

**CLEARING THE AIR: EXAMINING
THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY'S PROPOSED EMISSIONS STANDARDS**

HEARING

BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENERGY
POLICY, AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS

OF THE

**COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND
ACCOUNTABILITY**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JUNE 21, 2023

Serial No. 118-44

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability



Available on: *govinfo.gov*,
oversight.house.gov or
docs.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

52-640 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2023

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
GARY PALMER, Alabama	RO KHANNA, California
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	KATIE PORTER, California
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	CORI BUSH, Missouri
JAKE LATURNER, Kansas	JIMMY GOMEZ, California
PAT FALLON, Texas	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
KELLY ARMSTRONG, North Dakota	ROBERT GARCIA, California
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	BECCA BALINT, Vermont
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia	GREG CASAR, Texas
LISA McCLAIN, Michigan	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	DAN GOLDMAN, New York
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina	JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	
CHUCK EDWARDS, North Carolina	
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	

MARK MARIN, *Staff Director*

JESSICA DONLON, Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel

DAVID EHMEN, Counsel

JEANNE KUEHL, Senior Professional Staff

MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JULIE TAGEN, Minority Staff Director

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENERGY POLICY, AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS

PAT FALLON, Texas, Chairman

BYRON DONALDS, Florida	CORI BUSH, Missouri, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
LISA McCLAIN, Michigan	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	RO KHANNA, California
CHUCK EDWARDS, North Carolina	
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Hearing held on June 21, 2023	1

WITNESSES

The Honorable Joseph Goffman, Principal Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Air and Radiation (OAR) Environment Protection Agency Oral Statement	4
<i>Opening statements and the prepared statement for the witness are available in the U.S. House of Representatives Repository at: docs.house.gov.</i>	

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * Article, *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, "From birth to death, legacy of racism
lays foundation for Black Americans' health disparities"; submitted by Rep.
Bush.
- * Questions for the Record: to Mr. Goffman; submitted by Rep. McClain.
- * Questions for the Record: to Mr. Goffman; submitted by Rep. Donalds.

The documents listed above are available at: docs.house.gov.

**CLEARING THE AIR: EXAMINING
THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
AGENCY'S PROPOSED EMISSIONS STANDARDS**

Wednesday, June 21, 2023

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC GROWTH, ENERGY
POLICY, AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS

Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:09 a.m., in room 2247, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Pat Fallon [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Fallon, Donalds, Boebert, Luna, Edwards, Bush, Norton, Krishnamoorthi, Brown, and Stansbury.

Mr. FALLON. The Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Energy Policy, and Regulatory Affairs will come to order.

I want to welcome everyone here. And without objection, the Chair may declare a recess at any time. I recognize myself for the purpose of making an opening statement.

Today's hearing will examine the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed emission rules, including those that seek to place strict standards on tail pipe and power plant emissions. Our Subcommittee held a hearing on these proposed emissions standards on the 17th of May.

The Committee invited Mr. Goffman to testify. The EPA refused to provide him or Sarah Dunham. Chairman Comer and I were disappointed, to say the least, by the EPA's unwillingness to cooperate and subsequently send a letter to the EPA Administrator Michael Regan. We still moved forward with that hearing and invited other witnesses to testify. Our witnesses express concern that the industry would not be able to implement rules. That according to the EPA estimates would require electric vehicle to comprise two-thirds of all new car sales by 2022.

According to the Biden Administration, these new standards are the quote, unquote strongest ever. As clearly stated in our letter to Administrator Regan, the EPA ought to be willing to come before Members of Congress to answer questions about its proposed rules.

In fact, the former OIRA Administrator Sally Katzen agrees. She testified last week and underscored Congress' role in oversight of the Federal agencies and rulemaking process.

So, I am glad that Mr. Goffman is here today to allow Congress to do its job in conducting oversight of EPA's proposed emissions standards rules.

During the May 17 hearing, we also discussed recent Supreme Court cases, including *West Virginia v. EPA* and *Sackett v. EPA* that rein in EPA's regulatory overreach. However as exemplified by these proposed rules, EPA does not seem to understand its legal purview.

Last month, the EPA rolled out what equates to Clean Power Act 2.0, proposed rule that would drastically lower emissions for coal and gas-fired power plants. This is legislation by rule. The Supreme Court already ruled against the EPA and the first clean power plan and stated that EPA did not have the authority to place state level caps on carbon emissions under the Clean Air Act.

As 60 percent of our Nation's electricity is produced with coal and natural gas sources, Clean Power Plan 2.0 would have severe implications for the security of the United States' electrical grid. Yet the Biden Administration continues to disregard Supreme Court holdings when it advances radical proposed rules at an unprecedented clip. The Biden Administration and their leftist allies simply do not care.

When you hire activists to become bureaucrats, you are going to get none other than bureaucratic activists. In 2015, in a speech under the Obama Administration, the then EPA Administrator and former Biden National Climate Advisor, Regina McCarthy, said of this clean power plan and I quote: "This is a rule that actually regulates toxic pollution emissions from primarily coal facilities, and we think we're going to win because we did a great job on it."

But even if we do not, it was three years ago. Most of them are already in compliance. Investments have been made, and we will catch up. So, this is just very Machiavellian. The end justifies the means and is existentially poignant, as stated by Regina McCarthy.

EPA appears to not care about law and does not care about its rulemaking, whether or not it is legal, as long as it can force compliance and investment outside the law. Now, this is dictatorship—not by the proletariat, but dictatorship by the bureaucracy.

And our Democratic friends, because they agree with the goals, callously and carelessly look the other way when Congress is bypassed, the legislative process is ignored, and the rule of law is perverted. Agencies' actions that remove consumer choice operate on the assumption that Federal Government's unelected class knows best for its citizens, even more so than the citizens themselves.

My wife has an electric vehicle because that's the choice that she made for herself and our family. I have a combustion engine vehicle because that is the choice that I made for myself and our family. It is about choice. The Federal Government should not be in the business of regulating vehicles off the road or shuttering 60 percent of our Nation's power sources while simultaneously stressing the grid with the illogical proposals like banning gas stoves and electric school buses—and electrifying, rather, school buses.

The EPA cannot circumvent Congress or the law, try as they may. I look forward to hearing more about the—learning more about the EPA's process for ruling out these proposed rules.

And I yield to the Ranking Member.

Ms. BUSH. Ms. Bush, me? Right.

Mr. FALLON. Our Ranking Member Bush.

Ms. BUSH. OK. All right.

Mr. FALLON. From St. Louis.

Ms. BUSH. From St. Louis, you are right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Deputy Administrator Goffman, for being here with us today.

St. Louis and I are here to talk yet again about the urgent need to tackle the climate crisis and protect human health by reducing polluting emissions. The Subcommittee already considered this topic in the other hearing room just a month ago. While we have a different witness today, the science and the facts remain the same. Decades of scientific research proves that burning fossil fuels creates polluting emissions that enter the atmosphere and generate a greenhouse effect that dangerously warms our planet. These toxic emissions enter our lungs through the air we breathe and make us all sick. Pollution is nonpartisan. It impacts all our communities differently.

The quantity of pollution entering our atmosphere is staggering. According to the Congressional Budget Office and I quote, “In 2021, worldwide emissions of greenhouse gases from all sources amounted to 40.8 billion metric tons.” And the United States was quote, “Estimated to account for more than one-sixth of that amount.”

As I explained last month, we only have a brief window to act to prevent the most severe consequences of the climate crisis. We know the health effects of air pollution fall disproportionately on Black and Brown and Indigenous communities. I would like to request unanimous consent to enter into the record an article published in the *St. Louis Post Dispatch* on May 27 of this year.

Mr. FALLON. Without objection, so moved.

Ms. BUSH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. According to that article, and I quote, “About 4 million kids in the U.S. have asthma. The percentage of Black children with asthma is far higher than White kids. More than 12 percent of Black kids nationwide suffer from the disease compared with 5.5 percent of White children. They also die at a much higher rate”, end quote.

These are the stakes. The health and safety of innocent Black children are being compromised by reckless environmental destruction and pollution. Alarming data from the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services shows, and I quote, “Black children are more than ten times as likely as White children to visit emergency rooms for asthma-related complications.” This is unacceptable.

Under the leadership of the Biden-Harris Administration, the EPA is proposing tough, yet attainable standards to reduce the polluting emissions entering our atmosphere. When we finally implement the EPA’s rules, we will be taking significant steps to combat climate change, by making significant and long overdue reductions and the amount of polluting poisoning—pollution poisoning our air every day, we will be saving lives, and we will be preventing illness and suffering.

As we discussed last month, adoption of EPA’s proposed standards to reduce emissions from heavy trucks would produce, quote, “up to \$29 billion in benefits from fewer premature deaths and se-

rious health effects such as hospital admissions, due to respiratory and cardiovascular illnesses.” By the year 2030, adoption of the EPA’s proposed standards for fossil fuel power plants would result, and I quote, “approximately 1,300 avoided premature deaths and prevent more than 300,000 cases of asthma attacks.” And as someone who suffers from asthma, this is a good thing.

During the last hearing, my colleagues across the aisle tried to distract from these essential facts. They claim that the Biden Administration was trying to hijack the auto industry and eliminate consumer choice. They also claimed these standards were unaffordable, as if getting sick in this country was free, or as if the climate crisis will not impose any cost on our businesses, our homes, or our schools. The reality is that Republicans’ efforts to impede the finalization of the EPA’s proposed emissions control rules would result in the dumping of billions of metric tons of pollutants into the air that could have been avoided. Republicans’ antics would exacerbate the climate change already occurring, needlessly exposing our communities, particularly, Black, Brown, and Indigenous to the health consequences of pollution.

I thank the Biden-Harris Administration and the EPA for their work to address the climate crisis and make our communities healthier. And I thank Mr. Goffman for joining us today and for his leadership in this critical effort. Thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you. I now recognize myself for five minutes of questions. Oh, sorry. Thank you. I am pleased to welcome our witness today, Joseph Goffman. Mr. Goffman is Principal Deputy Assistant Administration for Air and Radiation at the Environmental Protection Agency. We look forward to hearing what you have to say on today’s important topic.

Pursuant to Committee rule 9(g), the witness will please stand and raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear and affirm that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Let the record show that the witness answered in the affirmative.

We appreciate you being here today for your testimony. And let me remind the witness that we have read your written statement, and it will appear in full in the hearing record. Please limit your oral statements to five minutes. As a reminder, please press the button in front of the microphone for you. And you are going to get a green light for four minutes, and you will get a yellow light for one minute, and then the red light, if you could carry a landing and wrap it up. I now recognize Mr. Goffman for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF JOSEPH GOFFMAN
PRINCIPAL DEPUTY ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR
OFFICE OF AIR AND RADIATION (OAR)
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY**

Mr. GOFFMAN. Good morning, Chairman Fallon, Ranking Member Bush, and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for giving EPA the opportunity to testify before you this morning on our proposed emission standards for cars and trucks. The transportation sector accounts for the largest portion, nearly one-third of greenhouse gas emissions, and for significant levels of health-threat-

ening air pollutants in the United States. Reducing these emissions is an EPA priority to ensure that Americans enjoy healthier lives.

In April, EPA announced proposed pollution standards for light, medium, and heavy-duty vehicles from model year 2027 and beyond. The proposed standards align with commitments already made by automakers and commercial vehicle manufacturers as they plan to accelerate clean vehicle technologies in the on-road vehicle fleet.

These proposals, which follow EPA's longstanding approach to setting car and truck standards under the Clean Air Act would deliver dramatic improvements in public health, notable saving for consumers and commercial fleets, and increase energy security for Americans. If finalized, these proposals would mark a significant step toward improving air quality, protecting people's health, and addressing the climate crisis.

These proposals would deliver these important public health benefits by achieving widespread reductions and harmful air pollutants. They would improve air quality for communities across the Nation, especially communities that have born a disproportionate burden of polluted air.

Motor vehicle pollution is linked with avoidable premature deaths and serious illnesses, including respiratory illness, cardiovascular problems, and cancer. In a single year, the proposals would prevent between 750 and 1,700 avoidable deaths with cumulative results over say 20 years being much higher.

In addition, EPA estimates that between 2027 and 2055, the proposed light-duty and medium-duty would reduce CO2 emissions by 7.3 billion metric tons. The heavy-duty proposal would reduce CO2 emissions by an additional 1.8 billion metric tons of CO2. Together these reductions would be the equivalent to more than twice the total U.S. CO2 emissions in 2020, and they would strengthen American energy security by reducing reliance on 20 billion barrels of imported oil.

The proposed standards would also deliver lower fuel and maintenance costs for families. The proposed light-duty vehicle standards would on average save consumers \$12,000 over the lifetime of the vehicle. Under the heavy-duty proposal, EPA expects that truck and bus owners would see, approximately, \$250 billion in savings, associated with reduced fuel use and vehicle maintenance and requirements with fewer repairs needed. Overall, EPA estimates that the benefits of the proposed light-duty vehicle standards alone would exceed their cost by at least \$1 trillion.

EPA developed the vehicle proposals recognizing the significant investments that Congress itself has already made in clean vehicle technologies, through both the Inflation Reduction Act and the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. And we also recognized the industry itself as well has made investments in response to market shifts, technology innovation, and increasing consumer interest in electric vehicles.

Since President Biden took office, the number of EV sales has more than tripled, while the number of available models has doubled. There are over 130,000 public chargers across the country, and that represents a 40 percent increase since just 2020. The private sector has also committed more than \$120 billion in domestic

EV and battery investments since President Biden signed the Inflation Reduction Act into law under a year ago.

Car and truck companies moving to include more electric and other zero emission vehicles and their products leads to increasing diversity of clean vehicle choices for consumers. We know that Americans need and want flexibility in the types of vehicles they drive. The proposed standards are performance-based emissions standards and are technology-neutral, meaning that manufacturers choose the mix of technologies, including internal combustion engines.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Goffman, I am sorry, you are way over.

Mr. GOFFMAN. I am so sorry.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you very much. I give you—

Mr. GOFFMAN. Thank you for the extra minute.

Mr. FALLON [continuing]. Eighteen percent more, right? OK. I now recognize myself for the purpose of asking questions for five minutes.

Mr. Goffman, thank you again for being here today. Although, I wish you were able to attend a hearing we had a month ago. I have to ask you, were you initially responsible for declining our invitation to appear before the Committee, or did another EPA official make that decision for you?

Mr. GOFFMAN. I participated in the decision.

Mr. FALLON. And so that begs the question, I mean, you do recognize the fact that Congress has oversight on the EPA. Why didn't you testify? Why didn't you appear?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Sorry?

Mr. FALLON. What was your reason for not appearing.

Mr. GOFFMAN. For my part, as with many things, it was primarily schedule.

Mr. FALLON. So, you could not change and adjust your schedule for the United States Congress?

Mr. GOFFMAN. It was difficult for me to do—

Mr. FALLON. So, what was more important?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Well, let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I am pleased to be here today. I understand that it is my obligation and commitment not only to be here today, but to continue to provide this Committee and the Congress with the—

Mr. FALLON. Well, thank you. Because I think this is just an institutional thing. I mean, it is for our chamber. Whether it is a Democrat or a Republican. I think it absolutely should be bipartisan. I am, quite frankly, outraged. As a citizen of the United States, if I was not serving in Congress, I would want the EPA and all government, you know, Federal Government agencies to appear before Congress when requested.

Even during the comment period that Mr. Regan appeared before the E&C. So, I would hope that in the future you would clear your calendar for Congress, I guess. I think that is fair to say. All right. Now, obviously, Mr. Goffman, are you an elected official.

Mr. GOFFMAN. I am not.

Mr. FALLON. OK. When you were nominated—when were you nominate by the Administration with just month and year?

Mr. GOFFMAN. March 2022, and then again earlier this year in January 2023.

Mr. FALLON. So, March 2022. And last Congress, was your nomination reported favorably or unfavorably out of the Senate?

Mr. GOFFMAN. It was reported on a ten-ten vote from the Environment and Public Works Committee last year. And a ten—

Mr. FALLON. So, by definition, that would be unfavorable because it did not pass?

Mr. GOFFMAN. I guess.

Mr. FALLON. In two and a half years, or I guess for the—a year and change—you have been operating in an acting capacity. Is that accurate?

Mr. GOFFMAN. I was in an acting capacity until November 2021, and now I am just the Principal Deputy, but I am responsible for what the—

Mr. FALLON. Are you confirmed? Have you been confirmed by the U.S. Senate?

Mr. GOFFMAN. No, no, I have not.

Mr. FALLON. OK. So, you know, the concern I have is when the EPA is passing major rules, and you are not elected, and the Administrator Regan, he is not elected either, correct? How many employees are at the EPA, roughly?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Roughly, 15,000.

Mr. FALLON. Yes, we said 17,000. So, roughly. Any of them elected of those 15 to 17,000.

Mr. GOFFMAN. No.

Mr. FALLON. Which begs the question then, why are y'all, in effect, legislating? Because let us say—do you have a law degree?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Yes, I do.

Mr. FALLON. From Yale?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. Is that right?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. OK. And you worked at Harvard?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. So very prestigious. You are familiar with West Virginia v. EPA?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Yes, I am.

Mr. FALLON. And SCOTUS, of course, some of their—for lay people can be complicated rulings. But essentially, did they rule that the EPA acted within its statutory authority, or did they rule that the EPA overstepped their authority?

Mr. GOFFMAN. The latter.

Mr. FALLON. How about Sackett v. EPA, the same question?

Mr. GOFFMAN. I am less familiar with that.

Mr. FALLON. OK. But did they rule—are you familiar with—did the EPA act within their statutory authority, or did they exceed it? It was their waterways in the United States.

Mr. GOFFMAN. I am generally familiar with the case. I am hesitant because I have not studied it.

Mr. FALLON. Well, I can share with you that they also ruled that the EPA, again, overstepped their authority. So, we have a pattern here about the SCOTUS. The highest authority we have has made it very clear that the EPA has exceeded their statutory authority, and they are making law when they do not have the authority to do so. These are major and seismic decisions.

So, the EPA's proposed Clean Power Act rule 2.0 would target emissions for coal and natural gas power plants. A sector that provides the U.S. with 60 percent of our electricity.

At a Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources hearing last month, James Danly of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC had testified that the intermittent renewable resources, like wind and solar are simply incapable of ensuring the stability of the bulk electric system; and warns that if generation assets necessary to systemic stability are retired, there will be—and this is a quote—“in time a catastrophic reliability event.”

Did the EPA consult with FERC on how Clean Power Plan 2.0 would further impact it with stability?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Yes, we did.

Mr. FALLON. So, can you commit to providing the Committee with any communications or documents between the EPA and FERC to ensure the safety and soundness of the power grid should this proposal be finalized?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Ah, yes.

Mr. FALLON. OK. Thank you. My time is up, so I yield now to the Ranking Member. Thank you.

Ms. BUSH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. St. Louis and I are here today in defense of the planet itself. My Republican colleagues convene weekly hearings to question the merits and the efficacy of strong government relations under the jurisdiction of every single Federal agency. Whether it be challenging sensible gun safety legislation or restricting the ability of the EPA to prevent corporations from polluting the very air we breathe, deregulation kills people.

As we see in life-threatening and emergency situations, like the tragic Titan submarine incident, the regulation of our transportation systems on land, air, or sea is a public safety concern. We do not look toward our investors or our bankers to step in when lives are on the line, but to our local, state, and Federal Governments.

That is why we are here to legislate and to regulate in the name of public safety. Let us remember what this hearing is really about. It is about the cars and the trucks most of us drive every day. We all agree that people need licenses to drive cars. They need license plates, inspections, seatbelts, and other closely monitored regulations to protect the well-being of everyone on the road. The EPA has reported that in 2030 alone, the proposed rule to reduce emissions from fossil fuel fire power plants would, quote, “prevent approximately 1,300 premature deaths” and, quote, “more 300,000 cases of asthma attacks,” which I previously stated.

I refuse to prioritize the profits of a ruthless auto industry over our environment or the health of our communities. We have over 60 years of scientific evidence that proves historically segregated Black communities who live closer to transportation hubs like St. Louis are at higher risk of exposure to toxic air pollutants.

In a groundbreaking March 2020 study published in the journal, *Environmental Science and Technology Letters*, researchers found that in comparison with White people, Black and Brown people reside near more smog and fine particulate matter from cars and trucks, buses and coal plants in areas that were historically red-lined. Those pollutants inflamed human airways, reduced lung

function, triggered asthma attacks, and can cause damage to the heart and cause strokes.

Black children, children of color, our seniors, people with disabilities, and those living outside without homes are all at risk. The implementation of these new EPA rules would be one important step toward achieving racial justice through direct climate action.

Mr. Goffman, can you please discuss the disproportionate impact of unhealthy air quality on communities of color?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to that, Ranking Member Bush. We certainly know that pollutants like fine particles, for example, do have a disproportionate impact on the health of people of color, associated with a greater incidence of a range of respiratory diseases, including, for example, asthma in children.

As you pointed out, something like 72 million people live very close to major highways and other transportation arteries. A disproportionate number of those people are people of color or people who live in low-income communities. Proposals like the one that we issued in April will go, we believe, a long way to protecting those very people from a wide range of the pollutants that are associated with their disproportionate encounters with heart disease, respiratory disease, and even cancer. And as you have pointed out, that not only impairs the quality of their lives, it adds heavy costs as well.

Ms. BUSH. Thank you. Mr. Goffman, can you, please, briefly explain why reducing pollutant emissions would have such a profound effect on just the people of this country at large?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Well, the power sector rules that we issued are a good example of response to your question, because through our proposal in May to set standards for CO2 emissions, our analysis shows that the emissions reductions of NOx, SOx on particles, even air toxics as well as CO2 would be spread pretty evenly across the country, so that as in the case with the car rules, everybody would benefit from those reductions and the resulting avoided illnesses and premature deaths linked to those.

Ms. BUSH. Thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Edwards from North Carolina.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Goffman, thank you for being with us today. I am excited to see that you did feel this hearing was important enough to attend.

The EPA's EV rules would necessitate enormous investments from the auto industry, driving up the average price per vehicles for consumers, and additionally electric vehicles are already much more expensive than traditional autos with internal combustion engines.

Mr. Goffman, EVs are much more expensive than gas-powered vehicles since they are. How do EPA's rules impact vehicle affordability for families?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Thank you, Congressman Edwards, for bringing that issue up because it is a central preoccupation of ours as well. These rules will not deliver the benefits that we just talked about unless the vehicles are attractive, appealing, and above-all affordable. And so, among other things, we are working with the auto in-

dustry itself. Many companies have already made a significant commitment to marketing EVs, and we are learning from them about what they are doing to address affordability, and what our rules need to do in order to support that.

We are also putting these rules in proposal form out in the wake of Congress itself having through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act introduced into the economy a number of measures whose purpose and ultimate effect will be to make the manufacturer of these vehicles less expensive and, therefore, give the car companies the opportunity to sell the vehicles they're planning to market at affordable prices.

Mr. EDWARDS. And so, what are some of the things that you have learned that you could share with this Committee that are going to make these more affordable? Because everything that I know right now shows that these vehicles are far more expensive on the American family.

Mr. GOFFMAN. Well, one of the things we have learned is the importance of lead time. We are here in 2023 having issued these proposals. We are working toward getting them into final. But one of the things we have learned from the companies is that they have already carefully mapped out business plans for the later years in this decade and the earlier years of 2030—in the 2030s, rather, to increasingly rely on EVs as part of their new car fleet. And that with that lead time and giving them the time to harvest the benefit of the investments that they are making that Congress has already made, they will be able to bring prices down so that people can afford these vehicles.

And the important thing from the agency's perspective is what we are learning is that we have to understand what they are doing since these standards are structured in the same way. The proposal we put out actually presents four different alternate approaches, so that we can continue to engage with the car companies, with other parts of the transportation sector in order to make sure that when we land these rules in final, it will reflect everybody's best understanding of how to make them afford—how to make these vehicles affordable.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you. Please excuse if I seem a little bit skeptical that I am not seeing anything, I am not hearing anything. I am certainly not seeing sticker prices on these vehicles be lowered to a point that families, at least in western North Carolina, could afford them. There is—and please hear me clearly, there is a huge concern from the people that I represent for them being forced to buy a vehicle that is well, well out of their range.

Many auto manufacturers expected to use the sale of internal combustion engine vehicles to pay for the transition to EVs. How would those rules affect that premise?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Well, one of the things we are seeing is that in the later part of this decade, when these rules start to phase in, companies will still be marketing well north of 40 million new internal combustion engine vehicles in their new car sales at, you know, as this rule ramps up. And, of course, under the proposal, the standards do not apply before model year 2027.

Mr. EDWARDS. All right. Thank you. Mr. Chair, I see I am out of time. I yield back.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you. The Chair now recognizes Ms. Brown from Ohio.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Under the Biden-Harris Administration, the commonsense regulations and rules put in place by the Environmental Protection Agency are prioritizing the health of our environment and our communities. We know that EPA's responsible for protecting the public from pollutants that might otherwise harm our health and negatively impact the environment, the climate.

For example, the average levels of lead in blood of Americans has steadily dropped since the 1970 when the EPA began to phaseout leaded gasoline, which was banned entirely in 1995. That is just one effort among so many in which the EPA's rules and requirements have served to protect the health and well-being of our communities. To be clear, the presence of lead is still a major problem in communities, like Cleveland. And we still have much work to do to remove lead and other pollutants from our air, water, and yes, pipes.

But the Biden-Harris Administration is working tirelessly to clean it all up, in particular, thanks to bipartisan infrastructure law, lead, pipe, and paint action plan, and investments from the Inflation Reduction Act.

When he passed the Bipartisan Inflation Law and the Inflation Reduction Act, it was a historic step toward combatting good climate crisis, while also addressing the pollution and pollutants that impact public health.

In addition to lead, other emissions from burning fossil fuels are actively harmful to the public, especially communities of color, which are repeatedly subjected to environmental injustices. Fortunately, we have agencies like the EPA playing a critical role in the fight to regulate those emissions and support healthier, longer, and better lives.

So, Mr. Goffman, what progress has the Biden-Harris led EPA made to lower pollutions and emissions under the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act among other policies?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Well, thank you for that. Thank you for that question. The Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act include a number of provisions that are already creating investments here in the United States for the components that auto manufacturers will need not only to make cleaner cars and trucks but to make them here and to make them at lower cost.

So, what we were doing with these proposals was, if you will, building upon those investments that Congress made in the first instance and now the private sector is making.

What our rules do at the proposal stage, at least, is—they are designed to harness those investments, so that 5 or 10 years from now, the cars and trucks that are being sold and coming onto the roadways will be much cleaner, not only operating with less or fewer CO2 emissions, but operating with fewer emissions, the whole change of pollutants that blight air quality and lead directly to avoidable illnesses and deaths.

Here we are in year three of the first term of the Administration, we have already finalized emissions standards for both cars and

trucks through model year 2026 for cars and conventional pollutants from diesel engines and trucks. And these proposals build on those actions that we have already taken.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you for that. And I would go on to say that as we all know, Black and Brown communities are disproportionately affected by both direct air pollution and the ramifications of climate change. And I want to also say I remain committed to highlighting and confronting those disparities. And I continue to thank President Biden for emphasizing this as a part of his mission as well.

Finally, Mr. Goffman, how does the EPA's rules ensure that all Americans, including communities of color have clean air?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Well, thank you for that question. I think you know that Administrator Regan has made it a priority so that all of EPA's resources, whether they're providing funding to communities or writing standards that industry can comply with and achieve reductions are designed in a way to provide benefits, not just to some Americans, but to all Americans, including with a focus on those communities that already at this point in history have born a greater burden of pollution and waste.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you. I just want to say, although the EPA is under threat from the right-wing extremist, I am grateful that the agency continues to work toward a cleaner future on behalf of the public. And I look forward to 30 years from now when we will view the phaseout of harmful pollutants in emissions as commonsense measure to protect public health similar to the ban on leaded gasoline. And with that, Mr. Chairman, thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. FALLON. The Chair now recognizes Mrs. Boebert from Colorado.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Goffman, are the EPA's rules to regulate light, medium, and heavy-duty vehicles economically feasible for middle class and hardworking American families living month to month and struggling with inflation?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Thank you for that question. It is a question that we take very seriously as well. And we have designed these rules to work hand in hand with the plans that we know the industry has to introduce and market clean—

Mrs. BOEBERT. Mr. Goffman, what is the average price of new combustion engine vehicles compared to the average price of a new electric vehicle?

Mr. GOFFMAN. I do not know the exact dollars. I know that today the EVs may be more expensive. But these rules—

Mrs. BOEBERT. So, the average price of a traditional internal combustion engine was \$45,600 while the average price of an electric vehicle was \$61,800. And if these unfavorable rules are finalized, your own estimates that I have seen suggests 67 percent of all new cars sold in the U.S. will need to be fully electric by 2032. Now, how much did the average price of an electric vehicle increase by last year?

Mr. GOFFMAN. I do not know. But—

Mrs. BOEBERT. It is 22 percent. From May 2022 to May 2023, it is increased 22 percent. So, it is not going down in price with these electric vehicles. We are seeing an increase. And by your own esti-

mates, the technological cost of this proposal could reach \$280 billion. That is increasing manufacturing costs by \$1,200 per vehicle.

Mr. Goffman, are you aware that in temperatures under 20 degrees Fahrenheit, electric vehicles lose nearly half of their charge in their batteries?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Yes.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Yes. So, in Colorado where we rely on four-wheel vehicles to get around in winter, many of these vehicles will be regulated out of existence under these proposed rules. How much does an electric vehicle battery cost to replace?

Mr. GOFFMAN. I do not know offhand, but you are putting your finger on important issues, which is exactly why the strategy reflected in these rules is to give industry years of lead time.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Well, you are regulating an industry out of existence here, and we are seeing it is less reliable. In Colorado, it is very common to have temperatures under 20 degrees Fahrenheit. And these batteries will not—will lose some of their charge.

Now, I have between \$5,000 and \$20,000 to replace an electric vehicle's batteries. And prolonged exposure to temperatures under 20 degrees can also compromise the electric vehicle's battery performance as much as 41 percent.

Now, how do you recommend that hardworking families who are struggling to get by absorb these additional costs associated with electric vehicles?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Well, our projection is that by the time these rules go into effect, both the industry and investments like those made in the IRA and the—

Mrs. BOEBERT. Oh, so we are just going to print more money to make up for that. So, I mean, we are seeing a 22 percent increase in one year for the cost of electric vehicles. Even the tires on electric vehicle wear 20 percent faster. I do not think that the average American taxpayer is looking for another Federal Government bailout for tires. I mean, over half of Americans have less than a thousand dollars in their savings account, and you are wanting them to spend more money on vehicles where the price is increasing, at 41 percent higher at risk for having to change out a battery, tires that wear 20 percent faster than your average car.

Now, please name two domestic mines, domestic mines that you support, Mr. Goffman, and that are critical to helping produce the amount of minerals necessary for the electric vehicles you have been praising today.

Mr. GOFFMAN. Well, the information I have is that in just under a year since the IRA was passed, 75 new facilities have been started to—

Mrs. BOEBERT. Domestic mines.

Mr. GOFFMAN. Including domestic mines.

Mrs. BOEBERT. Can you name any that you support? So, the Rosemont Mine and the Resolution Copper Mine are two mines Arizona blocked by the environmental extremist and the Federal bureaucrats that would produce massive amounts of copper in the United States. The Biden Administration has also blocked the Twin Metals Mine in northern Minnesota. And Democrats on the Natural Resources Committee oppose all domestic mining.

And if we do not mine for these minerals necessary, where are they going to come from, the 40,000 children mining for cobalt in the Congo with their bare hands in these China-owned mines? And then we buy these products from China and somehow feel virtuous about ourselves while they are building some 200 coal-fired energy plants.

These rules do not benefit the hardworking Americans that I represent. And I hope that you would reconsider them and the cost that the American family is going to have to absorb because of them. My time has expired, and I yield.

Mr. FALLON. The Chair recognizes Ms. Stansbury from New Mexico.

Ms. STANSBURY. All right. Well, good morning, everyone. It is a pleasure to be here to hold yet another hearing on electric vehicles and a delight to have the second opportunity to have the exact same hearing we had a couple of weeks ago. This definitely seems to be becoming a habit over the Oversight Committee. When the Majority does not get the answers that they want, they just have the hearing again and then beat up another witness.

And I do want to just say thank you, Mr. Goffman, for being here this morning. The EPA is always a popular punching bag of our friends on the other side of the aisle. And we all know the devastating impact that the Trump Administration had on the EPA and especially the morale of all of our Federal employees.

So, I want to thank you and all of our EPA employees who are sitting here with us today and all of them who are serving across the country to protect our environment, because we know that you are doing the work of the American people. We know that you are doing the work that the American people elected us in this body to do, which is to protect clean air, to protect clean water, and to ensure that all of our families have a livable planet for generations to come.

So, you know, we are here today to talk about climate change, to talk about this vehicle rule, and to talk about the actions that the Federal Government is taking to invest in the private sector and the public sector to make sure that we address this existential and catastrophic threat to all of humanity across the planet. And, you know, one of the reasons why I welcome the opportunity to have this hearing again is that it gives us another opportunity to highlight the important work that this Congress, last Congress passed in passing the most significant climate legislation ever in the history of the planet, and that is the Inflation Reduction Act.

And the work that the Biden Administration is doing through our Federal agencies to carry out the mandates that are in the Clean Air Act, that are in the Clean Water Act and the Inflation Reduction and Bipartisan Infrastructure Law to actually address our carbon emissions. And I think one of the things that folks really need to understand is that if we are going to address our carbon emissions and prevent a catastrophic climate calamity from affecting every single community on this planet, we have to do it sector by sector. We have to address it in the grid.

We have to address it in domestic energy security. We have to address it through building materials. And that is exactly what the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and the Inflation Reduction Act do.

And in particular, we have to address it in the transportation sector. Because transportation makes up about 29 percent of our emissions here in the United States.

Now, there was some comments made earlier about EPA overstepping its authority in terms of setting out emissions standards under the Clean Air Act. And while there was an unprecedented gutting of Federal authority by a political Supreme Court a few weeks ago, in Sackett, and in a previous Clean Air Act decision, we all know those of us who have worked in environmental policy, myself included, that the intent of Congress when they passed the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act was to protect American citizens, to protect our air, to protect our water.

And that they intended, in bipartisan basis, when both of those bills passed in Congress, and in the case of the Clean Water Act were signed by a Republican President to ensure that the American people would have a livable, breathable, drinkable clean planet for future generations. And so, it is just patently false that the EPA has overstepped their authority.

Now, with respect to this current rule, this is really about addressing that slice of the pie in the transportation sector. And so, Mr. Goffman, I wonder if you could just take one moment to please explain the significance of why we have to address it in the transportation sector and how this feeds into our overall efforts to combat climate change here in the U.S.

Mr. GOFFMAN. Well, thank you very much, Congresswoman, for doing as good a job as I have ever heard anybody do in laying out the entire vision of what it will take to address not just climate change but public health and air quality.

In your question, you provided exactly the context for these rules, which are but one of several pillars on which a new car, clean car fleet of on-highway vehicles is being built. What this set of proposals will do is work in an integrated way with the investments made by the Inflation Reduction Act and in the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law in the whole range of innovations and deployments of technologies that will allow us to travel on road, delivering freight and transporting passengers in a way that significantly reduces pollutants like CO₂. We projected that these proposals, if enacted, would achieve close to or certainly in excess of 9 billion tons of CO₂ reduced, which is close to twice 2020.

Mr. FALLON. Sorry, the gentlelady's time has expired.

Ms. STANSBURY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I will just say once again, thank you. This is a critical piece in fighting climate change, and we appreciate your service.

Mr. FALLON. The Chair recognizes Mrs. Luna from Florida.

Mrs. LUNA. Thank you. Mr. Goffman, thank you for coming in today. Just out of curiosity, have you ever owned a business?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Sorry?

Mrs. LUNA. Have you ever owned a business.

Mr. GOFFMAN. I have not.

Mrs. LUNA. How long have you been in this position?

Mr. GOFFMAN. My current position?

Mrs. LUNA. Yes, or at the EPA.

Mr. GOFFMAN. Two and a half years in this position.

Mrs. LUNA. What did you do previously?

Mr. GOFFMAN. I worked at Harvard Law School.

Mrs. LUNA. What did you do there?

Mr. GOFFMAN. I was the executive director of a legal research program.

Mrs. LUNA. OK. And you were there for how long?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Three years.

Mrs. LUNA. OK. And have you ever been to Anchorage, Alaska?

Mr. GOFFMAN. No, I have not.

Mrs. LUNA. Have you ever evacuated a hurricane in Florida?

Mr. GOFFMAN. No, I have not.

Mrs. LUNA. OK. And my final question, a little bit more personal, but how much do you make a year?

Mr. GOFFMAN. I think—

Mrs. LUNA. I know it is kind of random, but I am going somewhere with this.

Mr. GOFFMAN. About \$175,000 a year, or something like that.

Mrs. LUNA. Oh, my gosh. You are doing better than I think we are after taxes, right, guys? Anyways, the reason I asked that is because right now what I am seeing is the EPA, not necessarily you, but as a whole people advising on legislation that is impacting Americans who might not be as fortunate as us, right? So right now, the average cost of an electric vehicle is around \$66,000 a year. You have Black Americans average income 45K a year, and Hispanic Americans on average making about 58K a year.

So, when these policies go into place to force someone to buy a new vehicle, ultimately, what ends up happening is many people cannot afford that.

Places like Anchorage, Alaska, I had the opportunity of being able to go out on a CODEL recently. And, you know, what I am hearing from out there is they do rely on gas-powered vehicles, especially because of the environment that they are in. And in events like in Florida, when you have had to evac, we cannot necessarily rely on electric vehicles because of the fact that, one, Florida is a very big state, and also to the fact that there is not enough charging stations, nor is there infrastructure in place to, I think, provide the support needed for an entirely electric grid, not to mention there is a national security issue that goes hand in hand with that because of the fact that if the electric grid is hacked, ultimately what ends up happening is it can shut down our entire country, and that is something that I am sure that would even agree is a bad thing, correct.

Mr. GOFFMAN. Yes.

Mrs. LUNA. OK. So, my question for you is what is the EPA doing to actually talk to normal people, people not in Washington, people not at Harvard, people not in Congress to ensure that they are being taken care of because these policies, this legislation not only is it going to impact jobs, not only will it really attack the economy, but it is going to hurt Americans. So, are you guys doing any outreach to actual normal people to see if they agree with any of this legislation?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Thank you for that question. Engaging with everybody, if you will, is an absolute priority whenever we undertake rulemakings like this. We talk to industry, we talk to our coregulators in states, and we definitely arrange to meet with people in

communities across the country on a number of our rules. And what we hear the most from the people we talk to is that reducing pollution in their communities is a top priority.

Mrs. LUNA. I mean, I think everyone wants a clean community, but the problem is, is that if you have people in poverty because of laws that are not necessarily reflective of the areas that they live in, that is going to cause more issues long-term than I think what we can do not only to promote clean energy, which would be, in my opinion, nuclear energy, but then also, too, making sure that we are not sending our industries to places that do not respect the environment, and that is regardless of what we do here.

For example, in some of these Asian companies, they might be destroying the environment. So, it does not matter what we do here.

I have a question about Toyota Auto Corporation. It is estimated that about 1.2 million public charges by 2030 is what is needed. That's about \$400 per day. How many public chargers are going to be going online per day right now?

Mr. GOFFMAN. What I do know is that in the last couple years, there was a 40 percent increase in chargers, which now bring us up to a total of 130,000 chargers.

Mrs. LUNA. Do you know how many per day are going up? Because right now, to hit those metrics, it would need to be about 400 per day.

Mr. GOFFMAN. I do not know how many are going up, but I do know that Congress passed two significant pieces of legislation that will boost the deployment of chargers.

Mrs. LUNA. OK, and my final—

Mr. GOFFMAN. The private sector is making significant investments as well.

Mrs. LUNA. OK, and my final statement, because I am short on time, is like, look, I know you are in a very important position, but I just hope that you're taking into account people that might not necessarily have the resources when you guys are making these decisions because it is going to impact a lot of people, and it is going to hurt Americans.

Mr. GOFFMAN. Understood.

Mr. FALLON. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Krishnamoorthi from Illinois.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to Mr. Goffman for coming in.

A couple quick questions. One is, you know, I am Ranking Member of this new Committee in Congress dedicated to kind of winning the competition against the Chinese Communist Party, and this select committee is looking at the EV industry, in particular, as an area where the Chinese dominate the global electric vehicle industry.

How, if at all, would your rules help us in competing against the Chinese with regard to this crucial EV industry of the future?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Thank you for that question, because the competition you describe is a tremendous opportunity for America to expand its leadership in clean technologies. It is an opportunity that I think we, as a country, have already seized. It is reflected in the Inflation Reduction Act and the bipartisan infrastructure law, and

these rules are part of the greater—if I can put it this way—the greater fabric of the strategy to build out investment here in the United States in every part of what it takes to create a zero-emitting fleet on American roads.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. And I sense that there is broad concern about the cost of electric vehicles being so high. That has to come down for average, ordinary people to be able to access them.

But would you agree that the only way that the cost per car can actually go down is through economies of scale? That means making a lot of these with—over a certain period of time so that on a per unit basis, they go down in price.

Mr. GOFFMAN. That sounds to me, from what you just said, Congressman, exactly what the strategy of the major auto manufacturers is.

Two and a half years ago, or two years ago, the Detroit 3 announced a commitment to selling 50 percent EVs by 2030, and at least one of those companies followed up that announcement last fall by saying that its commitment was to make 100 percent new car EVs by 2035.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Was that General Motors?

Mr. GOFFMAN. General Motors, yes.

And that seems to be perfectly aligned with what you described.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. So, what you are saying is you are describing what the private sector is already doing.

Mr. GOFFMAN. Correct.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. I met with GM CEO Mary Barra yesterday in Detroit, along with Mike Gallagher, my Chairman, and several bipartisan Members of this Committee. Detroit is already ahead of the game. They are already doing what you are prescribing within these rules.

So, the question to me is this: How else do these rules help us? It appears that it helps to reduce carbon dioxide and greenhouse gas emissions. And why is that important? Why is it so important to reduce those emissions in the timeframe that you have indicated?

Mr. GOFFMAN. Well, it is important for several reasons. First of all, these rules are—again, work in partnership with the investments that Congress has already made so that what we are creating is not only—we, by we I mean the administration in Congress—is very powerful incentives to support what the private sector is planning to do, but these rules actually provide the American public with assurance that they will—that they will see the emissions reductions that we will get as we put more and more cleaner and cleaner cars on the road in a—

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. I would just—

Mr. GOFFMAN. In a timeframe when people today are suffering significant air quality-related health problems. And the buildup of greenhouse gases like CO₂ in the atmosphere is programming in increased weather disruption and climate disruption.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Now, you have proposed rule—you have proposed a rule, just as any administration does with regard to rulemaking, and you invite comments—

Mr. GOFFMAN. Correct.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY [continuing]. As part of this process.

Are you willing to potentially adjust any part of this rule based on the comments that you receive either from individuals, entities, anyone affected in this process?

Mr. GOFFMAN. We have designed the proposal to capitalize on the opportunity that commenters will provide us.

What we laid out is not just one approach. We laid out four different approaches, and we are counting on using that as a framework to engage with stakeholders, the public, states, and the industry so that when we finalize these rules, the approach we do adopt will achieve all of the objectives that everybody this morning spoke to.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Thank you. I appreciate your testimony.

Mr. FALLON. The Chair now recognizes Ranking Member Bush for a close.

Ms. BUSH. Thank you, Chairman.

Just like the last hearing on this topic, Republicans have focused heavily on the supposed cost of these regulations on consumers when their real concern is the cost of compliance for fossil fuel companies.

As the EPA has testified, these regulations will save money for consumers. More importantly, these regulations will reduce greenhouse gas and other pollutant emissions to help tackle—bless you—

Mr. FALLON. Thank you.

Ms. BUSH [continuing]. To help tackle the climate—see, we're trying to help—and improve public health.

As we have heard, these new standards will help avoid millions of metric tons of carbon pollution, as well as save hundreds of lives.

These regulations are based on the innovations of the auto industry, the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed emissions standards, as people would call ambitious, they are, yet attainable and support industry and consumers as we move toward more fuel-efficient and electric vehicles.

And if I sound like a broken record, it is only because we keep having the same hearing week in and week out. Nearly every hearing on this subcommittee has taken aim at the actions of the Biden Administration, and the Biden Administration has what they have done to move us closer toward a cleaner, more sustainable energy.

Republican's continued attack on the Biden Administration's regulatory process risks exacerbating our communities' exposure to worsening climate change and health risks, both of which have out-sized negative impacts on Black and Brown communities.

The climate crisis is here. It is now. And we have no time to waste. Congress must do everything we can to drastically reduce our emissions so the planet can continue to survive for our children and our grandchildren.

The EPA is doing just that by introducing these rules to curbe the emissions of pollutants from vehicles and power plants, two of the biggest sources of greenhouse gases. I thank them for doing this work to protect our planet and our people.

And as someone who knows people who have lost children during asthma attacks because of those complications, as someone who has had patients die from asthma attacks, all of those patients and all of the people I speak of are Black. As someone who lives with

asthma every single day and has almost lost her life from it, this deregulation kills. It harms our communities, and we must do everything to make sure our communities are safe.

Thank you and I yield back.

Mr. FALLON. So, I want to be clear about a few things. We would not have had a second hearing, we would not be here today, if the witness had agreed to testify a month ago, No. 1.

Two, trusting folks in industries like car manufacturing, Toyota, for example, said that they can produce 90 hybrid vehicles and the rare earth minerals that that takes, or they can produce, with those rare earth minerals, one electric car. What is better for the environment? Clearly, to have 90 hybrids out there than the one electric vehicle.

And I am also dismayed that there was absolutely no outrage whatsoever from our friends across the aisle that the EPA chose not to testify a month ago because it terribly unhealthy, and it sets a dangerous precedent.

Right now, we have a GOP-controlled House overseeing Democrat Federal agencies. There will be a day that comes when we have a Democrat House overseeing GOP Federal agencies, and I would assume that there was going to be outrage then. But because the precedent has been set that, apparently, it is just OK that folks do not clear their calendars for Congress when they work for Federal agencies—

Ms. BUSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. No—real quick. Go ahead.

Ms. BUSH. It is not that—Democrats understand that there was going to be another hearing. Thank you.

Mr. FALLON. We would not have had that second hearing if he had chosen to testify.

So, again, and to be respectful, I did not interrupt you, nor do I huff and puff when you speak. I listen respectfully, and I would expect the same.

Ms. BUSH. I asked you to yield.

Mr. FALLON. And we have so.

There was no outrage.

And then deregulation—this is some of the quotes that I heard. Deregulation kills people. We make people sick. There's lives on the line, and there's 60 years of evidence, and we are right-wing extremists. I mean, it is the same old script. It is just a different chapter.

But the problem is that a lot of that is not true when you look at empirical scientific evidence. Everyone has benefited from technological advancements that have been fueled by the energy sector. For instance, if you look at the life expectancy of Americans in 1900.

So, let us look at 1900. The carbon dioxide emissions worldwide were 1.95 billion metric tons. Today—well, in 2021, it was 37 billion metric tons. Nineteen times more. So, people must have been healthier in 1900.

The average life expectancy of an American in 1900 was 47 years of age. For African Americans, that comprised 95 percent of the non-White population at the time. It was only 33 years of age,

which is just heart-wrenching. So, Whites lived 42 percent longer than Blacks in the 1900's.

In 2019, life expectancy, with all that carbon in the air, for Whites was 79 years of age in this country, and for African Americans, it was 75 years of age. So, instead of a 42 percent gap, it was 5 percent, a drastic reduction and wonderful trend for parity.

But then interestingly enough, if you look at folks that make it to 70 years of age, believe it or not, African Americans live slightly longer than Whites that reach that age. And at 85, it is 50 percent Black folks that reach 85 years of age, live 50 percent longer at that point than White folks. Just interesting.

So, we have agencies like FERC saying that we are risking catastrophic failures in our grid. And catastrophic, by definition, is a momentous tragic event ranging from extreme misfortune to utter overthrow or ruin.

We have to have our agencies working together and be responsible to Congress. That was something that should have been completely bipartisan, but, again, we heard no outrage whatsoever.

And then, as always, it does not seem like anyone wants to recognize on the other side of the aisle that the United States is trending in the right direction. We are doing good things because we are responsible caretakers, and we have to find balance because the people that whine and moan about too much carbon emissions have carbon footprints themselves. I do not see anybody weaving their own clothing from hemp.

You have combustion engine vehicles, flying airplanes, and enjoy these advancements, and our country has reduced our carbon emissions in the last 20 years by over 20 percent. But our greatest political rival, China, seems rather callous to their carbon emissions and have increased their carbon emissions by 300 percent.

So where, again, is the picketing at Chinese consulates and embassies? Where are the Democrats in this Congress that mention that? It does not seem to happen and that is unfortunate.

Well, again, I wish we had not had to have this hearing again because we all are busy, but the EPA decided that, you know, they had more important things to do than testify in front of Congress, and I hope that never happens again, whether it is the EPA or any other Federal agency, and whether the Republicans are in charge of Congress or the Democrats are because this is about the process, and it is about the institution, and it is about the American people. We are their elected representatives.

Thank you.

And with that, and without objection, all Members will have five legislative days within which to submit materials and to submit additional written questions for witnesses, which will be forwarded to witnesses for their response.

If there is no further business, without objection, the Subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:19 a.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

