- to complete the cleanup of the area of concern at Lorain, Ohio on the Black River? Because I'm quite concerned if the administration is going to zero out GLRI and then take 50 million away from this year's budget, that really could stop work on -- in adjoining river that flows into the Great Lakes that was terribly damaged.

PRUITT:

Yes. We'll look at the ongoing work in the -- with the consumer focus on that area, Congresswoman, and I can get information to you. But the rescission that you're referring to, I think, is around \$369 million, which includes the \$50 million. That carryover typically is there and that's not intended to be punitive toward the Great Lakes.

It's just an overall pass back or rescission of the entire amount, but we will look at -- we will look at that particular area that you've identified and make sure that the ongoing work, as far as contracts, that have been led -- that work can continue to the dependency of the budget discussions.

KAPTUR:

Thank you. We were guaranteed that would happen. So, that really scared us. We've heard it is your intention to permanently shut down the Great Lakes Region Five office in Chicago and move it out of the

Great Lakes to the west of the Mississippi River to Kansas. Could you confirm for me whether EPA intends to do that?

PRUITT:

That's pure legend. As far as the discussion about moving or -- there's no consideration presently with respect to any regional offices at about moving them one location or another. That is something that we've not -- I don't know. I'm not sure where that came from.

I actually was visiting Region Five, the East Chicago Superfund site, and as I went into Region Five, there was media reports that somehow Region Five as was going to be moved. That's not something we discussed up until that point and it's not something is currently under discussion presently.

KAPTUR:

Thank you. EPA's second largest research lab is located in Cincinnati, Ohio and employs 1,700 scientists. Since you are proposing a 33 percent cut in your science budget, does this mean you will pink slip over 500 EPA scientist located in Cincinnati, Ohio serving ...

PRUITT:

You know, we will not. In fact, as I indicated to the chairman earlier, the proposed cuts to personnel in this budget will be achieved through attrition through voluntary buyouts and to the hiring freeze that currently is in place. We have, as I indicated, 20 percent of our workforce that are of retirement age today and that number increases substantially over the next 3 to 5 years.

KAPTUR:

Thank you. I want to ask your help in a very specific. Two years ago -- this is why we want you to come to Ohio -- Toledo, Ohio's freshwater supply was shut down over an entire weekend due to toxic algal blooms from Lake Erie that crept into the water treatment facility.

The amount of money required to fix this tri-state bi-national environmental threat is enormous and the responsibility for purifying the water should not simply rest with the city of Toledo, a community of 250,000 people that sits inside the largest watershed in the Great Lakes of over 2 million people and about 11 million animals. Further, Michigan has declared Lake Erie is impaired, but Ohio has not declared that Lake Erie is impaired. Indiana has said nothing. And Canada sits out there on the other side of the lake.

EPA has been incomprehensively accepted both of the state level determinations, Ohio saying nothing, Michigan saying Lake Erie is impaired, Michigan -- and Indiana saying nothing. Within your federalist view of EPA's role, isn't a tri-state, bi-national and disputed body of water precisely where EPA is statutorily mandated to take action?

PRUITT:

You know, Congresswoman, it's my understanding that Ohio EPA hasn't -- does not assess the open waters of Lake Erie just yet, but this is an area that we are committed to working with the state, all states in that area -- in that region, to ensure water quality standards are advanced and protected.

With respect to -- with respect to algal blooms, the EPA currently serves as a co-chair of the Harmful Algal Bloom and Hypoxia Research and Control Act interagency working group and we understand the importance of nonpoint source discharge into our waters. States had the primary responsibility, as you know, with respect nonpoint source and regulation. It's important we provide facilitation and technical assistance as we work with them, but it's very important that we work together in that regard.

KAPTUR:

Well, I will tell you this is not what (ph) it is, Mr. Chairman. The cuts that you have recommended to GLRI,



whether it's OMB or your -- some your advisors there, on top of the 35 percent cut to the Section 106 Clean Water Act State Implementation Grants means that Ohio will have a 30 percent cut to its budget from that 106 cut and with the cuts in GLRI and so forth, and the lack of clarity on what we can do to handle this massive water threat. This is why we want you to come to Ohio.

PRUITT:

I look forward to visiting with you.

KAPTUR:

Thank you.

CALVERT:

Thank you. Mr. Jenkins?

JENKINS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Administrator Pruitt, thank you for being here. Thank you for your new role. A lot of very nice things have been said about the leadership from you in this administration from Paris to kind of rightsizing the agency and I want to associate myself with those accolades and compliments.

A couple of quick things. I think you've heard very clearly around this table and I know you feel as well we all appreciate, we want, we love clean air and clean water. In West Virginia, our mountains and forests are second to none, but we are an energy state in West Virginia. We have coal, natural gas, oil, but we're also a human resource state with the hardest working people I would put up against anybody in this country.

And your predecessor candidly in the prior administration did everything it could to put West Virginia out of business and put West Virginians out of work. I'll respect my colleagues from across the aisle from Washington worrying about his 3,200 employees from Puget Sound at risk of losing their jobs.

In West Virginia as a result of the prior administration, we did lose over 10,000 direct jobs of coal mining, good jobs. We put so many people on the unemployment line because of the actions of the prior administration and the prior EPA administrator.

So, as Chairman Frelinghuysen mention a moment ago, the power of the purse. I know I have been working here in this committee to try to use the power of the purse to influence the direction and the work of the EPA in the policies. And I simply want to say thank you for creating signs of hope and opportunity for the hard-working people of West Virginia. We do have coal mines that are opening up. We've got people going back to work to create a sense of hope and opportunity in their lives. So, I want to thank you for that.

A couple of questions, number one, I just want to make sure it's clear for all to hear and see and listen. Does this administration make it a priority of having an all of the above energy policy?

PRUITT:

Yes, Congressman. I think what's important is you look how we generate electricity in this country. We need to have truly fuel diversity because as we have 1 percent growth in our GDP, there's not as much concern about said grid stability and grid security. But as we see 3 or 4 percent growth, it's important that utility companies across this country actually have diverse portfolios in which we generate electricity and that includes solid hydrocarbon and coal because you can so you can actually store it.

And this is an important with respect to energy security. You can store solid hydrocarbons on site. There's only such -- there's so much natural gas you can get to the pipe. And if there's attack on the transportation system, it puts your ability to generate electricity at risk if you have a heavy reliance on any particular fuel source in generating electricity.

I mean it will be like a business, Congressman, having one client or two clients and then if you lose that

client, your business goes away. It's important that American citizens know that our price per kilowatt compared to Europe, compared to other nations, is very, very competitive. In fact, it provides us the ability to grow a manufacturing base and the stability of our grid is important.

And so, our focus should be on using innovation and technology. As decisions are made, whether it's hydro or nuclear or coal or natural gas or oil in the generation of electricity that we use in innovation and technology to achieve the lowest emission standards possible in each of the areas that we regulate under our NAAQS program or otherwise.

JENKINS:

So, this administration and you and the leadership role that the EPA do see a future for coal?

PRUITT:

I believe it's absolutely essential that, again, we have a very robust fuel diversity and how we generate electricity in this country, and we ought to see optimism across the country. You cite that. And so, it is absolutely an all of the above strategy.

JENKINS:

Thank you. Three quick areas, clean power plant, WOTUS, 2015 ozone, in this committee, this subcommittee, thanks to the leadership of the subcommittee on CPP, we put riders in the funding bills to make sure CPP did not pursue further implementation under the prior administration.

Under WOTUS, we helped halt funding for implementation of WOTUS using that power of the purse. I proudly sponsored an amendment under the 2015 ozone in the funding mechanisms through this process to -- or the EPA for moving the goal posts. Is the work we have done in this committee resonate in moving forward with this administration and the work of the EPA understanding that we are matching up in priorities on those issues and others?

PRUITT:

Yes. And let me say because there's been a couple questions and discussion points about clean power plants specifically. I think it's important to recognize that with respect to WOTUS and CPP that the U.S. Supreme Court in the former -- excuse me -- in the latter issued a stay against the actual implementation of the rule. And you don't get a stay, as you know, from the U.S. Supreme Court or any court unless there's a likelihood of success and merits.

So, the uncertainty that was created with respect to the steps taken by the EPA to regulate under the clean power plant and also under WOTUS did -- the environmental objectives were not achieved. And so, we are in the process of withdrawing each of those rules, both the 2015 WOTUS rule in addition to the CPP that was issued as well and we will take steps. On WOTUS, we will have a final rule that will provide a definition for waters in the United States by the fourth quarter this year, no later than the first quarter of next year because that's the job of the agency.

And so, Congressman, I would just say to you that that goes to the heart of my comments in my opening statement that when an agency acts in excess or inconsistent with the statutory framework, lawsuits occur, it creates uncertainty in the marketplace and the environmental objectives that are focused on are not achieved.

JENKINS:

One very brief, new source review, we have a number of coal-fired power plants across the country that would like to invest for improved efficiency, keep that base load available, that grid security. I'm working with Congressman Griffith to develop legislation to bring some predictability for those power plants that continue to operate that we can improve efficiency. I welcome the opportunity to work with you and your office.

Do you have any thoughts about reforming new source review to encourage investment to give the

predictability our power generators need to make investments today knowing that the rules won't be changed on them in the future?

PRUITT:

It's a very important area because you have businesses and industry across the country that literally want to invest in some instances hundreds of millions of dollars in existing facilities to produce better outcomes on emissions. But as they do so, it triggers new source performance standards requirements that actually just incentivizes that.

So, we should work together to provide clarity, to encourage that kind of investment because it's good for the environment and it's good provide that certainty to those that want to invest to achieve those outcomes.

JENKINS:

I look forward to working with you on that legislation we're drafting. Thank you.

CALVERT:

Mr. Amodei?

AMODEI:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Administrator, it's good to see you again. I hadn't planned on this, but I do want to straighten something up that my colleague from Buckeye State had talked about. Actually, Region Five isn't going to move to Kansas. It's going to move to Winnemucca, Nevada. But the water from Lake Erie when it's drained is going to be treated in Kansas before it's delivered to Nevada to facilitate the cleanup of the lakebed of Lake Erie. We haven't had this discussion.

(OFF-MIKE)

AMODEI:

I think that's Yucca Mountain and we're going to help you on that too. So, that's -- it's all good. Thank you very much. Mr. Administrator, I want to echo the comments of my colleagues from the sooner state in terms of the -- there's been a lot of discussion about the budget. And as a history guy, I think it's important to note that the Congress has cut the agency quite a bit before you got there and quite a bit recently in relative terms.

And so, speaking only for myself, I would expect to take those cuts into account in echo my colleague sentiments about you may be the first person to get more than you asked for because, quite frankly, as many people made the point, nobody standing on the -- on the rooftops begging for dirty water and dirty air and dirty soil and those sorts of things.

So -- and I can't help but give a shout out to -- and I hate to do this publicly, but referring to the -- to the budget by the -- by the name of the director of OMB I think it's is beautiful and appropriate, and If anything, kind compared what he probably deserves. So, I think I like that in terms of giving you a pass on that.

Beyond that, I will tell you this. I've got some issues that I want to talk, but we've had some success dealing with your agency through your liaison folks and with the folks out in region nine actually. And so, we'll look forward to getting on the calendar of the appropriate folks in the agency and dealing with those specifically in the coming days.

So, thank you very much. I appreciate the fact that on several occasions you made the point that you're a process person. And so, when these things go forward, whether it's Paris Accords or a rule that that due process that's supposed to go through there in the public opportunity is important stuff. And when that is done, two things tend to take care of themselves. So, thank you very much. I appreciate your help working with us on water from Ohio and will talk with you offline.

PRUITT:

If I might, I really appreciate that the reference to process. And there's a reason why this body -- what Congress has said that the Administrator Procedures Act sets forth very strict guidelines on how we do rulemaking that we introduce a rule, we propose rule, we take comment from citizens and states and industry across the country. And our job as an agency is to take those comments and respond to them on the record and make an informed decision as we finalize the rule.

And the reason our process matters is that's how you reach consensus. I mean that's how you reach an informed decision and actually take in consideration all the various regions across the country, the impact of a rule economically, the impact of the rule on environment. And when that process is not respected, it actually contributes to bad outcomes.

And so, I mentioned that to you in my opening comment because it matters to this -- I think the success of working together and we're going to do that and refocus our attention there. We shouldn't regulate litigation. You know, one of the things that was a very, very -- and still remains a very difficult challenge is we inherited a host of consent decrees and those consent decrees actually sometimes change the very statutes that you have passed, timelines even established, substance of obligations that you put in statute, and that just shouldn't be.

You shouldn't have a core process litigation yield to a change in statute the Congress has passed. And so, this process focus is something that, I think, will yield good outcomes, along with the partnership that I've mentioned with the states, but also that really key focus on what is our authority in meeting the timelines that Congress has set.

And that's the reason of the Tosca update that you passed last year. It is so important that we meet those deadlines, those rules being out -- put out, the RFS issue, you know, the RVOs that are supposed come out every November that provides certainty to those marketplace. That has not been met in in many years.

And so, we're going to meet that deadline in November. So, I appreciate your comments about the process component and something that that we take seriously.

CALVERT:

Thank you. Ms. McCollum?

MCCOLLUM:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to re-state I think something that was touched on by several members here that the budget cut, the categorical grants to states and tried (ph) for 40 percent just going to be a nonstarter here.

States rely heavily on these grants, so do tribes, even report from the Environmental Council of State Federal Funds Account on average 27 percent of state environmental budgets. That's a quarter -- that's over quarter state budgets. And I think it's really important to remember that states have the ability to return this responsibility back to the EPA we have to keep this partnership moving forward.

You mentioned, in closing up here as we're coming to the end, about that working together. So, one of the things that I asked Secretary Zinke because sometimes there are things kinds out there happening and people are talking about, you know, no one is responding back to my letter.

So, if you could please tell me, is there a policy or guidance you could share with the chairman and I on what we can expect for timely responses to both the chairman and I and other members of Congress when we submit letters, question -- we're hearing that some committees are only going to respond to chairman and some are not going to respond to rank-and-file members. Do you have such a policy? And if so, could you share it with us?

PRUITT:

You know, it's something -- I appreciate the question because as I went to the confirmation process, I met

with roughly 40 to 45 senators, both Democrat and Republican, many of whom were not on the actually EPW committee because I wanted to spend time with them and hear their concerns.

Since having been sworn in, I've actually been on Capitol Hill multiple times, meeting with both Democrat and Republican members. It is my belief that it's my job to respond and serve all members of Congress.

MCCOLLUM:

OK.

PRUITT:

And I look forward to doing so. I mentioned that actually was in East Chicago, as I indicated earlier, was Senator Donnelly on that very important Superfund site that needs to be -- with new leadership. So, that is something that there's not a policy that recognizes majority versus non-majority.

(CROSSTALK)

MCCOLLUM:

Well, I'll call you if I don't think I'm getting a timely response. Another thing that's just been in the news and I'm sure -- well, I'm not sure -- I know you saw it that there were reports that you failed disclose e-mail account that you had while you were attorney general, the one at esp@oklahomaag.gov.

And it's kind of distressing because at your hearing you said you only had two e-mail addresses and now this third one came forward. So you weren't completely accurate at the time. And Senator Whitehouse said that you had several opportunities to correct the record on your e-mails. He -- in fact, he has a letter, which I'm submitting for the record, that goes on to say, "Since your (ph) public disclosure of your e-mails that Congress is learned of your relationships with energy companies that now regulate the EPA."

So, I want to, for the record and you can get back to us asking what you're using for e-mail addresses as EPA administrator, what other forms of electronic communication that you're using because I want to build a level of trust between all of us. So, that ...

PRUITT:

If I may, both in my oral testimony as well as in -- there's a letter actually that's submitted to EPW in May that recognized multiple states e-mail accounts. So, there's been a consistency there that the representations that you're citing are not accurate. So, we have informed the committee that was consistent with my oral testimony. We will provide you information about the current activities as well.

MCCOLLUM:

Great. One of the things that has come forward in that I've been following is, you know, when you were attorney general you had a different job than you have now and you had a lot of correspondence with Devon Energy who was aggressively challenging rules proposed by the EPA. You sent a letter to the EPA while you were a AG in Oklahoma urging that the EPA overestimated air pollution from natural gas wells and you -- the letter very closely reflected what lawyers from Devon Energy and this is also something has been in the public.

Just last month, the "New York Times" is now reporting that Devon Energy is reevaluating their settlement posture for illegally admitting 80 tons per year of hazardous chemicals like benzene, which is a known carcinogen. The company, from reports, is now backing away from an agreement to install a system to detect to reduce leaks of dangerous gas.

Additionally, the company now after agreeing and admitting that it violated the law is backing away from a proposed settlement, which had a six-figure penalty claim back to the taxpayers down the \$25,000. Based on your relationship with Devon Energy when you were attorney general, how do on handling this issue?

Are you going to recuse yourself because now you're the EPA? Is someone else going to be looking at it? Because at as you said, we want to work together. And so, I bring these articles up not to play gotcha

politics, but to create an honest and open dialogue about how the EPA is going to be conducted so that we can work together.

**PRUITT:**

And I appreciate you're not making presumption, Ranking Member McCollum. And I would say to you that as far as enforcement is concerned I talked about that in my opening comments. Enforcement matters to me. You mentioned my time as attorney general. We had a grand jury that I led. We had significant enforcement activities.

I understand that there are bad actors in the marketplace. There are individuals and companies that discharge toxics and pollutant into our water and they need to be prosecuted. There are people that engage in fraud under our Rent (ph) system with respect RFS. There are folks that validate permits that would establish, with respect to attainments.

So, all those things -- what I'm trying to respond to your question here ...

**MCCOLLUM:**

I know you are, but at the same time you're pinning one side of you also filed multiple lawsuits against the ...

**PRUITT:**

The lawsuits, it's interesting that the lawsuits are actually our topic of discussion. We won those lawsuits because the agency not acting within the authority of this body. The reason lawsuits were filed, 31 states filed a lawsuit against the EPA for that the waters rule because they acted out of authority. The reason 27 states sued the EPA and the clean power plant is the same thing. This body ought to be very jealous of any agency at the executive branch flaunting the framework that you've established under any statute.

**CALVERT:**

I thank the gentlelady. Very quick, I'm the only person that haven't asked any question. So, one thing I want to bring up -- and I mentioned this up in my opening statement, the DERA (ph) program. The agency noted that 10.3 million legacy diesel fleet engines are still in use. Also on the report, the EPA estimated over 1 million of the oldest and dirtiest diesel engines will still remain in use until 2030.

The M1 (ph) Empire in California, where I live, was part of the South Coast Air Quality district, which I talked about before, which has been in a nonattainment for ozone for about as long as the federal standard for ozone has existed. But it's not for a lack of trying. You know, as I mentioned, we have been regulating air quality longer than any other area on the planet and implementing some of the most stringent air pollution control measures.

We've done all we can do pretty much to reduce emissions from stationary sources. Our issue is the amount of cars and trucks. You mentioned mobile sources. That's the problem. And we also have two of the largest port facilities in United States, Port of L.A. and the Port of Long Beach, which will be responsible for 40 percent of all U.S. container cargo in the United States. These containers are loaded onto trucks would then travel through my district to the rest of the country. So, mobile sources contribute about 80 percent of the air quality in the South Coast. Of course, you know that part of California. I think there's about 20 some -- 26 million, 27 million people who live in the Los Angeles basin.

We've made significant progress in improving air quality. However, largely due to the topography, large volume of transportation occurs in and around the M1 (ph) Empire, we need some additional resources to make those improvements.

That's why we fund the Targeted Air Shed Grant Program to provide additional resources to areas across the nation that need help to meet air quality standards. The same is true for DERA grants. And as I mentioned in my opening statement, I appreciated the announcement with flexibility for implementation of the 2015 ozone standard because communities are just starting to work to meet the 2008 standards.

The fiscal year 2017 omnibus directed the EPA to send a report to Congress regarding administrative

options for regulatory relief. States and communities attempt to comply with both the 2008 and 2015 standards. In response, EPA has convened a task force, as you mentioned, to examine what options may be available.

So, my question real quickly is, in your opinion, how can we accelerate the process for some of these communities to reach their attainment goals?

PRUITT:

Well, I do -- I do want to address DERA for second. I think it's a very important program. The GAO has found a duplication with across federal agencies and the mission behind DERA is right and we believe it should be funded. And I think this committee should give direction on how it should be funded that we are committed to that DERA program. I believe it's important how ever you choose to achieve that.

With respect to how do we improve attainment, I mean I think a lot of it, Mr. Chairman, is restoring that that joint cooperation through compliance assistance equipping those at the local level to achieve better outcomes, but I do think some of it may be legislative.

I do really believe that addressing some of the issues we talked about earlier with ozone is something that this body ought to consider. But air attainment and our NAAQS program is some the best work we can do as a nation to impact health outcomes and it should be absolute priority of our agency working with Congress to achieve those outcomes.

CALVERT:

Thank you. As I mentioned when we started the meeting, we were trying to finish this by 1 o'clock because we have a meeting for the full committee I have to attend. So, if any real quick comments then we're going to wrap this up?

Seeing none, I appreciate you being here, Administrator Pruitt.

(OFF-MIKE)

CALVERT:

Very quickly, Mr. Kilmer.

KILMER:

Thanks. I appreciate it, Chairman. I'll keep it quick. My colleague from Oklahoma and I in the last hearing actually made, I think, a very thoughtful comment about the generational burden of death. There's a lot of moms in this room who were concerned about the generational burden of climate change on the next generation and the inability of our government do something about it.

I appreciate your -- I understand that there's going to be a difference on the Paris Climate Accords. What I don't get is the complete elimination of some of the -- some of the programs that are not even mandatory, things like the Energy Star Program. You know, there's a whole list of them in your budget, the Natural Gas Star program, which is a voluntary program to reduce methane leaks, things like the combined heat and power partnership to promote use of wasted heat, saving both energy and water and reducing pollution.

If you can just take a quick minute to help explain why ...

(CROSSTALK)

CALVERT:

I'm going to work with you to make sure that we address those issues. I suspect he has to spend his budget, but I'm going to work with you to make sure that we ...

KILMER:

Thanks, Chairman.

CALVERT:

... that work with that. Any other comments? With that, I'm sorry. I got to get to a meeting. I appreciate your attendance.

PRUITT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member McCollum.

CALVERT:

This hearing is adjourned.

List of Panel Members and Witnesses

PANEL MEMBERS:

REP. KEN CALVERT, R-CALIF. CHAIRMAN

REP. MIKE SIMPSON, R-IDAHO

REP. TOM COLE, R-OKLA.

REP. DAVID JOYCE, R-OHIO

REP. CHRIS STEWART, R-UTAH

REP. MARK AMODEI, R-NEV.

REP. EVAN H. JENKINS, R-W.VA.

REP. RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, R-N.J. EX OFFICIO

REP. BETTY MCCOLLUM, D-MINN. RANKING MEMBER

REP. CHELLIE PINGREE, D-MAINE

REP. DEREK KILMER, D-WASH.

REP. MARCY KAPTUR, D-OHIO

REP. NITA M. LOWEY, D-N.Y. EX OFFICIO

REP. HAROLD ROGERS, R-KY.

WITNESSES:

EPA ADMINISTRATOR SCOTT PRUITT

HOLLY GREAVES, SENIOR ADVISOR TO THE EPA ADMINISTRATOR



**To:** Birnbaum, Rona[Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov]; Irving, Bill[Irving.Bill@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Clarke, Deirdre[clarke.deirdre@epa.gov]; Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]; Krieger, Jackie[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov]  
**From:** Kocchi, Suzanne  
**Sent:** Tue 8/29/2017 6:12:42 PM  
**Subject:** FW: AA Confirmation Q&As on Endangerment Finding/UNFCCC  
[Aircraft Endangerment Draft QA - 082817.docx](#)  
[UNFCCC Negotiations - Paris Agreement Draft Q&A - 082517.docx](#)  
[GHG Endangerment Draft QA - 082817.docx](#)

Rona and Bill – See below. Please let Deirdre know if you have any edits. Thanks.

**From:** Clarke, Deirdre  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 29, 2017 2:10 PM  
**To:** Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>; Gunning, Paul <Gunning.Paul@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Krieger, Jackie <Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** AA Confirmation Q&As on Endangerment Finding/UNFCCC

Hi Suzie and Paul,

You will recall a few weeks ago that OAP was asked to review some one-pagers to brief an incoming AA. To supplement those one-pagers, OAPPS has also pulled together a handful of high-level Q & As. There are a handful of questions that need responses on the Endangerment Finding/UNFCCC. Please review these and let me know if you have any concerns by COB tomorrow. Thank you.

Deirdre Clarke

Office of Atmospheric Programs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

202-600-0614, *RPCV* Tanzania, '12-'15



**To:** Kocchi, Suzanne[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov]; Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Krieger, Jackie[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov]  
**From:** Clarke, Deirdre  
**Sent:** Tue 8/29/2017 6:10:25 PM  
**Subject:** AA Confirmation Q&As on Endangerment Finding/UNFCCC  
[Aircraft Endangerment Draft QA - 082817.docx](#)  
[UNFCCC Negotiations - Paris Agreement Draft Q&A - 082517.docx](#)  
[GHG Endangerment Draft QA - 082817.docx](#)

Hi Suzie and Paul,

You will recall a few weeks ago that OAP was asked to review some one-pagers to brief an incoming AA. To supplement those one-pagers, OAPPS has also pulled together a handful of high-level Q & As. There are a handful of questions that need responses on the Endangerment Finding/UNFCCC. Please review these and let me know if you have any concerns by COB tomorrow. Thank you.

Deirdre Clarke

Office of Atmospheric Programs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

202-600-0614, *RPCV* Tanzania, '12-'15

**To:** Williams, Melina[Williams.Melina@epa.gov]; Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]; Kocchi, Suzanne[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov]  
**From:** Birnbaum, Rona  
**Sent:** Tue 8/15/2017 5:51:29 PM  
**Subject:** FW: CLIMATE: Foes of endangerment finding 'nudge' Pruitt -- Tuesday, August 15, 2017 -- www.eenews.net

Hey Melina, you're quoted here from an email.

**From:** DeLuca, Isabel  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 15, 2017 1:43 PM  
**To:** Lubetsky, Jonathan <Lubetsky.Jonathan@epa.gov>; Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: CLIMATE: Foes of endangerment finding 'nudge' Pruitt -- Tuesday, August 15, 2017 -- www.eenews.net

FYI

**From:** Jones, Enesta  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 15, 2017 1:41 PM  
**To:** DeLuca, Isabel <DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** CLIMATE: Foes of endangerment finding 'nudge' Pruitt -- Tuesday, August 15, 2017 -- [www.eenews.net](http://www.eenews.net)

<https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/08/15/stories/1060058798>

# Foes of endangerment finding 'nudge' Pruitt

Arianna Skibell, E&E News reporter

Published: Tuesday, August 15, 2017

Critics of federal action against climate change thought they had an ally at U.S. EPA with the confirmation of Administrator Scott Pruitt.

But after months of pressure from conservative think tanks and Trump administration transition figures, the former Oklahoma attorney general has yet to publicly commit to challenging the legal finding that underpins President Obama's suite of greenhouse gas regulations.

Immediately after President Trump's inauguration, EPA was flooded with petitions to revisit the previous administration's 2009 finding under the Clean Air Act that carbon dioxide is dangerous to public health and must be regulated.

The Competitive Enterprise Institute and board members of the Science and Environmental Policy Project filed one [petition](#) Feb. 17.

Also filing a [petition](#) was a group of homeowners concerned about how a government-mandated shift toward renewable energy sources might affect their electric bills.

The Concerned Household Electricity Consumers Council, represented by attorney Francis Menton, has kept pressure on the agency with reminders in the form of supplements and letters, the latest of which was sent July 24, Menton told E&E News.

"We have followed up to nudge them into responding," Menton said, "but they have not."

Myron Ebell, director of the Competitive Enterprise Institute's Center for Energy and Environment, confirmed in an email that EPA had not responded to the request.

While there is no recognized timeline for the agency to respond to petitions, if an "unreasonable" amount of time elapses, then petitioners can sue the agency for an answer, said Rob Verchick, EPA's former deputy associate administrator for policy under President Obama.

"There is case law that shows if it's a year or two years and there is no response, that can be understood as an unreasonable amount of time," he said. Indeed, Menton said suing is an option.

EPA's silence on the endangerment finding could be a sign of political deliberation. EPA spokeswoman Liz Bowman said the agency has received numerous petitions, "which require serious consideration."

"Administrator Pruitt encourages the exchange of ideas and is committed to a robust and honest dialogue on the science related to climate change," she said in an email.

### **Misplaced petitions?**

The delay could also be due to bureaucratic inertia. Documents obtained by E&E News under the Freedom of Information Act reveal a chain of email communications between EPA officials trying to locate the petitions.

In an email forwarded Feb. 8, acting Assistant Administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation Sarah Dunham expressed uncertainty about the location of a petition to reconsider the original mobile sources of the endangerment finding.

"FYI. Apparently this is now somewhere in the CMS system. The beachhead team was aware of this petition and had given a heads-up that we were going to receive this," she wrote.

In an email marked March 28, EPA Office of General Counsel employee Melina Williams said she didn't remember receiving the CEI petition.

"I am not remembering us having received the CEI petition — do any of you remember it?" she wrote. "There's also no date stamp on this version and it's not clear to me from a quick look to whom it was directed at EPA. If you all had a way of sorting out whether we actually received it, that would be a useful fact to know."

She continued: "Assuming it was actually filed, we should add this to the collection of petitions on the endangerment finding.

"Also, if we did actually receive it, we should also probably put it in line to be posted to the petitions received website along with the Concerned Household Electricity Consumers Council petition, though from the article, it sounds like that website hasn't been updated since the inauguration."

The [website](#) had not been updated by press time.

And in an April 25 email, Executive Assistant for the Office of General Counsel Carla Veney wrote: "Hello, this was assigned to [the Office of

General Counsel]. But, shouldn't this be an [Office of Air and Radiation] assignment?"

## **Litigation and limbo**

While Pruitt is on record questioning the science underlying the finding, analysts say reversing it would be an uphill battle and could land EPA in lengthy and unprecedented legal battles.

"If they work to rescind the finding, there would be no scientific evidence to support it and they would be thrown into litigation," Verchick said.

"All of that delay and litigation would create uncertainty in energy markets," Verchick said. "Leaders in fossil fuels industry have argued to EPA that they want some kind of regulation on carbon because they don't want to be left in limbo."

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers have voiced support for a revised Clean Power Plan that would still limit emissions but be narrower than the one proposed by the Obama team (*E&E News PM*, Aug 9).

Any move to implement carbon rules for power plants, however, would amount to an implicit admission that greenhouse gas emissions deserve curbing and would mean those pushing to challenge the endangerment finding have lost a key battle (*Greenwire*, April 10).

Petitioners from the CHECC include economist James Wallace III and climatologist Joseph D'Aleo, who forecast "global cooling" in the 2008 edition of "The Old Farmer's Almanac" (*Climatewire*, Oct. 14, 2008).

Both Wallace and D'Aleo have criticized EPA's authority in past court battles. Three Supreme Court decisions have affirmed EPA's authority to regulate greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act.

*Reporters Kevin Bogardus and Hannah Hess contributed.*

**To:** DeLuca, Isabel[DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov]; Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]; Krieger, Jackie[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Krishland, Dana[Krishland.Dana@epa.gov]; Kocchi, Suzanne[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov]  
**From:** Birnbaum, Rona  
**Sent:** Thur 8/10/2017 6:50:35 PM  
**Subject:** RE: ACTION: Argus re: endangerment petitions

I'm ok with this.

**From:** DeLuca, Isabel  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 10, 2017 2:44 PM  
**To:** Gunning, Paul <Gunning.Paul@epa.gov>; Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>; Krieger, Jackie <Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Krishland, Dana <Krishland.Dana@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: ACTION: Argus re: endangerment petitions

Hi all,

I just had another chat with OGC, and have updated the response to the following. I plan to send this out very soon -- please let me know if you have any concerns.

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Thanks!

Isabel

**From:** Gunning, Paul  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 10, 2017 2:28 PM  
**To:** DeLuca, Isabel <DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov>; Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>; Krieger, Jackie <Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Krishland, Dana <Krishland.Dana@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: ACTION: Argus re: endangerment petitions

Perfect, thanks Isabel



**From:** DeLuca, Isabel  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 10, 2017 2:02 PM  
**To:** Gunning, Paul <[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov](mailto:Gunning.Paul@epa.gov)>; Birnbaum, Rona <[Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov](mailto:Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov)>;  
Krieger, Jackie <[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov](mailto:Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Krishland, Dana <[Krishland.Dana@epa.gov](mailto:Krishland.Dana@epa.gov)>; Kocchi, Suzanne  
<[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov](mailto:Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: ACTION: Argus re: endangerment petitions

Thanks, Paul. I'm adding Jackie for awareness.

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

I'll plan to send this up momentarily, if you all are comfortable with it.

Thanks,  
Isabel

**From:** Gunning, Paul  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 10, 2017 12:08 PM  
**To:** Birnbaum, Rona <[Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov](mailto:Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov)>; DeLuca, Isabel <[DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov](mailto:DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Krishland, Dana <[Krishland.Dana@epa.gov](mailto:Krishland.Dana@epa.gov)>; Kocchi, Suzanne  
<[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov](mailto:Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: ACTION: Argus re: endangerment petitions

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Or something along these lines

**From:** Birnbaum, Rona  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 10, 2017 10:44 AM  
**To:** DeLuca, Isabel <[DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov](mailto:DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Krishland, Dana <[Krishland.Dana@epa.gov](mailto:Krishland.Dana@epa.gov)>; Kocchi, Suzanne <[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov](mailto:Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov)>; Gunning, Paul <[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov](mailto:Gunning.Paul@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: ACTION: Argus re: endangerment petitions

The response is accurate:

**Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process**

+Suzie, Paul

**From:** DeLuca, Isabel  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 10, 2017 10:28 AM  
**To:** Birnbaum, Rona <[Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov](mailto:Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Krishland, Dana <[Krishland.Dana@epa.gov](mailto:Krishland.Dana@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: ACTION: Argus re: endangerment petitions

Hi Rona,

Could you please take a look at the draft response to the petitions question (below)?

**Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process**

**From:** Birnbaum, Rona  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 09, 2017 11:59 AM  
**To:** DeLuca, Isabel <[DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov](mailto:DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Krishland, Dana <[Krishland.Dana@epa.gov](mailto:Krishland.Dana@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: ACTION: Argus re: endangerment petitions

You should definitely check with Jonathan L (who is keeper of the tracking table) regarding the exact number and whether they are categorized as petitions for 'reconsideration' or something slightly different. (Dana is also keeping record) but one of them (CEI, I believe) never appeared to be correctly submitted to the agency(?). The 3<sup>rd</sup> one came from the Concerned Household Electricity Consumers Council.

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

### Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

**From:** DeLuca, Isabel  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 09, 2017 11:42 AM  
**To:** Birnbaum, Rona <[Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov](mailto:Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: ACTION: Argus re: endangerment petitions

Hi Rona,

See the press Q that just came in (below). Have we had any similar questions recently (none come to mind). Do you have recommendations for a response?

Thanks,

Isabel

**From:** Jones, Enesta  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 09, 2017 11:34 AM  
**To:** DeLuca, Isabel <[DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov](mailto:DeLuca.Isabel@epa.gov)>; Bremer, Kristen <[Bremer.Kristen@epa.gov](mailto:Bremer.Kristen@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Jones, Enesta <[Jones.Enesta@epa.gov](mailto:Jones.Enesta@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** ACTION: Argus re: endangerment petitions

**Reporter: Michael Ball**

**DDL: 1 pm on 8/10**

Has EPA taken any action on the petitions for reconsideration of the GHG endangerment finding it has received this year? Or does it intend to begin a review of or issue a decision on these petitions in the near future? (next 3-6 months?)

Also, can you confirm how many petitions the agency has received. I am aware of two so far – from the Competitive Enterprise Institute and the Texas Public Policy Foundation. Are there any others?

**Enesta Jones**

U.S. EPA

Office of Media Relations

Office: 202.564.7873

Cell: 202.236.2426

**"The root of all joy is gratefulness."**

**To:** Clarke, Deirdre[clarke.deirdre@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Krieger, Jackie[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov]; Sarofim, Marcus[Sarofim.Marcus@epa.gov]; Birnbaum, Rona[Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov]; Krieger, Jackie[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov]; Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]  
**From:** Kocchi, Suzanne  
**Sent:** Tue 8/29/2017 8:05:05 PM  
**Subject:** FW: AA Confirmation Q&As on Endangerment Finding/UNFCCC  
[Aircraft Endangerment Draft QA - 082817\\_mcs.docx](#)  
[GHG Endangerment Draft QA - 082817\\_mcs.docx](#)

See attached from Marcus and Rona. Bill will send his separately.

**From:** Kocchi, Suzanne  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 29, 2017 2:13 PM  
**To:** Birnbaum, Rona <[Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov](mailto:Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov)>; Irving, Bill <[Irving.Bill@epa.gov](mailto:Irving.Bill@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Clarke, Deirdre <[clarke.deirdre@epa.gov](mailto:clarke.deirdre@epa.gov)>; Gunning, Paul <[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov](mailto:Gunning.Paul@epa.gov)>; Krieger, Jackie <[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov](mailto:Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: AA Confirmation Q&As on Endangerment Finding/UNFCCC

Rona and Bill – See below. Please let Deirdre know if you have any edits. Thanks.

**From:** Clarke, Deirdre  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 29, 2017 2:10 PM  
**To:** Kocchi, Suzanne <[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov](mailto:Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov)>; Gunning, Paul <[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov](mailto:Gunning.Paul@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Krieger, Jackie <[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov](mailto:Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** AA Confirmation Q&As on Endangerment Finding/UNFCCC

Hi Suzie and Paul,

You will recall a few weeks ago that OAP was asked to review some one-pagers to brief an incoming AA. To supplement those one-pagers, OAPPS has also pulled together a handful of high-level Q & As. There are a handful of questions that need responses on the Endangerment Finding/UNFCCC. Please review these and let me know if you have any concerns by COB tomorrow. Thank you.

Deirdre Clarke

Office of Atmospheric Programs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

202-600-0614, *RPCV* Tanzania, '12-'15

**To:** Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]; Kocchi, Suzanne[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov]  
**From:** Steller, John  
**Sent:** Mon 6/5/2017 4:51:23 PM  
**Subject:** RE: biomass paper  
[Biomass One Pager 06-05-17.docx](#)

Paul – Yes, version with highlighted changes is attached.

**From:** Gunning, Paul  
**Sent:** Monday, June 05, 2017 12:46 PM  
**To:** Steller, John <Steller.John@epa.gov>; Irving, Bill <Irving.Bill@epa.gov>; Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>; Fawcett, Allen <Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: biomass paper

Thanks John. Can you please send along a track changes version or just highlight the changes/additions.

Thanks

Paul

**From:** Steller, John  
**Sent:** Monday, June 05, 2017 11:56 AM  
**To:** Gunning, Paul <Gunning.Paul@epa.gov>; Irving, Bill <Irving.Bill@epa.gov>; Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>; Fawcett, Allen <Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: biomass paper

Paul,

I have attached an updated document with input from Rona and OAQPS to address Sarah's

comments. The OAQPS text edit was more extensive so I removed a portion of it to keep the document from becoming even more lengthy. I have included the removed text below for additional insight in the event it is requested.

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Thanks,

John

**From:** Gunning, Paul

**Sent:** Monday, June 05, 2017 8:21 AM

**To:** Steller, John <Steller.John@epa.gov>; Irving, Bill <Irving.Bill@epa.gov>; Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>; Fawcett, Allen <Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>

**Subject:** FW: biomass paper

Comments from Sarah on Friday afternoon. John can you please take a crack at adding a sentence or two to address these points.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

I would like to get this back to Sarah as soon as possible. Thanks

Paul

**From:** Dunham, Sarah

**Sent:** Friday, June 02, 2017 4:31 PM

**To:** Harvey, Reid <Harvey.Reid@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>

**Cc:** Gunning, Paul <Gunning.Paul@epa.gov>

**Subject:** RE: biomass paper



# Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

**From:** Harvey, Reid  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 01, 2017 5:43 PM  
**To:** Dunham, Sarah <[Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov](mailto:Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** Gunning, Paul <[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov](mailto:Gunning.Paul@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** biomass paper

Here's the biomass piece for your review, reflecting input from OAQPS, OAP, and OGC. Paul **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy** an follow up with you if you have revisions or questions.

Thanks,

Reid

**To:** Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]; Irving, Bill[Irving.Bill@epa.gov]; Birnbaum, Rona[Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov]; Fawcett, Allen[Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov]; Kocchi, Suzanne[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov]  
**From:** Steller, John  
**Sent:** Mon 6/5/2017 3:56:26 PM  
**Subject:** RE: biomass paper  
[Biomass One Pager 06-05-17.docx](#)

Paul,

I have attached an updated document with input from Rona and OAQPS to address Sarah's comments. The OAQPS text edit was more extensive so I removed a portion of it to keep the document from becoming even more lengthy. I have included the removed text below for additional insight in the event it is requested.

# Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Thanks,

John

**From:** Gunning, Paul  
**Sent:** Monday, June 05, 2017 8:21 AM  
**To:** Steller, John <Steller.John@epa.gov>; Irving, Bill <Irving.Bill@epa.gov>; Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>; Fawcett, Allen <Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: biomass paper

Comments from Sarah on Friday afternoon. John can you please take a crack at adding a sentence or two to address these points.

**Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process**

**Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process**

I would like to

get this back to Sarah as soon as possible. Thanks

Paul

**From:** Dunham, Sarah  
**Sent:** Friday, June 02, 2017 4:31 PM  
**To:** Harvey, Reid <Harvey.Reid@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Gunning, Paul <Gunning.Paul@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: biomass paper

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

**From:** Harvey, Reid  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 01, 2017 5:43 PM  
**To:** Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Gunning, Paul <Gunning.Paul@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** biomass paper

Here's the biomass piece for your review, reflecting input from OAQPS, OAP, and OGC. Paul  
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy can follow up with you if you have revisions or questions.

Thanks,

Reid

**To:** Krieger, Jackie[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov]; Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]; Haeuber, Richard[Haeuber.Richard@epa.gov]; Snyder, Carolyn[Snyder.Carolyn@epa.gov]  
**From:** Harvey, Reid  
**Sent:** Mon 6/12/2017 2:29:35 PM  
**Subject:** FW: CPP Repeal OMB Pkg  
[CPP Repeal Post-It Note.pdf](#)  
[Comm Plan CPP-draft Jun1.docx](#)  
[CPP Repeal OMB Transmittal Memo.docx](#)  
[EO12866 CPP Repeal 2060-AT55 Proposal RIA 20170602.docx](#)  
[EO12866 CPP Repeal 2060-AT55 Proposal RIA Spreadsheet 20170602.xlsx](#)  
[EO12866 CPP Repeal 2060-AT55 Proposal 20170602.docx](#)  
[CPP Repeal Action Memo 060217docx mk.docx](#)

CPP repeal package

**From:** Culligan, Kevin  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 07, 2017 10:38 AM  
**To:** Harvey, Reid <Harvey.Reid@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: CPP Repeal OMB Pkg

**From:** "Eck, Janet" <Eck.Janet@epa.gov>  
**To:** "Rush, Alan" <Rush.Alan@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** "Iglesias, Amber" <Iglesias.Amber@epa.gov>, "Henigin, Mary" <Henigin.Mary@epa.gov>, "Culligan, Kevin" <Culligan.Kevin@epa.gov>, "Steiner, Elyse" <Steiner.Elyse@epa.gov>, "Lamason, Bill" <Lamason.Bill@epa.gov>, "Thompson, Fred" <Thompson.Fred@epa.gov>, "French, Chuck" <French.Chuck@epa.gov>, "Tsirigotis, Peter" <Tsirigotis.Peter@epa.gov>, "Weatherhead, Darryl" <Weatherhead.Darryl@epa.gov>, "Macpherson, Alex" <Macpherson.Alex@epa.gov>, "Sasser, Erika" <Sasser.Erika@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** CPP Repeal OMB Pkg

Hi Alan, Attached is the Repeal of Carbon Dioxide Emission guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units (SAN 5548.7) for OMB review. Please forward to OP for upload into ROCIS. Thanks.

**To:** Krieger, Jackie[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Martinich, Jeremy[Martinich.Jeremy@epa.gov]; Kocchi, Suzanne[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov]; Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]  
**From:** Birnbaum, Rona  
**Sent:** Wed 8/16/2017 1:00:26 PM  
**Subject:** Review AA Confirmation One-Pagers  
[P100P1UN.PDF](#)  
[GHG Endangerment Findings.DOCX](#)

Jackie, here are two 1-pagers. The one on the 2009 GHG Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings was developed from the format started by Jonathan L...everything in there is public facing.

The one on the 2016 Aircraft Endangerment and Contribution Findings is the actual current public facing fact sheet from the web site. Since it's so recent, it may be the best thing to use for these purposes.

Jeremy and I are both around today to revise as needed. Thanks, Rona

**From:** Martinich, Jeremy  
**Sent:** Monday, August 14, 2017 4:14 PM  
**To:** Birnbaum, Rona <[Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov](mailto:Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: BY COB August 15 - Review AA Confirmation One-Pagers

**From:** Birnbaum, Rona  
**Sent:** Monday, August 14, 2017 8:46 AM  
**To:** Sarofim, Marcus <[Sarofim.Marcus@epa.gov](mailto:Sarofim.Marcus@epa.gov)>; Martinich, Jeremy <[Martinich.Jeremy@epa.gov](mailto:Martinich.Jeremy@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: BY COB August 15 - Review AA Confirmation One-Pagers

**From:** Kocchi, Suzanne  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 10, 2017 8:50 PM  
**To:** Birnbaum, Rona <[Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov](mailto:Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov)>; Irving, Bill <[Irving.Bill@epa.gov](mailto:Irving.Bill@epa.gov)>; Franklin, Pamela <[Franklin.Pamela@epa.gov](mailto:Franklin.Pamela@epa.gov)>; Fawcett, Allen <[Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov](mailto:Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov)>; Banks, Julius <[Banks.Julius@epa.gov](mailto:Banks.Julius@epa.gov)>

**Cc:** Weitz, Melissa <[Weitz.Melissa@epa.gov](mailto:Weitz.Melissa@epa.gov)>; DeFigueiredo, Mark <[DeFigueiredo.Mark@epa.gov](mailto:DeFigueiredo.Mark@epa.gov)>; Sarofim, Marcus <[Sarofim.Marcus@epa.gov](mailto:Sarofim.Marcus@epa.gov)>; Desai, Mausami <[Desai.Mausami@epa.gov](mailto:Desai.Mausami@epa.gov)>; Gunning, Paul <[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov](mailto:Gunning.Paul@epa.gov)>; Waltzer, Suzanne <[Waltzer.Suzanne@epa.gov](mailto:Waltzer.Suzanne@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Re: BY COB August 15 - Review AA Confirmation One-Pagers

Deirdre just sent another note - for those that can't access W drive email Jackie and she will send you the files

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 10, 2017, at 5:15 PM, Kocchi, Suzanne <[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov](mailto:Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov)> wrote:

See below - please share drafts with Paul by Tue 10 am.

Please ask Deirdre directly if you have issues accessing files.

Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Clarke, Deirdre" <[clarke.deirdre@epa.gov](mailto:clarke.deirdre@epa.gov)>  
**Date:** August 10, 2017 at 5:11:47 PM EDT  
**To:** "Snyder, Carolyn" <[Snyder.Carolyn@epa.gov](mailto:Snyder.Carolyn@epa.gov)>, "Gunning, Paul" <[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov](mailto:Gunning.Paul@epa.gov)>, "Haeuber, Richard" <[Haeuber.Richard@epa.gov](mailto:Haeuber.Richard@epa.gov)>, "Newberg, Cindy" <[Newberg.Cindy@epa.gov](mailto:Newberg.Cindy@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** "Kocchi, Suzanne" <[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov](mailto:Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov)>, "Krieger, Jackie" <[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov](mailto:Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov)>, "Orehowsky, Karen" <[Orehowsky.Karen@epa.gov](mailto:Orehowsky.Karen@epa.gov)>, "Rim, Elisa" <[Rim.Elisa@epa.gov](mailto:Rim.Elisa@epa.gov)>, "Maranion, Bella" <[Maranion.Bella@epa.gov](mailto:Maranion.Bella@epa.gov)>, "Hall-Jordan, Luke" <[Hall-Jordan.Luke@epa.gov](mailto:Hall-Jordan.Luke@epa.gov)>, "Moss, Jacob" <[Moss.Jacob@epa.gov](mailto:Moss.Jacob@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** **BY COB August 15 - Review AA Confirmation One-Pagers**

Hi All,

We are being asked to begin preparing materials for the nomination of an AA for air.

OAP's key issue one-pagers are Methane Data, Interstate Transport (CSAPR), Endangerment Findings: Aircraft, HFCs, SNAP, Energy Star, and Paris (see the attached Excel file for OAR's complete list).

The draft one-pagers are on the W: drive → Congressional → 2017 AA Nominations → One-pagers

By next Wednesday, 8/15, please review the draft one-pagers, save edits on the W: directly, and update the Excel spreadsheet with the status of the document and send it back to Jackie.

**Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy** Please get in touch with Jackie if you have any questions/concerns. Thank you!

**From:** Lubetsky, Jonathan

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 9, 2017 1:55 PM

**To:** Ashley, Jackie <Ashley.Jackie@epa.gov>; Terry, Sara <Terry.Sara@epa.gov>; Clarke, Deirdre <clarke.deirdre@epa.gov>; Hopkins, Daniel <Hopkins.Daniel@epa.gov>; LaRue, Steven <LaRue.Steven@epa.gov>; Wolfe, Michael <Wolfe.Michael@epa.gov>; Sutton, Tia <sutton.tia@epa.gov>; Meekins, Tanya <Meekins.Tanya@epa.gov>

**Cc:** Cyran, Carissa <Cyran.Carissa@epa.gov>; Saltman, Tamara <Saltman.Tamara@epa.gov>; Mroz, Jessica <mroz.jessica@epa.gov>; Thundiyil, Karen <Thundiyil.Karen@epa.gov>; Haman, Patricia <Haman.Patricia@epa.gov>; Whitehurst, Shanika <whitehurst.shanika@epa.gov>; Krieger, Jackie <Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov>; Noonan, Jenny <Noonan.Jenny@epa.gov>; Shoaff, John <Shoaff.John@epa.gov>

**Subject:** BY COB August 15 - Review AA Confirmation One-Pagers

Hello all –



As discussed at last week's OAR congressional meeting, we are beginning the process to prepare material for the nomination of an AA for air. Note, there has not been an announcement of a nomination, and this is to prepare for the eventual announcement of an AA at a time unknown.

As we discussed, we worked with OCIR to prepare a list of topics requiring one-pagers. For each one-pager topic listed in the attached excel file, also on the W, we (Jessie, Tamara, Carissa, and Jonathan) have created a corresponding folder, and draft document. In a few cases, as noted in comments in the excel file, we have made other suggestions, such as using an existing public fact sheet as the material.

Please review the key issue one-pagers and provide us your comments by COB August 15. Please save updated files on the W, and update the spreadsheet with the status of the document.

As a reminder, the materials should only contain publically available material and answer these two questions: what is XX topic, and what are the latest actions/milestones/updates regarding X topic.

Materials can be found on the W drive here - <\\W1818tdcec029\OAR-WIDE-SHARE\Congressional\2017 AA Nomination\One-Pagers>

Please let me know if you have any questions regarding the process.

Thank you,

Jonathan Lubetsky

<AA Confirmation Material Tracker.xlsx>

**To:** Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]; Kocchi, Suzanne[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Crimmins, Allison[Crimmins.Allison@epa.gov]; Martinich, Jeremy[Martinich.Jeremy@epa.gov]; Fawcett, Allen[Fawcett.Allen@epa.gov]  
**From:** Birnbaum, Rona  
**Sent:** Mon 4/17/2017 8:22:26 PM  
**Subject:** FW: CIRA Review Files for Paul  
[Electricity\\_041717.docx](#)  
[Health\\_041717.docx](#)  
[Infrastructure\\_041717.docx](#)  
[Intro,Framework,Context\\_041717.docx](#)

Paul, here is the initial set of draft chapters electronically and in case Suzie would like to have a look as well.

**From:** Crimmins, Allison  
**Sent:** Monday, April 17, 2017 4:04 PM  
**To:** Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Martinich, Jeremy <Martinich.Jeremy@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** CIRA Review Files for Paul

Hi Rona, please find attached the Intro and the first 3 chapters ready for Paul's review (I just handed him hard copies).

**Introduction**

**Health**

**Infrastructure**

**Electricity**

**Water**

**Agriculture**

**Ecosystems**

**Synthesis**

-Allison

Allison Crimmins

Environmental Scientist

Climate Change Division, Office of Atmospheric Programs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

202.343.9170 | [crimmins.allison@epa.gov](mailto:crimmins.allison@epa.gov)

**To:** Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]; Kocchi, Suzanne[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov]  
**From:** Birnbaum, Rona  
**Sent:** Tue 2/7/2017 10:39:14 PM  
**Subject:** FW: CMS ASSIGNMENT -- AX-17-000-3904 RESPONSE DUE Feb 8, 2016  
[AX-17-000-3904.pdf](#)  
[AX-17-000-3904 Routing Slip.pdf](#)

This went to OAQPS and I'm guessing is being reassigned to OAP through the CMS system. I'm not sure why it's being treated like a regular correspondence since it's a petition. Suzie, do you know what the process is for receiving these? Does Rebecca need to do anything formal to acknowledge receipt of petitions?

As you'll see, this is not surprising given our previous correspondence with these folks...

**From:** Hoffman, Howard  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2017 4:40 PM  
**To:** Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>; Sarofim, Marcus <Sarofim.Marcus@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Williams, Melina <Williams.Melina@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: CMS ASSIGNMENT -- AX-17-000-3904 RESPONSE DUE Feb 8, 2016

To make sure you all have seen this.

Howard J. Hoffman USEPA-OGC-ARLO (202) 564-5582(O) Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy Room 7415  
WJC-North

Mailing address: Mail Code 7344A, 1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW Washington, D.C. 20460

The contents of this message may be subject to the attorney-client, work-product, or deliberative process privileges.

**From:** Hutson, Nick  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 07, 2017 4:18 PM  
**To:** Hoffman, Howard <[hoffman.howard@epa.gov](mailto:hoffman.howard@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Fw: CMS ASSIGNMENT -- AX-17-000-3904 RESPONSE DUE Feb 8, 2016

Howard ... resending.

It is a petition to reconsider the original mobile sources GHG endangerment finding.

I asked that it be sent to OAP or OTAQ. I don't know if we normally acknowledge receipt of these or not.

Nick

**Nick Hutson, PhD**

Energy Strategies Group

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

(919) 541-2968

[hutson.nick@epa.gov](mailto:hutson.nick@epa.gov)

---

**From:** Morales, Mariel  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 7, 2017 3:08 PM  
**To:** Hunt, Virginia  
**Cc:** Fruh, Steve; Hutson, Nick; Ashley, John  
**Subject:** CMS ASSIGNMENT -- AX-17-000-3904 RESPONSE DUE Feb 8, 2016

Hi Virginia,

I am assigning this control to ESG. I've attached the incoming letter and routing slip. Response is due Feb 8. This control came through CMS late. If you need more time, let me know, and I will be put in a request for an extension.

Mariel Morales

Communications Specialist

OAQPS/SPPD

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

(919) 541-9774

**To:** OAR Briefings[OAR\_Briefings@epa.gov]  
**Cc:** Krieger, Jackie[Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov]; Clarke, Deirdre[clarke.deirdre@epa.gov]; Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]  
**From:** VonDemHagen, Rebecca  
**Sent:** Wed 1/11/2017 9:47:50 PM  
**Subject:** FW: Letter for Janet's signature plus attachment re letter sent to OIG  
[2017-0062 referral GHG hotline \(002\).pdf](#)  
[McCabe cover letter for Francis Menton response 11 Jan 2017.docx](#)  
[Menton Carlin response attachment 11 Jan 2017.docx](#)

;;;

Good Afternoon,

Attached please find a cover letter and associated attachment responding to a November letter sent to the OIG regarding the 2009 endangerment finding, for Janet's review and signature.

The letter from the OIG was sent only to Janet in OAR and requests that the OIG be CCed on the response (which we've done); however, we noticed that the original letter to the OIG from November CCed Administrator McCarthy, Dr. Ana V Diez Roux (CASAC), and Dr. Peter S. Thorne (SAB). Could you please advise on whether they should be CCed on the outgoing response from Janet?

Let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Rebecca

**Rebecca von dem Hagen**

Office of Atmospheric Programs

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

(202) 343-9445

[vondemhagen.rebecca@epa.gov](mailto:vondemhagen.rebecca@epa.gov)

**From:** DeAngelo, Ben  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 11, 2017 1:48 PM  
**To:** VonDemHagen, Rebecca  
**Cc:** Gunning, Paul ; Birnbaum, Rona ; Orlin, David ; Williams, Melina ; Krieger, Jackie ; Zenick, Elliott  
**Subject:** Letter for Janet's signature plus attachment re letter sent to OIG

Hello Rebecca,

As discussed earlier...attached are:

\*\* the cover letter for Janet's signature (note the cc to OIG)

\*\* the separate attachment to accompany the letter that responds in detail to the November letter originally sent to OIG.

\*\* the original incoming.

Janet's letter and attachment contains further input from OGC received today.

Please let me know if you have any questions and thanks for your help in routing this.

-Ben

**Benjamin DeAngelo**

Senior Analyst for Climate Change

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

+1 202-343-9107 (office)

+ Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy (cell)

[deangelo.ben@epa.gov](mailto:deangelo.ben@epa.gov)



**To:** Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]  
**From:** Kocchi, Suzanne  
**Sent:** Wed 5/10/2017 2:53:06 PM  
**Subject:** FW: Endangerment petition supplement  
[17-000-8488.pdf](#)

-----Original Message-----

From: VonDemHagen, Rebecca  
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 10:50 AM  
To: Birnbaum, Rona <Birnbaum.Rona@epa.gov>; Kocchi, Suzanne <Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov>;  
Hyland, Dana <Hyland.Dana@epa.gov>  
Cc: Krieger, Jackie <Krieger.Jackie@epa.gov>; Clarke, Deirdre <clarke.deirdre@epa.gov>  
Subject: Endangerment petition supplement

This appears to be new. It's a supplement to the January 20th petition from the Concerned Household Electricity Consumers Council, dated May 8. Deirdre can reply via CMS to ask for the assignment to be closed.

Thanks,  
Rebecca

-----Original Message-----

From: cmsadmin@epa.gov [mailto:cmsadmin@epa.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 09, 2017 2:57 PM  
To: Clarke, Deirdre <clarke.deirdre@epa.gov>; VonDemHagen, Rebecca  
<VonDemHagen.Rebecca@epa.gov>  
Subject: CMS New Assignment - Maria Carroll - AX-17-000-8488

Control AX-17-000-8488 has been assigned to your office on 5/9/17 2:57 PM by Maria Carroll. Please go to the CMS webpage to view the details of the control.

Summary Information -

Control Number: AX-17-000-8488  
Control Subject: Petition for Reconsideration of Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(A) of the Clean Air Act; EPA Docket No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-01  
From: MacDougald, Harry W.

Note: This Email was automatically generated. Please do not attempt to respond to it. You can access this control at <https://cms.epa.gov/cms>. Questions or comments concerning CMS should be directed to CMS Support at 202-564-4985 or [CMSInformation@epa.gov](mailto:CMSInformation@epa.gov).

**To:** Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]; Kocchi, Suzanne[Kocchi.Suzanne@epa.gov]  
**From:** DeLuca, Isabel  
**Sent:** Fri 2/3/2017 7:41:08 PM  
**Subject:** web edits  
[climate change web edits Jan 2017.docx](#)

Let me know if you need more detail... I can pull before and after shots if needed.

**To:** Gunning, Paul[Gunning.Paul@epa.gov]  
**From:** DeLuca, Isabel  
**Sent:** Thur 1/12/2017 9:50:27 PM  
**Subject:** timeline  
[Timeline 1.12.17.v2.docx](#)

Hi Paul,

Apologies for the delay – attached is the timeline (climate science milestones) that we discussed earlier. I've also left a hard copy on your desk, if that's easier to review. Rona and her team have reviewed this -- we're working on finding images to go with the entries (e.g., portraits of Tyndall and Fourier; and graphs and covers associated with the reports), but I wanted to give you and Sarah an opportunity to see the text. Millet is reviewing concurrently as well.

As you know we're hoping to post this in conjunction with the museum launch, since this is an outgrowth of that project. I'll send you a link to the site in staging shortly.

Please let me know if you have any comments or concerns!

Thanks,  
Isabel

/climate-change

Date	Page Title	URL	Notes
1/06	Carbon Dioxide Emissions Associated with Bioenergy and Other Biogenic Sources	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/carbon-dioxide-emissions-associated-bioenergy-and-other-biogenic-sources">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/carbon-dioxide-emissions-associated-bioenergy-and-other-biogenic-sources</a>	Minor text edit to reference meeting in past tense
1/06	Carbon Dioxide Capture and Sequestration: Overview	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/carbon-dioxide-capture-and-sequestration-overview">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/carbon-dioxide-capture-and-sequestration-overview</a>	Removed outdated link
1/06	Climate Change Regulatory Initiatives	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-change-regulatory-initiatives">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-change-regulatory-initiatives</a>	Updated links; minor text edits to match text on destination site
1/09	The Social Cost of Carbon	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/social-cost-carbon">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/social-cost-carbon</a>	Added technical documents
1/13	Climate Adaptation Resources and Guidance	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-adaptation-resources-and-guidance">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-adaptation-resources-and-guidance</a>	Updated link & minor text edits to match text on destination site
1/13	Voluntary Energy and Climate Programs	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/voluntary-energy-and-climate-programs">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/voluntary-energy-and-climate-programs</a>	Updated link & minor text edits to match text on destination site
1/17	Climate Change: Basic Information	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-change-basic-information">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-change-basic-information</a>	Updated link to FAQs
1/17	Climate Change Facts: Answers to Common Questions	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-change-facts-answers-common-questions">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-change-facts-answers-common-questions</a>	Replaced with updated version (long planned edits)
1/17	Frequently Asked Questions About Climate Change	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/frequently-asked-questions-about-climate-change">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/frequently-asked-questions-about-climate-change</a>	Posted updated version
1/19	Climate Change Newsroom	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-change-newsroom">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-change-newsroom</a>	Added links
1/19	Climate Change	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange</a>	Updated news box
1/19	Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases under the Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment-and-cause-or-contribute-findings-greenhouse-gases-under-section-202a">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment-and-cause-or-contribute-findings-greenhouse-gases-under-section-202a</a>	Edited typo
1/19	Climate Change: Frequently Asked Questions	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-change-frequently-asked-questions">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-change-frequently-asked-questions</a>	Added link to printable version
1/20	What EPA Is Doing about Climate Change	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/what-epa-">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/what-epa-</a>	Removed link to CAP

		<a href="#">doing-about-climate-change</a>	
1/20	<a href="#">International Climate Partnerships</a>	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/international-climate-partnerships">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/international-climate-partnerships</a>	Removed duplicative text on UNFCCC (2 sentences), link to CAP, link to WH
1/20	Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/reducing-greenhouse-gas-emissions">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/reducing-greenhouse-gas-emissions</a>	Removed link to CAP
1/20	<a href="#">EPA Adaptation Collaboration</a>	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/epa-adaptation-collaboration">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/epa-adaptation-collaboration</a>	Removed links to WH programs, text edits, changed name from Federal Adaptation Collaboration
1/20	Adapting to Climate Change	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/adapting-climate-change">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/adapting-climate-change</a>	Updated link & text to reflect change to Adaptation collaboration name
1/20	Carbon Dioxide Capture and Sequestration: Federal Research and Regulations	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/carbon-dioxide-capture-and-sequestration-federal-research-and-regulations">https://wcms.epa.gov/climatechange/carbon-dioxide-capture-and-sequestration-federal-research-and-regulations</a>	Removed links to WH programs

## /climate-indicators

Date	Page Title	URL	Notes
1/12	Climate Change Indicators: Heavy Precipitation	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-indicators/climate-change-indicators-heavy-precipitation">https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-indicators/climate-change-indicators-heavy-precipitation</a>	Fixed broken link
1/12	Understanding the Connections Between Climate Change and Human Health	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-indicators/understanding-connections-between-climate-change-and-human-health">https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-indicators/understanding-connections-between-climate-change-and-human-health</a>	Corrected typo in figure alt-text
1/17	Contact Us About Climate Indicators	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-indicators/forms/contact-us-about-climate-indicators">https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-indicators/forms/contact-us-about-climate-indicators</a>	Reviewed and republished (per Drupal maintenance requirements)
1/20	Downloads for Indicators Technical Documentation	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-indicators/downloads-indicators-technical-documentation">https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-indicators/downloads-indicators-technical-documentation</a>	Fixed broken link

/ghgemissions

<b>Date</b>	<b>Page Title</b>	<b>URL</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1/10	U.S. Greenhouse Gas Inventory Report: 1990-2014	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/us-greenhouse-gas-inventory-report-1990-2014">https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/us-greenhouse-gas-inventory-report-1990-2014</a>	Updated link
1/11	Natural Gas and Petroleum Systems	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems">https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/natural-gas-and-petroleum-systems</a>	Updated link
1/17	Contact Us about Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/forms/contact-us-about-greenhouse-gas-emissions">https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/forms/contact-us-about-greenhouse-gas-emissions</a>	Reviewed and republished
1/18	Updates Under Consideration for Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems in the 1990-2015 GHG Inventory	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/updates-under-consideration-petroleum-and-natural-gas-systems-1990-2015-ghg-inventory">https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/updates-under-consideration-petroleum-and-natural-gas-systems-1990-2015-ghg-inventory</a>	Added memos and workshop PDF
1/19	Sources of Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/sources-greenhouse-gas-emissions">https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/sources-greenhouse-gas-emissions</a>	Removed links to CAP & CAR
1/20	Overview of Greenhouse Gases	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/overview-greenhouse-gases">https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/overview-greenhouse-gases</a>	Removed links to CAP & CAR
1/23	Stakeholder Workshop Presentations: Natural Gas in the Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/stakeholder-workshop-presentations-natural-gas-inventory-us-greenhouse-gas-emissions">https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/stakeholder-workshop-presentations-natural-gas-inventory-us-greenhouse-gas-emissions</a>	Reviewed and republished (per Drupal maintenance requirements)
1/23	Summary Report of November 2015 Stakeholder Workshop on EPA GHG Data on Petroleum and Natural Gas Systems	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/summary-report-november-2015-stakeholder-workshop-epa-ghg-data-petroleum-and-natural">https://wcms.epa.gov/ghgemissions/summary-report-november-2015-stakeholder-workshop-epa-ghg-data-petroleum-and-natural</a>	Reviewed and republished (per Drupal maintenance requirements)

/climate-impacts

<b>Date</b>	<b>Page Title</b>	<b>URL</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1/13	Climate Impacts in Alaska	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-impacts/climate-impacts-alaska">https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-impacts/climate-impacts-alaska</a>	Fixed typo
1/13	Climate Impacts on Human Health	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-impacts/climate-impacts-human-health">https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-impacts/climate-impacts-human-health</a>	Fixed typo

		<a href="#">impacts-human-health</a>	
1/13	International Climate Impacts	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-impacts/international-climate-impacts">https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-impacts/international-climate-impacts</a>	Fixed typo

/climate-change-science

<b>Date</b>	<b>Page Title</b>	<b>URL</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1/18	Climate Change Impacts and Risk Analysis (CIRA)	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-change-science/climate-change-impacts-and-risk-analysis-cira">https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-change-science/climate-change-impacts-and-risk-analysis-cira</a>	Added new report info
1/26	Climate Change Science	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-change-science">https://wcms.epa.gov/climate-change-science</a>	Updated link to CIRA overview page

/global-mitigation-non-co2-greenhouse-gases

<b>Date</b>	<b>Page Title</b>	<b>URL</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1/24	Global Mitigation of Non-CO2 Greenhouse Gases	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/global-mitigation-non-co2-greenhouse-gases">https://wcms.epa.gov/global-mitigation-non-co2-greenhouse-gases</a>	Updated link

/cira

<b>Date</b>	<b>Page Title</b>	<b>URL</b>	<b>Notes</b>
1/18	Frequent Questions about CIRA	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/cira/frequent-questions-about-cira">https://wcms.epa.gov/cira/frequent-questions-about-cira</a>	Updated FAQs
1/18	Climate Change in the United States: Benefits of Global Action	<a href="https://wcms.epa.gov/cira">https://wcms.epa.gov/cira</a>	Added link to CIRA overview page

/ghgrp

52 pages; regular programmatic updates