This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1

	1
1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS SALANDRO
3	HIF341180
4	
5	
6	THE MISSION OF THE U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL
7	PROTECTION AGENCY
8	THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2017
9	House of Representatives
10	Subcommittee on Environment
11	Committee on Energy and Commerce
12	Washington, D.C.
13	
14	
15	
16	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in
17	Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Shimkus
18	[chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.
19	Members present: Representatives Shimkus, McKinley, Barton,
20	Blackburn, Harper, Olson, Johnson, Flores, Hudson, Cramer,
21	Walberg, Carter, Duncan, Walden (ex officio), Tonko, Ruiz,
22	Peters, Green, DeGette, McNerney, Cardenas, Dingell, Matsui, and

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

2

Pallone (ex officio).

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

23

Staff present: Ray Baum, Staff Director; Mike Bloomquist, Deputy Staff Director; Samantha Bopp, Staff Assistant; Adam Buckalew, Professional Staff Member, Health; Allie Bury, Legislative Clerk, Energy/Environment; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Kelly Collins, Staff Assistant; Jerry Couri, Chief Environmental Advisor; Zachary Dareshori, Staff Assistant; Jordan Davis, Director of Policy and External Affairs; Wyatt Ellertson, Research Associate, Energy/Environment; Margaret Tucker Fogarty, Staff Assistant; Adam Fromm, Director of Outreach and Coalitions; Ali Fulling, Legislative Clerk, Oversight & Investigations, Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection; Jordan Haverly, Policy Coordinator, Environment; Zach Hunter, Director of Communications; A.T. Johnston, Senior Policy Advisor, Energy; Peter Kielty, Deputy General Counsel; Ben Lieberman, Senior Counsel, Energy; Mary Martin, Deputy Chief Counsel, Energy & Environment; Drew McDowell, Executive Assistant; Brandon Mooney, Deputy Chief Energy Advisor; Mark Ratner, Policy Coordinator; Annelise Rickert, Counsel, Energy; Christopher Santini, Counsel, Oversight & Investigations; Dan Schneider, Press Secretary; Peter Spencer, Professional Staff Member, Energy; Madeline Vey, Policy This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

Coordinator, Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection; Evan Viau,
Legislative Clerk, Communications & Technology; Hamlin Wade,
Special Advisor, External Affairs; Everett Winnick, Director of
Information Technology; Priscilla Barbour, Minority Energy
Fellow; Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff Director; Jacqueline Cohen,
Minority Chief Environment Counsel; Jean Fruci, Minority Energy
and Environment Policy Advisor; Evan Gilbert, Minority Press
Assistant; Caitlin Haberman, Minority Professional Staff Member;
Rick Kessler, Minority Senior Advisor and Staff Director, Energy
and Environment; John Marshall, Minority Policy Coordinator; Jon
Monger, Minority Counsel; Alexander Ratner, Minority Policy
Analyst; Andrew Souvall, Minority Director of Communications,
Outreach and Member Services; Tuley Wright, Minority Energy and
Environment Policy Advisor; C.J. Young, Minority Press Secretary;
and Catherine Zander, Minority Environment Fellow.

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

Mr. Shimkus. The subcommittee will now come to order. Before I begin my opening statement, I want to make a general announcement to members about the process today. After months of trying to find a mutually acceptable date for a hearing, the committee was able to finally get agreement with the administrator to join us and we announced it. At the end of last week, however, the committee learned Mr. Pruitt was being summoned to meet with his boss, the President, for 90 minutes around lunch.

Rather than agreeing to start the whole process over and/or the hearing earlier and to have a defined end time, or push the entire hearing to a late afternoon start time, or try to find another mutually acceptable date, we have come to an agreement which we understand is not ideal, but gives members maximum flexibility to personally question the administrator about the Agency's missions.

Therefore, we will proceed with opening statements, the administrator's testimony, and members' questions until 11:00 a.m. We will recess at that time and reconvene at 2:00 p.m. in 2322 which is upstairs. We expect the administrator will stay with us until committee members who are present or want to ask questions have been given their turn to ask questions. I will also note that there is going to be a voting period in this

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

last block and we are going to try with the help of my colleagues to keep the hearing going through that vote series. I have done it before years ago. It is a juggling, but we are going to try to get that done. Administrator Pruitt, I want to thank you for joining us today and discussing issues the Environment Subcommittee has jurisdiction over. Notably, the Clean Air Act, CERCLA, which is a Superfund act, the Solid Waste Disposal Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and Toxic Substances Control Act, one that this committee is very proud of passing in the last Congress.

A few years ago, we began an effort to tackle updating and authorizing a number of these laws and have been waiting for the opportunity for you and someone from your agency to be here so that we can discuss the Administration's position on these important changes to the laws and how EPA implements them. We are also tasked with the oversight of these EPA programs and we look forward to being able to start conducting oversight hearings soon.

Today, we would like to start dialogue with you about your vision and priorities for the EPA. You noted at the outset of your tenure at the EPA that your goal was to refocus EPA on its intended mission, return power to the states and create an

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	atements
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	d to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

environment where jobs can grow. And your agenda focused on the three Es: environment and protecting the environment; economy, sensible regulations that allow economic growth; and engagement, engaging with state and local partners. You also stated that EPA would, and I quote, operate with the statutes that Congress passes and not reimagining authority to pick winners and losers. That sounds like you are headed in the right direction.

We support analyzing regulatory barriers to determine whether they create unnecessary burdens or impede job creation and we want to work with you to make sure that the EPA develops and implements regulations that protect the environment while promoting growth and creating jobs. You said it best in a statement you made when you kicked off your back to the basics agenda earlier this year. We can and we will achieve a clean air and a clean water and we will also have strong economic growth and job creation at the same time.

We have some specific areas of focus that we would like to discuss today and continue to work on with you and your staff as we go forward. The first is Superfund cleanup. You have indicated that Superfund cleanup is a priority of the Agency and that several clean up efforts have been, and I quote, restored to the rightful place at the center of the Agency's core mission,

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

./

close quote.

You have also noted that you intend to figure out ways to cut through bureaucratic red tape that has slowed the cleanup of Superfund sites and that EPA is creating a list of the top ten sites that the Agency can aggressively address. We want to work with you on these efforts and work together to figure out what Congress can do to help make Superfund cleanups more efficient.

The next issues are the Toxic Substances Control Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act. Last year, this committee was responsible for overhauling TSCA and we are interested in the appropriate and the timely implementation of the rules that are the outgrowth of the new law. We also look forward to work with the Agency as we have reauthorized funding and make improvements in the law to improve compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Last but not least, the Clean Air Act. Our members are actively engaged on several air issues like the Clean Power Plan, the EPA's recent ozone standard which has created obstacles to new infrastructure development and manufacturing. We also want to look into addressing the challenges relating to obtaining air permits required for new construction and expansions of the

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attribı	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

existing facilities under EPA's New Source Review program.

Administrator Pruitt, the long and the short of it is that we have an agenda packed with legislative and oversight activities and we need the EPA to be engaged participants that work with us as we move forward. We need to be assured that the Agency will send us witnesses for legislative and oversight hearings and in turn we will work with you to figure out where Congress needs to act to help you accomplish your mission, the Agency's goals of providing regulatory certainty, balancing environmental benefits and economic practicalities, and restoring confidence to regulated entities across the country.

Thank you for coming up here and we look forward to continuing this conversation in the new year. And with that I will yield back my time and turn to my friend from New York, Mr. Tonko, for 5 minutes.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Shimkus follows:]

165 | ********** INSERT 1*******

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you,
Administrator Pruitt. Thank you for being here this morning.
However, I fully expected that you, Mr. Administrator, as a proud
Oklahoman, would have been here Sooner.

[Laughter.]

Mr. Tonko. All right. In all seriousness, Mr.

Administrator, I hope this is the first of many appearances, regular appearances before our Energy and Commerce Committee.

Your predecessors came before this committee frequently and I can tell you it wasn't because they liked being berated every other 5 minutes for a few hours, it was because they understood that they had a responsibility to be accountable to Congress.

So I expect moving forward you will provide administration witnesses, responses to letters, and technical assistance quickly when we ask. I know many members have serious concerns about the direction of EPA in the past year which is why there is so much interest in today's hearing. Members will raise questions about how you have chosen to be a steward of taxpayer funds, who has had access to you, and the growing influence of industry at the Agency.

Members will also question the rollback of a number of safeguards that were put into place to protect human health.

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

In July, the New York Times published an article, and I quote, Counseled by Industry, Not Staff, EPA Chief Is Off to a Blazing Start, which reported more than 30 environmental rules being delayed or undone. And often these public health safeguards are being undone with little or no legal or scientific justification.

I think it is worthy noting that, historically, the majority of EPA rules have withstood legal challenges, including challenges led by you in your capacity as Oklahoma's attorney general. EPA's decisions should be guided by sound science, not corporate interests and these concerns touch every office under your charge -- clean water, air quality, contaminated lands, chemical safety, pesticides to name a few.

From my view, rules across the Agency are being undone capriciously with little regard to the human impacts or the science that went into developing them. In fact, many states and industries were partners during the process when these rules were developed. Frankly, I believe EPA has all the signs of an agency captured by industry. You shouldn't need to be traded on the New York Stock Exchange or need an invite to a private steak dinner at a Trump hotel in order to get an audience with the EPA administrator.

I am particularly concerned about Agency actions on climate

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	atements
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	d to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

change. The Fourth National Climate Assessment Climate Science Special Report, a thorough, comprehensive report by the federal government has reaffirmed what the scientific community has long known, climate change is real, primarily caused by human activity, and a serious threat to our people and our economy.

Despite this scientific consensus, EPA has begun to roll back rules at the behest of special interests to address greenhouse gas emissions which have been developed over many years, backed by science, and include economic impact studies. This is just one example in a trend of dismissing the role of science at EPA.

Scientific integrity of the Agency must be protected.

Instead, we have witnessed the proposed elimination of research funding and eroding of technical and scientific capacity. The dismissal of qualified members of the Scientific Advisory Board the removal of information from EPA's website and the censorship of Agency scientists from participating in public events are incredibly troubling. Finally, I want to take a minute to recognize the work done by EPA's career employees. I know these dedicated public servants joined the Agency to protect human health and the environment and are to be commended for their hard work in this difficult environment.

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	atements
within n	nay be inaccura	ate, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Com	mittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

But as the workforce is reduced, as the advice of the experts is ignored, and as morale at the Agency decreases, I know there will be an inclination to pursue other career opportunities.

Our country cannot afford to lose the institutional knowledge at an agency as important as EPA or fail to attract the next generation of qualified, dedicated public servants. I want to thank EPA's employees, know that your work is greatly appreciated by members here and beneficial to Americans across our great country.

Back to basics does not mean starving the Agency of its resources and personnel that it needs to do its job. It does not mean giving lip service to protecting clean air and water while rolling back dozens of essential rules. EPA's success has been about making steady progress over time and EPA has proven to be a resilient agency in the past, but this year we have witnessed a number of alarming decisions and I hope we will get answers to better understand some of those decisions today, Mr. Administrator.

And again we welcome you before this committee. Thank you so much and I yield back, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair now recognizes the Chairman of the full committee, Mr. Walden

2.40

254 | from Oregon, for 5 minutes.

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

2.62

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

Mr. Walden. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, Mr. Administrator. We are delighted to have you before the House Energy and Commerce Committee. I think this is your first oversight hearing on The Hill and we are delighted that we could have you here to tell us what is going on at the EPA, to take our questions and to hear what we have to say. I am obviously disappointed the President called you out in between, but I appreciate the fact you will be here this morning and come back this afternoon and continue to participate in this process.

With this I am going to yield briefly to my friend from Oklahoma who would like to formally introduce you to the committee, and with that I will yield 30 seconds to Mr. Mullin from Oklahoma.

Mr. Mullin. Thank you, Chairman Walden. Thank you, Chairman Shimkus, for allowing me to participate. I have the great privilege of introducing Oklahoma's own Scott Pruitt to our EPA administrator. Thank you, sir, for being here.

First, I want to thank Mr. Pruitt for making himself available for today's hearing. Administrator Pruitt and his team have worked tirelessly to bring the EPA back to its core mission, protecting our environment in common sense ways with input from

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The star	tements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be po	sted on
the Comr	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

our states, local government, and tribes to a collaborated approach which is now very -- which is a breath of fresh air.

Nobody wants to take care of our backyards more than us in our states. That is why I want to thank Mr. Pruitt for doing what is right by having the input of those with interests there.

Mr. Pruitt, thank you for coming here today. Thank you for making the whole state proud. I appreciate you and I yield back to Chairman Walden.

Mr. Walden. I thank the gentleman for his introduction of our witness today. And as you know, Administrator Pruitt, the committee you are appearing before today is charged by the House of Representatives with legislative and oversight responsibilities for the bulk of the statutes that the EPA implements. We may not write the check to the EPA -- the appropriators claim to do that -- but we are your authorizing agency or committee.

It has been almost 10 months since you were sworn in as administrator of an agency that turned 47 this past Monday, so today I would like to begin with what will hopefully be a continuing conversation about the agency that you oversee, your vision for it, and what challenges you face. I am particularly intrigued by your back to basics concepts and your stated intent

2.84

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	atements
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	d to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

to return EPA from its freewheeling administrative pursuits to its mission of protecting air, soil, and water and doing so according to explicit dictates of Congress. I hope that this view of governing will guide your EPA, rather than efforts to end run Congress in the Federal Register or on the courthouse steps.

I also want to discuss the goals you are establishing for the programs at EPA and the metrics you intend to use to measure their progress. In particularly, I want to know that you have a plan to address staffing issues identified by the Agency's Inspector General for over the last 2 decades. This is a 20-year-old problem you are inheriting, but it is one I think we both take seriously.

So we appreciate your commitment to budget transparency and as we want to make sure the public knows how each law is being implemented and how the money is being spent, I expect that back to basics is not an abdication of environmental protection, but rather a rededication of mastering the most fundamental aspects of EPA's mission.

Whether it is cleaning up Superfund sites, ensuring that safe drinking water is being piped into people's homes, or keeping air clean and safe to breathe, this is the primary mission of

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	atements
within n	nay be inaccura	ate, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Com	mittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

the EPA. While these jobs may sound mundane, as any football fan will appreciate they are like the essential blocking and tackling techniques and so we appreciate what you are doing on all of that.

I also want to thank you and your team for your attention to the Superfund cleanup in the Portland Harbor. While this area is not in my district, it is in my state and what happens at the Port of Portland has an impact on all Oregonians. You brought a fresh and a welcome approach to this complicated and costly cleanup.

Unlike the prior administration, you have proven that this administration wants to actually clean up this environmental mess and do the work in a common sense manner in close working partnership with local stakeholders. To paraphrase an old song, if you can do it there you can do it anywhere.

And so I thank you for being here. I thank you for your collaborative work on the Portland Superfund cleanup. We know we have more effort to achieve there, but everybody -- well, not everybody, but most people affected by it including the port and city and everybody else saying thank you, now we feel like we have hope and a chance to get this done right, so thanks for your work there.

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
	17
342	With that Mr. Chairman, I would yield back the balance of
343	my time to the committee.
344	[The prepared statement of Mr. Walden follows:]
345	
346	**************************************

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	tements
within ma	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be po	sted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair now recognizes the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone from New Jersey, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have served in Congress alongside both Democratic and Republican administrations and in my experience the lack of transparency and cooperation from this Administration is completely unprecedented. The Environmental Protection Agency under Administrator Pruitt has consistently failed to respond to congressional oversight requests. In a few instances when we have actually received responses they are perfunctory at best.

EPA has also refused to testify at legislative and oversight hearings and has refused to respond to some basic requests for technical assistance on legislation that has moved or is moving its way through this committee. Even today, after finally agreeing to appear before this authorizing committee some 10 months into his term, Administrator Pruitt is planning to leave after only 1 hour. And this is not the way any agency is supposed to interact with its authorizing committee.

I would hope that this frustration is not only felt by committee Democrats and I would hope to see a change from both the EPA and the overall Trump administration. This lack of

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

transparency applies not just to Congress but also to the press, the public, and even EPA's career staff. The stories coming from the Agency paint a pretty bleak picture. While we know the Administration has wasted more than \$58,000 of taxpayer money on private jets and noncommercial flights, Mr. Pruitt's schedule has been largely kept secret and this week a major newspaper had to sue the Agency for access to this important public record.

Meanwhile, EPA career staff have been excluded from meetings. When they do participate they are apparently blocked from bringing phones and even pen and paper with them. Moreover, Administrator Pruitt has reportedly used \$25,000 of public funds to build a secret phone booth in his office to further isolate himself from the staff and any and all scrutiny. And why all the secrecy, one has to wonder. Mr. Pruitt has also launched an unprecedented assault on independent science, purging academic scientists with no conflicts from Science Advisory Board and replacing them with industry employees. At the same time, he has ignored the advice and conclusions of his own scientific staff on numerous occasions.

Today's hearing is supposedly about the mission of the EPA.

According to the EPA itself, the Agency mission is to protect
human health and the environment and no one cares more about that

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

mission than EPA's career staff. Ignoring the staff, undermining the staff, and cutting the staff out of decisions, amounts to ignoring and undermining that mission, in my opinion.

Administrator Pruitt has been on a press tour lately proclaiming his vision of what the EPA's mission means and what it means to be an environmentalist and his words ring hollow because his actions have consistently and systematically undermined protections for human health and the environment.

I have only 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman, so I can't list all the actions the administrator has taken to undermine protections for public health and specifically for vulnerable populations including workers, children, and Native American tribes, but I want to give a few examples.

First, pulling out of the Paris agreement; second, pulling back the Clean Power Plan; third, rolling back protections from toxic air pollutants including mercury, methane, and smog then handing implementation of the toxic chemicals reform law just signed into law last year over to industry lobbyists; reversing the decision to ban the toxic pesticide chlorpyrifos; delaying and undermining the risk management planning program that should protect workers and communities; and, finally, reversing course on Superfund financial assurance requirements putting more of

This is a preliminar	y, unedited	transcript.	The s	statements
within may be inacco	ırate, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to the
speaker. A link to th	e final, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Committee's webs	ite as soon as	it is available	e .	

413 the burden on taxpayers and less on polluters.

With accomplishments like this, it is no wonder that the administrator is working so hard to hide his actions. But the American people need transparency and they deserve honesty from both the EPA and the White House and perhaps today's hearing will be the beginning of a new, more transparent era.

To his credit, Administrator Pruitt reached out to me in advance of this hearing and requested a meeting which we did have, but if the administrator wants to improve his relationship with the members of the committee, the steps he needs to take are clear. He needs to provide the documents we have requested and will request in the future. He needs to provide substantive answers to our oversight questions, and he needs to make himself and other EPA staff available as witnesses routinely.

And if the administrator wants to earn the trust of the American people he needs to stop the secrecy and his war on science and reverse the systematic rollback of public protections. It is the mission of the EPA to protect the public health and the environment and not attack it. And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time.

Now we turn to our guest. We would like to welcome and thank you, our distinguished witness, U.S. EPA Administrator Scott

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	tatements
within may	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribut	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

Pruitt,	for	being	here	today	y. You	u will	have	an	opp	ortuni	ty to
give an	oper	ning st	tatemen	nt fo	llowed	by a	round	d of	qu∈	estions	from
members	. W	e appr	eciate	you	being	here	and y	ou (are	recogn	ized
for 5 m	i nut	0 9									

435

436

437

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	tements
within ma	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be po	sted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

STATEMENT OF SCOTT PRUITT, U.S. EPA ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Pruitt. Well, Chairman Shimkus, Ranking Member Tonko, Chairman Walden, Ranking Member Pallone, it is good to see you this morning, and other members that I have not had the chance to meet. I look forward to the discussion today. It was a year ago today that the President announced my nomination to the Environmental Protection Agency; thus began the process, the confirmation process which culminated in mid-February and began serving in that timeframe as well.

It has been a very, very consequential and I think exciting 10 months as I have been at the EPA. We have focused our efforts on three core principles as we are seeking to make decisions.

As I said during the Senate confirmation process, rule of law would again take center as we make decisions around the responsibilities that I have as administrator.

Fundamentally, my job as the administrator of the EPA is to administer statutes that you have passed as Congress to advance the objectives in those statutes from the Clean Air Act to the Clean Water Act across TSCA and CERCLA and a host of federal statutes. And rule of law matters, because as we act and adopt regulation, if we act untethered to a statute it creates

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The stat	tements
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be po	sted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

uncertainty in the marketplace and those that have expectations placed upon them don't know how to conduct themselves. And so rule of law is not something that is academic. It is not something that is just legal. It truly impacts how we do our job at the Agency.

And secondly, I have tried to emphasize process. Process matters as well. It is this body that has required federal agencies, executive agencies to go through the EPA to adopt rules that are consistent with comment and informed discussions that take place over a period of time.

Where a proposed rule takes place comment occurs, we respond to that comment on the record, and then finalize our decisions based upon the comments provided. Just one example, during the Waters of the United States rule of 2015 over a million comments were submitted to the Agency as that definition was adopted, and the Agency took the very, very important step of responding to each of those to make a decision. The same needs to take place today. And so we have incorporated changes at the Agency to respect process to make sure that citizens' concerns across the country are heard and that we respond on the record to those concerns. And then, thirdly, and some of you have mentioned this in your opening comments as well, is a commitment to

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

federalism. Federalism is something, again is not just a legal or academic concept, it is something that you have put into statutes, many statutes. You have prescribed authority to states across this country, because when we work together with states to achieve better outcomes with air and water quality it serves the citizens of your respective states. And I will say to you, 2 days after being sworn in as EPA Administrator, I had 18 to 20 governors in my office on a Sunday -- Democrats and Republicans -- Governor Dayton of Minnesota to Governor Herbert to Utah. And we talked about a host of issues on air quality and water quality and Superfund and we began a journey that started in February.

And I have visited almost 30 states since that time, visiting with governors and respected DEQs to advance the issues of the respective states. And the reason that is important is because the issues in Utah, the second most driest state in the country, are different than the water issues in Minnesota. And so we must work with our partners at the state level to achieve better outcomes and that has been a focus along with these issues of process and rule of law.

I want you to know this dialogue that begins today is important to me. I have met with some of you individually.

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

have met with many of your colleagues across the rotunda in the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans, on issues that impact their states. I know that these are very difficult issues that we handle at the Agency. I seek to engage in a civil discourse with you. I seek to have a thoughtful discussion about how we can advance the objectives of what you have passed in these statutes and I appreciate the opportunity. And I do hope, Ranking Member Pallone, that we can begin a good discussion going forward into 2018 on these issues and look forward to the questions today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Pruitt follows:]

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time.

I also want to note that a full statement of the administrator has been placed into the record. I failed to say that earlier.

And then I would like to recognize myself for 5 minutes to start the round of questioning. Again thank you for being here.

At a recent Oversight Subcommittee hearing, EPA's Office of Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office testified that EPA cannot ensure that it has the right people in the right places with the right skills and competencies to accomplish its mission. According to the Inspector General, EPA offices would probably achieve better results if they knew more precisely what the requirements were and what kind of people it needs to address them.

In addition, EPA has not conducted a workload analysis in over 20 years. It seems to me that a back to basics agenda for your agency must include this type of analysis to make sure the Agency is operating optimally. Can you assure me that you intend to perform this workforce analysis?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. We are actually engaged in that process now. There is a gentleman by the name of Henry Darwin that is the CEO at the Agency. He worked for Governor Ducey in the state of Arizona. We are actually partnering with Toyota to begin a

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

Lean process at the Agency to evaluate management practices. The Agency for many years, and this is something that I found surprising, has not measured outcomes consistently. We are actually creating a dashboard of monitoring in air quality and water quality, Superfund remediation across the full spectrum of our responsibilities to measure progress in each of those areas on a weekly and monthly basis.

And that has been incorporated into the program offices at the EPA, but it is also being incorporated in the regions across the country and that is one thing that I will share with you that I think has been very challenging as I have taken over this position. We have ten regions across the country, as you know, from San Francisco to Atlanta, Chicago, Boston, and there is a great deal of inconsistency with respect to permitting, compliance and assistance, enforcement in these issues with respect to how we administer the statutes.

And we need, I think, a more coordinated, collaborative process to ensure that we don't have different approaches in Region 8 in Denver versus, you know, Region 3 in Philadelphia, so that process is ongoing, Mr. Chairman. It is a very important process. And I think a performance based, metric based approach to these program offices that we are engaged in is so, so important

because it enlivens, I think empowers employees.

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570

571

572

573

574

575

576

577

578

579

580

581

582

583

You mentioned, Ranking Member Pallone, the career staff at the Agency. I will say to you that as we have engaged in our Superfund focus I have had career employees come up to me and say thank you for awakening areas that have been dormant for a little while and they are very thankful for the focus that we have placed on some of those core missions. And the measurement and metrics that we are incorporating going forward is a part of this that you referenced, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you very much. That is important to me. One of the reasons why I care so much about the workforce issue is the implementation of the Toxic Substance Control Act. In particular, I want to comment to the new chemicals. Since the law's enactment, the Agency has needed to reassign staff from other offices to address a sizeable backlog in the new chemical application.

Your team helped clear out substantially the backlog, but I fear as soon as the borrowed EPA workers go back to their regular jobs backlogs will come back to be the norm of the operation.

What assurances can you give me that the new chemical applications will stay on a schedule for the future?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, we had many, and I want to commend

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

Congress on the good work that was done in updating TSCA. I mean that was a decade in the making and for you to do that was a very important thing for our office. There were deadlines that you put in that statute, as an example, rules that were supposed to come out by June of this year. I made a commitment during the confirmation process to meet those deadlines and we in fact did those rules under TSCA.

The other area that you cite, Mr. Chairman, was the backlog. As you know, the changes you made in the TSCA statute required that before chemicals entered the flow of commerce our agency had to affirm or approve those chemicals. And there was a backlog of roughly 700 of those chemicals that were at the office before we arrived and we did actually clear that backlog out by July by dedicating resources there. It is a commitment going forward that we do that timely. We are adopting rules now to ensure that the process is defined so that folks know what is expected to meet the deadlines going forward.

Mr. Shimkus. Let me cut down my last question to just a simple question on what is the -- so we talk West Lake, this is parochial, West Lake in the St. Louis metropolitan area. Are you on track to issue the Record of Decision and can you give us a sense of timing?

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The staten	nents
within may	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attributed to	o the
speaker. A	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be poste	ed on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

Mr. Pruitt. Yes, we are, Mr. Chairman. We are going to -- we should be able to announce a decision in the month of January. There is proposals that I am looking at this month to make a decision on West Lake. It has been a long time coming, specifically 27 years. It is a very important issue to the people of St. Louis.

For those of you who don't know on the committee, 8,000 tons of uranium comingled with 38,000 tons of solid waste dispersed over a very large geographical area, buried about 80 feet deep, and it has taken the Agency 27 years to make a decision on whether to excavate or cap the site. That is unacceptable and the decision is coming in the month of January.

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you very much.

Let me now turn to the ranking member, Mr. Tonko, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And again welcome, Administrator.

Mr. Pruitt. Thank you.

Mr. Tonko. During your confirmation hearing you said that you, and I quote, have no firsthand knowledge, close quote, of the EPA's Scientific Integrity Policy. However, you did commit to reviewing the policy and following federal guidance regarding

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

62.3

624

625

626

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The s	statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattribu	ted to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be	posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.	

	32
628	scientific integrity. Now that you have had some time at the
629	Agency, have you reviewed the EPA's Scientific Integrity Policy?
630	Mr. Pruitt. Yes. We have reviewed that and implemented
631	it at the Agency.
632	Mr. Tonko. So have you reaffirmed the Scientific Integrity
633	Policy to scientists as well as political appointees at EPA?
634	Mr. Pruitt. It is a matter of priority to make sure that
635	we have a scientific review of rules at the Agency that are
636	objective, transparent, and peer-reviewed, and that is a
637	commitment that we are enforcing at the Agency, Mr. Ranking
638	Member.
639	Mr. Tonko. Okay. Thank you, sir. And an essential
640	component of scientific integrity is strong safeguards against
641	conflicts of interest. Have you required recusals among your
642	staff, including yourself, when serious conflicts of interest
643	occur?
644	Mr. Pruitt. Absolutely. We have done that and we will
645	continue to do that. And that is one of the areas that has been
646	mischaracterized with respect to some of these advisory boards.
647	Mr. Tonko. Okay. Thank you, sir. I only have 5 minutes,
648	so if I could move along. I have been very concerned by changes

to EPA's Science Advisory Board. These concerns are shared by

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the greater. A link to the final official transcript will be nested on
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
33
the scientific community. Mr. Chair, I would like to enter this
letter signed by over 1,000 scientists into the record as well
as the letter from the American Geophysical Union which represents
more than 60,000 scientists.
Mr. Shimkus. Yes, I am sure we will. Let me make sure my
staff sees it and then we will.
Mr. Tonko. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Administrator Pruitt, do you believe scientists are a
special interest group?
Mr. Pruitt. I am sure I don't understand the question,
Ranking Member Tonko.
Mr. Tonko. Well, are they a fundamental contribution to
the Agency or seen as a special interest?
Mr. Pruitt. Look, when we engage in rulemaking at the Agency
we build a record. And scientists at the Agency whether it is
in the chemical shop, the air program office, it is important
that we hear from our scientists internal to the Agency
Mr. Tonko. Thank you.
Mr. Pruitt but also those advisory committees in
building the record and that is a point of emphasis, absolutely

receive EPA grant money are less qualified to give technical

Thank you. Do you believe scientists that

Mr. Tonko.

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The stat	ements
within may	be inaccura	te, incomp	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker. A	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will be pos	sted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

advice	to	EPA	than	states	or	industry	which	may	also	have	а
financi	ial	rela	ations	ship wi	th t	the Agency	y?				

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I believe that these advisory committees as you know them are independent advisory committees to the Agency to equip us in making informed decisions about the efficacy of rules that we adopt. And these advisory committees, Ranking Member Tonko --

Mr. Tonko. It is --

Mr. Pruitt. May I finish?

Mr. Tonko. Yes.

Mr. Pruitt. The advisory committees --

Mr. Tonko. If you could just answer the question though too.

Mr. Pruitt. I am.

Mr. Tonko. Okay.

Mr. Pruitt. These advisory committees had scientists serving in an independent capacity. Twenty of them made up three of the committees that have received \$77 million from the Agency in grants. That causes a perception or an appearance of a lack of independence in advising the Agency on a host of issues. And we went to those scientists and advised them that they could continue serving on these advisory committees or receive the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

grants but they could not do both, to ensure the independence of the counsel they were providing to us in the rulemaking process.

Mr. Tonko. Administrator, can you provide specific examples of a time when an EPA grant recipient on an advisory committee provided conflicted advice?

Mr. Pruitt. I can say to you that as a grantee, we the grantor, Ranking Member, and we have an ongoing obligation to oversee those grants, that creates an appearance of a lack of independence and that was addressed with the policy that we instituted. And we can provide you examples, many examples of scientists who received grants over a period of time that were substantial and it called into question that independence and we addressed that to the policy that we implemented.

Mr. Tonko. At the same time, does it make sense to ignore the advice of the very scientists that EPA determines are worthiest of grant funding?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, we are not in fact. We simply said to those individuals that they could continue receiving the grants and advise the Agency in the counseling role or receive the grants and continue providing that authority we granted them to provide substance to the Agency going forward.

Mr. Tonko. I would just hope that they would be seen as

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

a very reliable source. EPA's actions over the past year have led many people, myself included, to conclude that EPA's current political leadership has been dismissing the role of science in its decision making. It appears that independent and Agency scientists' recommendations are being ignored for the benefit of industry. It happens with chlorpyrifos, it happened with the Clean Power Plan, and it appears to be happening with TSCA. In many cases, scientific data are even being removed from EPA's website. This is incredibly concerning.

Will you commit to making scientific information, including information about climate change, prominently available on EPA's website?

Mr. Pruitt. Science is essential to our NOx program in review of those pollutants. It is essential as we make decisions on Superfund sites. It is essential as we review pesticides under statutory authority. It will remain central and core to what we do and is in fact central and core to what we are doing presently.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair now recognizes the Chairman of the full committee, Mr. Walden, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Walden. I thank the gentleman.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	atements
within n	nay be inaccura	ate, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Com	mittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

And again, Administrator Pruitt, thank you for being here and thank you for coming back later this afternoon when the President concludes his meeting with you.

To the Portland Superfund site as you know that was declared in 2000, 17 years later they finally have a Record of Decision.

One of the concerns I have heard from folks that are involved in that is that there isn't the personnel in the Portland area

Mr. Pruitt. I am sorry. I didn't hear, Chairman.

Mr. Walden. There isn't the personnel in the Portland area to fully implement the program, you have a lot of people up in Seattle. And I just draw that to your attention they are concerned about that and urge that you dedicate adequate resources to the Portland site so they can get going on that. And I know you are very committed to that whole cleanup operation.

One of the other issues that has come up is the Clean Air Act has the exceptional events exception process. We have had all these wildfires. My gosh, they have these horrible wildfires again in California. We had them in the Northwest. It has been subject of some of our hearings here about how that process works today, the amount of time, money it takes to go through it to get an exception.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

760	What can you do to ensure a more timely, cost effective EPA
761	process on exceptional event determinations?
762	Mr. Pruitt. There is actually quite a bit of work, Mr.
763	Chairman, with respect to ozone and exceptional events going on.
764	Bill Wehrum is our only confirmed AA at this point for air.
765	Bill is leading a task force review of both NSR but also these
766	issues around background ozone, but in addition to exceptional
767	events. We need to provide clarity in that area so that we know
768	how these rules will be enforced and applied going forward. That
769	clarity is not there presently and that is a focus of the Agency
770	presently as we go into 2018.
771	Mr. Walden. We would like to work with you on that. It
772	is important to a number of members on the committee. By the
773	way you said he is confirmed. How many confirmations are you
774	still waiting for, for staff? How many do you have, confirmed
775	people in place, and how many are you waiting for do you know?
776	Mr. Pruitt. We have one.
777	Mr. Walden. One what?
778	Mr. Pruitt. One confirmed.
779	Mr. Walden. Besides you?
780	Mr. Pruitt. That is correct.
781	Mr. Walden. And how many would be pending?

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	tements
within ma	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be po	sted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

Mr. Pruitt. Well, we have deputy, general counsel, all the program offices. We have CFO, we have several that need to be confirmed and hopefully that will occur soon.

Mr. Walden. Wow. EPA air emissions data show how air pollutants have been steadily decreasing in the United States over time. Since 1990, carbon monoxide concentrations are down 77 percent, lead down 99 percent, nitrogen dioxide 54 percent, ozone down 22 percent, coarse particulate matter down 39 percent, fine particulate matter down 37, sulfur dioxide down 81 percent.

What role have advanced technologies such as hydraulic fracturing played at decreasing the nation's air emissions?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I think it is substantial. You know, many don't know that we are at pre-1994 levels today with respect to our CO2 footprint. We have reduced our CO2 levels from 2000 to 2014 by almost 20 percent largely through innovation and technology. We have achieved a lot through mobile sources under the Clean Air Act for reduction of CO2, but with respect to stationary sources and other forms it has been primarily through innovation and technology.

But you do highlight something, Mr. Chairman, that I want to say. We need to celebrate progress that we have made as a country with respect to our air quality. We have reduced those

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	atements
within n	nay be inaccura	ate, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Com	mittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

pollutants that we regulate under the Clean Air Act by over 65 percent. That is a good thing and we need to celebrate that.

And that has been because of the actions you have taken here and that has also been because of the actions we have taken at the EPA.

But it has also been because of the actions taken by the private sector in states across the country. It is a collaborative process that has achieved good outcomes with respect to air quality. We have much work to be done. Forty percent of the country live in areas that don't meet air quality standards, about 120 million people. We need to focus upon that and it is an important metric that we are measuring at the Agency.

But we do need to celebrate the progress we have made and that has been through innovation and technology in a very, very important way.

Mr. Walden. Thank you, sir. In addition, you know, our committee has submitted, I think, at least five letters to your agency seeking records and documents and information. In the past administration it was very, very difficult to get responses to many of our requests. We appreciate the fact that we have received more than a thousand pages of documents on grant management issues. I also want to say we appreciate the numerous

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
826	bipartisan briefings you and your team have provided especially
827	in light of the hurricanes that took place. We do appreciate
828	that.
829	So know that when we send a letter we want a response and
830	we want it you hear it from both sides I think that we expect
831	all the agencies to respond to our requests so we can do our
832	oversight work. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I would yield back
833	the balance of my time.
834	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
835	minority's request for those letters to be accepted into the
836	record, without objection, will be permitted.
837	[The information follows:]
838	
839	**************************************

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statements
within may	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to the
speaker. A	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	
					10

Mr. Shimkus. And with that the chair now recognizes the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone from New Jersey, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I wanted to talk to you about, Mr. Administrator, about TSCA, because unfortunately under your leadership I think EPA is retreating from the important task of TSCA in regulating toxic chemicals. The framework rules for implementation of TSCA published in June are not consistent with the law in very dangerous and worrisome ways, in my opinion, and I think this is because Nancy Beck, a former lobbyist for the chemical industry, was allowed to completely rewrite the rules in flagrant violation of ethics rules.

And I have written to you twice regarding Nancy Beck's involvement in these rulemakings, but I have not gotten a response. So let me ask you a few questions and I would like you to just answer yes or no. Did you ask Nancy Beck to recuse herself from the framework rulemakings?

Mr. Pruitt. Nancy Beck like every employee at the Agency

Mr. Pallone. Just yes or no. I don't have a lot of time.
Mr. Pruitt. Ranking Member Pallone, I need the ability to

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
862	answer your question and I will answer your question. Every
863	Mr. Pallone. Well, I just, can you say yes or no before
864	you proceed with the answer?
865	Mr. Pruitt. Nancy Beck went through ethics review by the
866	ethics official at the Agency.
867	Mr. Pallone. So you did not recuse her. So let me ask you
868	
869	Mr. Pruitt. Mr. Ranking Member Pallone
870	Mr. Pallone. Well, you didn't recuse her.
871	Mr. Pruitt. That is something that we have career
872	Mr. Shimkus. Let's be respectful and let's let people
873	answer.
874	Mr. Pallone. I understand but
875	Mr. Shimkus. But let's answer shortly and concisely so the
876	Ranking Member can
877	Mr. Pruitt. We have career employees at the EPA that are
878	ethics officials that review those issues.
879	Mr. Pallone. Okay, look. Mr. Chairman, he refuses to
880	answer the question. He obviously has not recused her, so I want
881	to move on. I have asked you for copies of all of Nancy Beck's
882	ethics agreements and waivers. Will you provide those to the
883	committee, yes or no?

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

Mr. Pruitt. Absolutely.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you. The framework rules had already been completed and sent to various internal EPA offices for concurrence before Dr. Beck started at the Agency. We understand that they were completely rewritten after she started at EPA, by her. Now I asked you for a document tracking the changes she made to the rules. Will you provide that to the committee, yes or no?

Mr. Pruitt. We will provide the information that is requested and make sure it is available.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you. Thank you, that is fine. I would like to quickly focus on one specific chemical undergoing review right now under the TSCA.

Mr. Pruitt. I am sorry. I didn't hear.

Mr. Pallone. I am sorry. I would like to quickly focus on one specific chemical undergoing review right now under TSCA and that is asbestos. Unfortunately, your EPA's work on asbestos, in my opinion, clearly illustrates the problems in how you are implementing the act.

TSCA requires EPA to look at the intended conditions of use for a chemical defined as the conditions under which a chemical is manufactured, processed, distributed, used, and disposed of.

This is a	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ited to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Comn	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

But in the scoping document for the asbestos risk assessment, your EPA has announced that you will look only at manufacturing processing and distribution and you will not include the use -- you will completely ignore asbestos that is being used and disposed of in this country.

Let me just explain. The use and disposal of asbestos is the main source of risk from asbestos. If you ignore those things you will produce a risk assessment that fails to capture the risk to workers and ordinary Americans and, in my opinion, will not be scientifically valid and will not be protective of public health.

So my question really is this. Do you think you can just ignore certain things that are inconvenient for the industry? In other words you are saying we will look at the manufacturing process, distribution, but we won't be looking at how it is used and disposed of in this country. Do you understand what I am asking?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes, absolutely. And I think you raise a very valid concern. In fact, I had a conversation last week about this issue with the chemical office. I think you raise a very, very meaningful concern.

Mr. Pallone. All right. So hopefully, you know, we will

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

see action on looking at the use and disposal; is that correct?

Mr. Pruitt. That is a very important factor that we need to consider and that is something that I have already raised with the office that is overseeing this.

Mr. Pallone. All right. Well, I appreciate that. Thank you, Mr. Pruitt. The other concern I have is that now that Brazil has banned asbestos mining all of the asbestos that is going to continue to flow into the United States will come from Russia, okay, because Brazil has banned it. So again my concern is that the EPA is basically protecting Russian mining at the expense, I think, of American workers by saying that, you know, asbestos is going to continue to flow into the country but it can't come anymore from Brazil. So would you just respond to that the fact that right now Russian mining is the only source for it and we continue to allow it.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I think that as you have indicated this factor that hasn't been considered up until this point that is something we are going to do going forward and I think that is very important. I am not really familiar with the import issue that you have raised. If there is an impact we can have on that I look forward to the discussion on how better we can influence that. I don't know what role we would play in that regard, but

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
look forward to that discussion.
Mr. Pallone. Well, I appreciate again your willingness to
look at that, Mr. Administrator. Thank you.
Mr. Pruitt. I think the primary issue is what you raised
earlier which is the disposal issue I think is very valid and
something we need to look at going forward.
Mr. Pallone. All right, thank you.
Mr. Chairman, can I just ask unanimous consent to put into
the record a letter from Linda Reinstein, who is executive
director of the Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, and a
letter from the Safer Chemicals, Healthy Families coalition.
Mr. Shimkus. Without objection, so order.
[The information follows:]

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statemen	ıts
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to tl	he
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted of	on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.	

965 Mr. Pallone. Thank you.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair now recognizes the former chairman of the full committee, Mr. Barton, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Barton. Thank you, Chairman Shimkus. I want to give Ranking Member Tonko A+ for the line of the day so far, his Sooner comment. That was --

Mr. Pruitt. That was very good. That was very good.

Mr. Barton. Excellent. Mr. Administrator, at the very beginning of the Obama administration there had been a Supreme Court case, Massachusetts v. EPA, that said the Clean Air Act amendments didn't specifically say that CO2 was or was not a pollutant, therefore it might be found to be a pollutant. As soon as President Obama came into office he asked the EPA for a findings document.

This finding document was rushed through very quickly within about, I want to say, 60 days and surprise-surprise said that they found that CO2 was a pollutant. There was a career analyst at EPA that took exception to that and wrote a scathing report that ripped it apart. That analyst was discouraged from bringing his report forward and ultimately forced to retire.

Are you aware of that finding document and, if so, do you

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

987 | have any plans to revisit it?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I am aware of the Mass. v. EPA decision as you indicated that occurred in 2007. There was work actually being done in 2008 by the Bush administration that was left to the Obama administration, and you are correct, Congressman, that the work done in 2009 was accelerated by the Agency.

In fact, there was something done in 2009 that in my estimation has never been done since and not done before that event, where they took work from the U.N. IPCC and transported it to the Agency and adopted that as the core of the finding. So there was a breach of process that occurred in 2009 that many believe was not handled the proper way. But the Mass. v. EPA decision and the processes that followed involved both the Bush and the Obama administrations and that process was again in 2009, I think, short shrifted.

Mr. Barton. I would encourage you to go back and revisit the finding document and get the report that this career analyst put forward. If you can't find it let me know, because I have it and it is fairly -- not fairly, it is very damning on what they found.

My second question, I have been told that you plan at some point in time to set up a red team-blue team review of pending

This is a p	reliminary,	unedited	transcript	t. The	statemen	ts
within may	be inaccurat	te, incomp	plete, or n	nisattribu	ited to tl	1e
speaker. A	link to the fi	nal, offici	al transcri	pt will be	e posted o	n
the Committ	ee's website a	as soon as	it is availa	ble.		

regulations where you have scientists basically engage in an internal debate pro the regulation, con the regulation so that you really get a balanced scientific understanding of the pending regulation. Do you plan to use a red team-blue team approach and if so when might we expect that to start?

Mr. Pruitt. That is an ongoing review internally,

Congressman. It is something that I hope to be able to do and
announce sometime beginning part of next year at the latest.

But that is something we have been working on for the last several
months in trying to put that together and that would be a process
that would be focused upon an objective, transparent, real-time
review of questions and answers around this issue of CO2.

I think one of the most important things we can do for the American people is provide that type of discussion, because it hasn't happened at the Agency. As I indicated, the Agency borrowed the work product of a third party and we need to ensure that that discussion occurs and it occurs in a way that the American people know that objective, transparent review is taking place. And so that red team-blue team concept is something that is ongoing as far as an evaluation and we may be able to get there as early as January of next year.

Mr. Barton. Good. I would commend you on that. And I

This is	a prelim	inary, ur	nedited	transcrip	ot. The	stateme	nts
within n	nay be in	accurate,	incomp	olete, or	misattribu	ited to	the
speaker.	A link t	o the fina	l, officia	al transcr	ipt will be	e posted	on
the Com	mittee's v	vebsite as	soon as	it is avail	able.		

think you know under the Obama administration EPA became more than just an enforcement agency. It more and more began to intervene in the policy arena, in many cases going further than at least those of us on the Republican side felt that they should go.

Do you believe that before you set a standard you absolutely ought to check with the Department of Energy and the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission so that you really get a balanced analysis of what is going on, and do you feel that as we take a look at the reauthorization of your agency and the Department of Energy that it might be necessary to try to rebalance that equation between the energy policy arena and the environmental enforcement arena?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, as I indicated in my opening comments, Congressman, it is important that as we do our work at the Agency that we only do what Congress permits and authorizes us to do. I think the challenges over the last several years -- it was mentioned in some of the opening comments about the Clean Power Plan. It was unprecedented for the U.S. Supreme Court to enter a stay against the Clean Power Plan, and as you know you don't get a stay of enforcement on a rule unless there is a likelihood of success on the merits later.

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The state	ements
within ma	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be pos	ted on
the Comm	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

And so there was an understanding that the steps taken by the previous administration, building blocks 1, 2, 3 and 4, there was a reimagining of authority that took place under the Clean Air Act that caused a lot of confusion on what was authorized and what wasn't. That is not the proper way to approach these issues and we are addressing that at the Agency in ensuring that we hew to rule of law in these processes to make sure that there is confidence in the rules that we adopt going forward.

Mr. Barton. My time has expired. I thank you, Administrator, for your answers.

Mr. Shimkus. All right. And the gentleman yields back. An announcement for my colleagues, we are going to go to Congressman Ruiz. He will have the last 5-minute block of questions before we allow the administrator to get downtown, and then I will make an announcement about getting back promptly at 2:00 for the administrator and for us to follow up. So with that the chair now recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. Ruiz, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Ruiz. Administrator Pruitt, welcome to the committee.

I am Dr. Raul Ruiz and it is a pleasure to meet you. I want
to talk about particle pollution. Fine particle pollution is
harmful to human health and can be deadly even at the very low

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	tements
within ma	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be po	sted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

concentrations. Hundreds of peer reviewed studies have found that these microscopic particles can reach the deepest regions of the lungs and actually enter the bloodstream. Exposure to fine particles is associated with premature death, asthma attacks, chronic bronchitis, decreased lung function, and respiratory disease.

As an emergency medicine physician from the Inland Empire in California, which has some of the country's highest levels of particle pollution, I have seen firsthand the impacts of exposure to dangerous levels of fine particle pollution and let me tell you it is not nice. It is not a pleasant experience to treat kids who come in with asthma because of a bad air particle pollution day.

The scientific consensus long recognized by the EPA during both Republican and Democratic administrations is that fine particle pollution is a non-threshold pollutant, meaning that there is no level of fine particle pollution exposure below which no harm occurs, including premature death. So Administrator Pruitt, do you agree that fine particle pollution is a non-threshold pollutant?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. And I would say to you that particulate matter under the NOx program, as you know we can't engage in a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

	54
1097	cost-benefit analysis there. It is all about health.
1098	Mr. Ruiz. Yes.
1099	Mr. Pruitt. And it is a very important role that we play
1100	in those criteria pollutants under the NOx program.
1101	Mr. Ruiz. Thank you. Administrator Pruitt, were you aware
1102	that the Bush administration used the health benefits associated
1103	with reducing this non-threshold pollutant to justify their 2003
1104	Clear Skies legislation cosponsored by Senator Inhofe?
1105	Mr. Pruitt. I am familiar with the legislation.
1106	Mr. Ruiz. Yes, they did.
1107	Mr. Pruitt. I didn't know about the cosponsoring aspect.
1108	Mr. Ruiz. They did. All right. And that the Bush
1109	administration relied on those same health benefits for its
1110	economic analysis for the 2004 Tier 4 rule to control emissions
1111	from nonroad diesel engines? That is a good thing.
1112	Mr. Pruitt. Yes, it is, Congressman.
1113	Mr. Ruiz. Yes, they did. They relied on that. Isn't it
1114	true that the Bush EPA agreed that there are no safe thresholds
1115	for fine particle pollution related health effects including
1116	premature death in the 2005 Clean Air Interstate Rule?
1117	Mr. Pruitt. I think you have stated it well, Congressman.
1118	Mr. Ruiz. They did. The recently confirmed Assistant

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to the
speaker. A	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

Administrator for Air and Radiation, Mr. William Wehrum, played
a key role in developing those rules during the Bush
administration, and Andrew Wheeler, the nominee to be the deputy
administrator handled the Clear Skies bill when he worked for
Senator Inhofe.

Administrator, are Mr. Wehrum and Mr. Wheeler wrong about fine particle pollution having no safe level?

Mr. Pruitt. Wrong about what?

Mr. Ruiz. That there is no safe level for particle pollution, so I don't think they were wrong.

Mr. Pruitt. I don't think I stated that they were wrong.

Mr. Ruiz. Okay, great. So you agree that --

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. So I am not entirely sure what your question is. That Bill Wehrum is doing a fine job, is focused on these issues as is Andy when he is confirmed as deputy and I agree with your position that it is a very important criteria pollutant that we need to regulate on the NOx --

Mr. Ruiz. Wonderful.

Mr. Pruitt. -- in a very, very important way.

Mr. Ruiz. So despite that, this well-established scientific reality, your proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan, EPA assumes for the first time that there are safe levels of deadly

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to the
speaker. A	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

fine particle pollution. That is a concern of mine. Did you rely on any new peer-reviewed scientific studies to support reversing EPA's position on fine particle pollution?

Mr. Pruitt. As you know, Congressman, no, we did not base that upon -- our withdrawal of the Clean Power Plan is largely based upon the jurisdictional issues of the Clean Air Act.

Mr. Ruiz. Okay.

Mr. Pruitt. And all I have to have is a reason basis to withdrawal a rule, a U.S. Supreme Court stay of the Clean Power Plan --

Mr. Ruiz. Well, that is obviously a point of difference in --

Mr. Pruitt. We did not base our withdrawal of the Clean Power Plan upon the issues that you have cited.

Mr. Ruiz. Okay. So I do think that the mission of the EPA is, was charged by the people to protect the health and the environment of the American people so that everybody, regardless of socioeconomic status, can enjoy a healthy environment and therefore live their life to full health potential. And this Clean Power Plan was part of that mission to make sure that we protect the environment so therefore we could protect the people's health.

This is a	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ited to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Comn	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

And there is no reliance on any scientific studies whether
they were peer-reviewed or non-peer-reviewed, as you just
admitted, in withdrawing this. This was your interpretation of
the jurisdictional matter of the EPA which we beg to differ, of
course, because we are here to protect the American people's
health.

Do you believe therefore that it was appropriate to reverse the EPA's positions on the deadliness of fine particle pollution?

Because there is the assumption here that now the EPA is saying that there is a threshold for that to happen.

Mr. Pruitt. We did not reverse it, Congressman. And moreover, we are going to be introducing a replacement rule too in place of the Clean Power Plan.

Mr. Ruiz. Before my time has expired --

Mr. Shimkus. Your time has just expired, but be quick.

Mr. Ruiz. Let me submit this unanimous consent to place this 2012 letter from EPA to Chairman Upton into the record, please.

Mr. Shimkus. Again we will look at it and I am sure we will do it.

Mr. Ruiz. Thank you.

Mr. Shimkus. And the gentleman's time has expired.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	atements
within n	nay be inaccura	ate, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Com	mittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

I want to remind all my members that pursuant to my announcement at the start of the hearing, we are recessing now so Mr. Pruitt can attend a meeting with the President at the White House. Mr. Pruitt will be returning to the committee to answer member questions. We will convene at 2322 Rayburn House Office Building. This is for people who don't know the operations here very -- and our guests -- at 2:00 p.m. sharp, and stay as long it takes for every member who is present and wants to ask questions to be given their turn to ask questions.

For our guests in the gallery, your seat here does not guarantee your seat when we resume the hearing. Seats will be allocated on a first come-first serve basis starting at 1:45. Should you wish to join the proceedings in 2322, and it is a smaller hearing room, you will need to be in line outside of 2322. And I apologize for the inconvenience and the committee stands in recess.

[Whereupon, at 11:00 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 2:28 p.m., the same day.]

Mr. Shimkus. The subcommittee will come to order. When we recessed, it was Mr. McKinley's turn to be recognized. So with that I want to recognize the gentleman from West Virginia for 5 minutes.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	tements
within ma	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be po	sted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Administrator, for coming and participating in this. Over the years we had asked your predecessors to come particularly as it relates to Section 321(a) to see the impact some of the regulations were having in the coal fields and they declined to do that.

But I am particularly appreciative of the fact that a week ago or 2 weeks ago the EPA, you sent -- other folks came to West Virginia to get the impact of what these regulations are having, because it is pretty clear in the statute that we have to abide by the economic impact. We have to take that into consideration when rules and regs are promulgated. They didn't do that.

And I know you and I have had that conversation that you want to follow the law very clearly, and I know a federal judge has already ruled that the EPA in the past considered them discretionary and not mandatory. I think your position I have heard from you is that you think that they are mandatory and you intend to abide by them. Am I correct on that?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes, Congressman. And we did in fact as you indicated send representatives to West Virginia as part of the proposed withdrawal. And I do think it is important that that is a rulemaking process. You know, we have talked a little bit this morning about the withdrawal of the Clean Power Plan, and

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	tements
within ma	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be po	sted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

as I indicated earlier that is primarily jurisdictional as far as the basis for that withdrawal.

But that is a rulemaking process, and so that rulemaking process means that we go out and solicit and receive comment from across the country. We are not just going to be in West Virginia. We are going to be in Gillette, Wyoming soon. We are going be in San Francisco. We are going to be Kansas City. There is going to be a crosscurrent of viewpoints with respect to this issue and it is important we hear all voices and that process is ongoing.

Mr. McKinley. Well, I think I particularly appreciate the fact that you sent people to the coal fields to understand the impact of what those regulations were doing when 86,000 coal miners lost their job during the Obama administration and no one paid attention. No one came to those communities to find out what was going to be the impact of another regulation that was going to put them out of business.

But part of the question is have they been able to debrief you? What were some of the salient issues? What were the points that were raised at the meeting in Charleston?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, quite a few comments that were offered, it was multiple hours of information, and again a crosscurrent of information that we are reviewing. And I think that,

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	atements
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	d to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

Congressman, you hit on some very important matters with respect to the cost of the Clean Power Plan that wasn't taken into consideration before and that is something that came out in the process in West Virginia.

Mr. McKinley. I know you have made a commitment. You said you are going back to blocking and tackling the fundamentals of rulemaking. Is there something that we should be doing here in Congress to make sure that we don't revert back to that old way of just following the ideology rather than science?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I think, you know, there are some things we have done recently that I think are very important to the process that I talked about earlier. For many years the APA, the Administrative Procedure Act that governs how we do rulemaking has not been really followed as closely as it should. We have used guidance as forms of rules at times which I think subverts the voices that need to be heard on substantive actions. We have engaged in litigation, regulation through litigation. We talked about a sue and settle practice at the Agency that literally has impacted state implementation plans across the country with air quality.

And so there is much that we need to do to ensure that we respect that process and make sure that rulemaking is adhered

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misat	
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript w	vill be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.	
	62

I mean, excuse me, the APA is adhered to as we are engaged in rulemaking.

Mr. McKinley. Well, in the time -- or is there something you would suggest, because that has been on the books that they are supposed to do that but we saw 8 years where they did not Is there something that we should do to tighten up that?

Well, I think that anytime that an agency, and it is not just the EPA it is any agency of the executive branch that engages in litigation to change substantive requirements in the statute, you know, timelines that Congress sets or taking discretionary duties and making it nondiscretionary, as an example, that is something that should be dealt with by Congress. And I think speaking to that through codification is something that could be, I think it would be very helpful.

Mr. McKinley. Okay, thank you. I yield back.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. now recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. Peters, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Mr. Administrator, for being here. I wanted to ask you about the methane rule. EPA has an effort to control dangerous methane

1273

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

1291

1292

1293

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

pollution from the oil and gas industry. The common-sense rule asks operators to put our natural gas resources to productive use rather than wastefully leaking them. I support the rule because it will boost energy supplies, reduce air pollution including smog, air toxins, greenhouse gases, and the estimated benefit of capturing methane emissions from the oil and gas industry is \$2 billion annually.

Do you support this rule and if not, without it what would you do to reduce wasted natural gas?

Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, I think as you -- historically, the way the Agency has dealt with methane has been part of a VOC approach where volatile organic compounds as we have regulated the VOCs methane has been part of that bundle. What happened with that particular rule is the EPA for the first time pulled methane out of the bundle and regulated it separately. We haven't taken any action on that as you know as far as the substantive rule itself. There are compliance dates that are forthcoming that have been extended and that has really been the focus up until now.

But I think there is a meaningful debate, discussions that should occur about whether the rule should be focused on a bundle approach, a VOC approach, or whether methane should be pulled

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to the
speaker. A	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

out. As you know, methane is very valuable. Companies don't like to flare methane because it can be captured and used in other ways and it is very marketable, if you will. And so I think having a rule in place that incentivizes that and ensures that we approach it pursuant to the statute, I think, is very -- that is something we should look at.

Mr. Peters. Okay. So you have said -- I think you and Secretary Perry have both made appearances on CNBC and on March 9th you said that carbon dioxide is not a primary driver contributing to recent climate change, and that said differently that you said CO2 is not the only contributor to climate change. Do you agree that methane, nitrous oxide, and other greenhouse gases are air pollutants?

Mr. Pruitt. Absolutely. Absolutely, and are more potent, actually, than CO2.

Mr. Peters. Right, so --

Mr. Pruitt. Methane is more potent than CO2 as you know in that regard.

Mr. Peters. So I have to say it seems to me, I knew you have emphasized the importance of points of process before, but if the object is to reduce methane, nitrous oxide, and other greenhouse gases what would be the strategy whether as part of

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to the
speaker. A	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

a bundle or is not part of a bundle, how do you think we should go about controlling and reducing those greenhouse --

Mr. Pruitt. I mean I think that distinction matters though, Congressman.

Mr. Peters. Okay.

Mr. Pruitt. I think as we look at the statutory framework and how methane should be regulated the question whether it should be part of the bundle is a significant question and so that is what we are evaluating. Again the focus in the first 10 months has been on those compliance dates, and as you know the rule is in effect presently and that has been the primary focus. As we go forward, the discussion and the focus will be on whether it needs to be a part of the bundle or not.

Mr. Peters. So I understand the procedural point you make about whether it is part of the bundle, but whichever avenue we take, whether it is part of the bundle or not, how would we go about reducing the emissions of methane gas?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, you look at the wellhead, you speak to companies with respect to the flaring practices that have gone on historically, and there are best management practices and best practices that can be deployed by companies to ensure again there is not an incentive for companies to waste methane. It is

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

something that can be used and it is very valuable. We need to recognize that and encourage and incentivize that.

Mr. Peters. Right. And I think one of the things that we have noticed is it has many benefits and the price of natural gas has gone down, so perhaps the incentive to lose that cheap gas isn't as great as it might be to actually force the control of it. But you mentioned a couple of things like looking at the wellhead and so forth. Substantively, do you think that what is the methane rule is the right kind of approach to deal with that?

Mr. Pruitt. I think, Congressman, it is probably best that, you know, in the rulemaking process it is important that I don't prejudge outcomes and I think that what will be important is taking comment on those issues as we go forward.

Mr. Peters. Do you intend to start from zero or do you intend to put out the methane rule for additional comment? How do you intend to land this plane?

Mr. Pruitt. I mean it is yet to be determined.

Mr. Peters. All right. Well, I would say I think it is

-- we have made a lot of progress on it. I think that there is
a lot of understanding within the industry that natural gas can
be a better burning fuel than some fuels we use, but you have

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The statem	ients
within may	be inaccura	te, incomp	plete, or mis	attributed to	the
speaker. A	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will be poste	d on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

to control methane to really get the benefit out of it from a climate change standpoint and that is kind of where we should be.

Mr. Pruitt. Thanks, Congressman.

Mr. Peters. Thank you.

Mr. Peters. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Olson, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Olson. I thank the chair. And welcome, Administrator Pruitt. My congressional district, Texas 22, may be the biggest one in America. Right now we have 850,000 people and growing quickly. The huge majority of these people wanted me to tell you thank you, thank you, thank you for making EPA what it should have been, an agency in D.C. that works with local governments, local private sector to get clear air and cleaner water. Thank you for that.

They are frustrated by the last 8 years. The administration used the EPA that became a combatant that actually kept us from getting cleaner air and cleaner water, and they are thrilled to have you there. They got tired of things we can't achieve as human beings, technology that is not available and yet it is demanded. They are tired of arranging lawsuits to sue and settle and that is now gone also. Thank you for that.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

There are many frustrations back home, one example, the RFS. As you know, sir, I have had long and serious concerns with the RFS. I hope this committee will act to take care of this matter quickly. But in the meantime, until we act, guess what, you are on point and you have a lot of leeway going forward.

My question is how have the concerns about the ethanol blend wall, or even RIN prices, figured in your decisions about the 2018 targets?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, a couple things. Number one, I was very, very appreciative to the Agency of the work that was done to meet the deadline. Historically, as you know the November 30th deadline to publish those volume obligations has been missed and it creates uncertainty. People don't know what is expected. It affects capital outlay, et cetera, and so it was very important to meet that November 30th deadline and we did in fact do that.

As we have looked at volume obligations with respect to conventional cellulosic, bio-based diesel, the advanced categories, the focus is try, we try to focus our efforts on objective criteria whether it is production levels and/or demand. As an example, the most we have ever produced with cellulosic is about 180 to 190 million gallons domestically, yet the volume obligations, historically, by the agencies have been set around

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	sattribu	ted to the
speaker. A	link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Commit	ttee's website	as soon as	it is availabl	le.	

1427 | 300 million or so.

So when you set those levels artificially high it creates other problems elsewhere and so I think in the administration of that statute it is very important upon our agency to be as objective as possible at setting those volume obligations to reflect true production levels.

You know, bio-based diesel, the capacity is about 2.6 billion I have heard, but the production levels have not eclipsed 2.1 billion. We imported about 700 million gallons from last year to meet that level, so there are a lot of questions obviously around the administration of RFS. Please know that I and we are committed to doing it pursuant to that statutory framework that you have established, but at the same time that statutory framework is very challenging because the levels that have been set by statute have never been met. And so we have got a lot of challenge there.

Mr. Olson. And as you know, Senator Barrasso asked EPA to complete a long overdue study on the environmental impact of the RFS. That is something that is required by the Clean Air Act. Any update on the progress of this study?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. Actually, I have been briefed on that within the last couple weeks and we have begun the process to

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted or
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

provide	that	study	to C	ongres	ss. T	'hat	is	something	that	is
statutor	ry an	d somet	thing	that	needs	to	be	done.		

Mr. Olson. Thank you. And also talk about Hurricane --

Mr. Pruitt. I am sorry. Say it again?

Mr. Olson. Hurricane Harvey, sir --

Mr. Pruitt. Yes, yes.

Mr. Olson. -- hit my district hard. As you know, hit us twice basically, the most expensive hurricane in American history. Talking with Dr. Bryan Shaw, who heads up our Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, he is quite pleased with the working together with EPA during that storm. You guys deployed all over the Gulf Coast, on the coast, inland, and got acting pretty quickly.

One concern is having money to go forward and one solution may be what is called the State Revolving Fund. Can that be used to address repairs in Texas? It is under your control and will you do that?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, SRFs as you know have been used in a very good way to address infrastructure challenges at the state level and I think it is something that Congress ought to consider.

Again I want to highlight something though with respect to Hurricane Harvey and Hurricane Irma and then what is going on

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	tements
within ma	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	d to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be po	osted on
the Comn	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

in Puerto Rico. We embedded officials from EPA with local towns and cities across Texas, Florida as the storms approached in order to have real-time decisions made on the threats that it posed to drinking water, Superfund sites, chemical facilities, and the rest, and it was truly an example of federalism in action between the state, local towns and cities, and the U.S. Government working to address those issues. So I am very, very thankful for the leadership of Region 6, you know, which is in Dallas and then obviously Region 4 as it relates to Florida. It was good work by their folks, employees, but also the folks at the state level.

Mr. Olson. And speaking for Dr. Shaw, he would say great teamwork with the EPA. Thank you, thank you. One final thank you, the San Jacinto Waste Pits.

Mr. Pruitt. Yes.

Mr. Olson. Harvey knocked them loose. All this benzene came out.

Mr. Pruitt. Yes.

Mr. Olson. You stepped up and said we will stop this forever. So thank you for that.

Mr. Pruitt. You know, I think it is important, Mr. Chairman, and this is an example. We talked about the Superfund initiative at the Agency. San Jacinto is a site in Houston, Texas that is

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statement
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted o
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

just off of I-10. It has dioxin that has been placed there and embedded for a number of years and it is near a harbor and barge traffic goes through.

The Agency has been working with folks at the state level and responsible parties for a number of years and the solution has been to take a covering and put it over the site and then pile rocks on top of the site and it has been that way for 10 years. I was in Houston in mid-September and looked at the site and it is totally unacceptable to have that type of temporary situation because of potential hurricanes coming through and displacing those rocks.

So we provided a permanent solution there, about \$115 million of cost that responsible parties are going to bear to provide a permanent solution and the citizens, I think, have been very pleased with the outcome.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. Let me go to Mr. -- Jacinto -- the other member from Texas, Mr. Green, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Green. Thank you for being here today, Mr.

Administrator. I have the district -- I used to have the San

Jacinto Waste Pits but in Texas they keep changing our lines.

I think it was in Pete Olson's for awhile. Now it is in Brian

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

Babin's. Ted Poe had part of it. So, but we change our lines in Texas.

But I want to thank you for visiting right after Harvey and seeing what was there. And I appreciate EPA continuing to make sure we have a permanent fix there because that area is like you said, barge traffic, people crab and fish in that area and both the city, the county, and the state have signs up in Spanish, English, in Vietnamese that expectant mothers or small children should not eat the crabs or the fish. But I don't know if that day you were there, but every time I go there everybody is fishing.

So, but thank you and hopefully we can move that as quickly as possible because it is an industrial area but it also is a recreational area, because I water-skied in that water back when I was young.

But is there a contradiction of priorities of EPA between the cleanup of the Superfund sites and the Agency's commitment to the drastic cuts in the Superfund program? I know the EPA's budget request was 30 percent cut in the Superfund program. I know that may not affect San Jacinto Waste Pits because we have a responsible party, but there are a lot of Superfund sites around the country that don't have a responsible party.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, it is a concern, Congressman. In fact,

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

during the budgeting process, appropriations process, I conveyed to our committee that if monies were necessary to address those orphan sites -- we have orphan sites that make up the Superfund portfolio -- that I would come and advise Congress and ask for those funds. I mean it is very important that as we go forward on Superfund cleanup that money not be the problem on how we get those cleanups. We need accountability there.

I will tell you that in my time evaluating the Superfund portfolio there is very few orphan sites and most of it is just a lack of direction on how we should clean up. There are several examples, in Chicago. I think one of the members earlier today mentioned Portland. San Jacinto was one of those where there just simply wasn't much direction on how to get accountability and how to get cleanup with these responsible parties.

And so we are trying to do both, but I commit to you that if there are issues, deficiencies on funding with respect to that Superfund priority we will advise you and ask for help as we work through the appropriations process.

Mr. Green. Okay. Well, thank you. Because I know back in September the EPA Inspector General issued a report about the distribution of Superfund full time FTEs among the EPA regions does not support the current regional workloads. As a result,

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

some regions have to prioritize work and are slowed down like you mentioned or discontinued. And are you aware of that OIG's report?

I have actually talked to the Inspector Mr. Pruitt. Yes. General about the Superfund issues going forward and we have looked at some management issues. How we bid projects, sometimes they are not competitively bid. We sometimes are getting bids that take -- routinely I hear something will take 15 or 20 years. And I have pushed back saying that perhaps that is not how long it should take and maybe the bid is just trying to prolong things as far as receiving funding for 15 or 20 years in those So we are trying to get reform both in how we contractors. process and how we bid out and do remediation, but also making decisions early in the process to make sure that we get accountability on outcomes.

Mr. Green. Okay, since I come from the Houston area and the Houston ship channel, where we have five refineries, my next question. The EPA recently released its final ruling on renewable fuel standard that said 15 billion gallon standard for conventional ethanol. I know many of my refineries in my district and along the Gulf Coast were disappointed with this final number.

Would you commit to lowering future RFS requirements to avoid

1559

1560

1561

1562

1563

1564

1565

1566

1567

1568

1569

1570

1571

1572

1573

1574

1575

1576

1577

1578

1579

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	atements
within n	nay be inaccura	ate, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Com	mittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

this blend wall that we are having? And I know from Oklahoma you understand.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, Congressman, I can't commit to certain outcomes with respect to that process. That is a rulemaking process. But what I can tell you is what I shared earlier with the question, we will objectively determine each year what the production levels look like they are going to be. We are tracking those numbers now.

Biodiesel has been as big of a challenge as conventional. We have routinely set that at 2.1 or higher. 2.1 was the last number before this year. And as I indicated, we imported 700 million gallons of bio-based diesel from Argentina to meet that 2.1 billion gallon limit. So we ought not be dependent upon the people of Argentina to meet a volume obligation that we are setting domestically so that is something that we will continue to look at, but we can't prejudge those outcomes at this point.

Mr. Green. Well, and every time I talk to one of my refineries they talk about the problems of RINs and of course the chair of the committee is a great fellow from Illinois but we do have some differences on corn ethanol as compared to biofuel.

Mr. Pruitt. But Congressman, it is a fair point and I will say to you it is a real issue as far as RIN reform. I mean we

This is a prelim	minary, unedite	d transcript.	The statements
within may be	inaccurate, inco	mplete, or mi	sattributed to the
speaker. A link	to the final, off	cial transcript	will be posted on
the Committee's	website as soon	as it is availab	le.

need to get some accountability in the RIN market. 1603 1604 There is a lot of speculation that goes on with respect to RINs. 1605 There are enforcement issues, fraud that occurs. In fact we 1606 just prosecuted a company, I think it was 30 million plus as a There is a lot of work 1607 fraud that occurred in the RIN market. 1608 to be done to get reform and accountability in the RIN market. 1609 I would be glad to work with you on that. Mr. Green. you. 1610 1611 The gentleman's time has expired. Mr. Shimkus. The chair 1612 now recognizes the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Johnson, for 5 1613 minutes. 1614 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Johnson. And Mr. 1615 Administrator, thank you for being here with us today.

first express my support for your comments on cooperative When issuing drastic regulatory changes like the federalism. Clean Power Plan, the previous administration did not take into account the people that would have been most truly affected by those regulatory changes and those are the hardworking coal miners, the power plant workers, and others throughout the industry supply chain, all of which, many of which live in eastern and southeastern Ohio where I live and represent.

As you well know, the Ohio EPA along with many other states

1616

1617

1618

1619

1620

1621

1622

1623

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	atements
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	d to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

breathed a sigh of relief when the Supreme Court issued a stay of this rule that would have had a devastating effect on not only Ohio's electricity generation and economy, but other states as well. That in my opinion is not cooperative federalism. Now EPA's recent public hearing in West Virginia on the proposed repeal of the Clean Power Plan I think exemplifies the Agency's willingness to listen to those that would have been most affected by the rule.

No one cares more about the air we breathe nor the water we drink than those of us that live in regions where that kind of work goes on, places like eastern and southeastern Ohio where some of the best paying energy and manufacturing opportunities for jobs reside. There is a necessary balance to environmental protection and a process to share that responsibility with states and local leaders like you have suggested is a crucial and much needed change to how these regulations have been approached in the past. So I applaud your work in that regard.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, if I could say, Congressman, and to give you an example about how it shouldn't work, when I came into this position there were 700 approximate state implementation plans that many of your states had prepared on how to improve air quality where resources had been devoted, expertise delegated at the state

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

level to improve air quality pursuant to those state implementation plans. They were sitting on a shelf at our agency that we had not acted upon and that is just simply not a good way to do business.

We as an agency need to respond up or down on those kinds of plans to give input and direction back to states. We need to encourage and want to encourage states to take those kinds of steps. And I think it was very disheartening over the last several years for that to take place. We are trying to remedy that.

Mr. Johnson. Well, I thank you for that collaborative approach. I want to move on to another subject though that is important in our state, the deadlines under which the Brick MACT which were set up under, set under a 2015 EPA rulemaking are soon approaching. These regulations affect domestic brick and tile manufacturers among other small businesses typically located in rural communities, and in most cases are the primary source of jobs in those little small communities especially in my district. The EPA, your agency, recently announced its intentions to reconsider these regulations. Can you please elaborate on status and timing of the Agency's reconsideration of the Brick MACT regulations?

This is a	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ited to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Comn	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

Mr. Pruitt. Well, as far as the timing it would be very difficult to provide that to you at this point, Congressman.

I think we need to assess what that process will look like. It is not a rulemaking process, per se, but it approaches that and so that is something that we will have to evaluate.

I apologize that I don't have that answer, but -Mr. Johnson. Can you look at it and get back to us?
Mr. Pruitt. Sure.

Mr. Johnson. Okay, all right. That will work. Let me just make some comments about that. You know, the last Brick MACT rule was enacted in 2003. Hundreds of millions of dollars spent by the industries to comply then later vacated by a federal court, but only after most brick manufacturers had already committed to facility modifications to comply and the money had been spent.

So for all practical purposes, judicial review was meaningless in that case in terms of the economy and the jobs.

Do you agree we don't want to see a repeat of that kind of situation?

Mr. Pruitt. Absolutely. And I think as we look at other, there are other examples, Congressman. Where that has happened where there has not been a stay of enforcement on a particular rule. Those that are required to meet the rule's obligations

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	be inaccura	te, incomp	plete, or misa	attribu	ited to the
speaker. A	link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript v	will be	e posted on
the Commit	tee's website	as soon as	it is available		

take those steps and by the time that judicial review takes place it is somewhat hollow with respect to whether the rule was constitutional or lawful in the first instance. So I think it is very important that we work to get these things right so that that doesn't happen.

Mr. Johnson. I appreciate it. Mr. Chairman, I yield back a 5 whole seconds, and I thank you for your service, Mr. Administrator.

Mr. Shimkus. The chairman thanks him and the chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Colorado for 5 minutes, Ms.

Ms. DeGette. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

Administrator Pruitt, thank you for coming today. I am the ranking Democrat on the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of this committee and I will tell you, we all take our obligations very seriously. Effective oversight relies on receiving the information from the agencies that we oversee.

And members of the committee have sent the EPA over 34 written requests this year including requests about the lack of transparency at the Agency, removal of climate data from the website, and other critically important topics. Now to date, Mr. Administrator, we have received no response to eight of these

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
82
letters. Let me give you an example and I can give you copies
of all of these.
On May 18th, members of this committee and the Committee
on Science, Space, and Technology sent a letter requesting
documents and additional information on EPA's premature removal
of qualified experts from EPA's board of science counselors.
Now we still, 7 months later, have not received a response.
Mr. Pruitt, can you commit to giving us a timely response
to this request?
Mr. Pruitt. Are you referring to BOSC? Is that what you
are referring to, the Board of Scientific Counselors?
Ms. DeGette. That is correct.
Mr. Pruitt. Yes. We will provide whatever information you
need there.
Ms. DeGette. Thank you.
Mr. Pruitt. I would disagree that it was a premature
removal. We yes.
Ms. DeGette. Well, no, no. I am not arguing with you about
the substance.
Mr. Pruitt. Yes. Yes.
Ms. DeGette. I just need to get the information.

Mr. Pruitt.

Sure.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
Ms. DeGette. And then there are seven other letters that
we have not gotten responses. Can you also commit that you will
give us responses to those letters?
Mr. Pruitt. If you inventory those. I have a
Ms. DeGette. I will give you copies of all of them.
Mr. Pruitt. Yes. Yes.
Ms. DeGette. Now there is 22 other letters, Mr. Pruitt,
that the minority at least feels have had incomplete response.
For example, there was one on April 20th where Ranking Member

that the minority at least feels have had incomplete response.

For example, there was one on April 20th where Ranking Member

Pallone sent a letter requesting a briefing on the budget requests

and they got a five-sentence letter back that basically said we

are developing the President's budget based on the framework

provided by the blueprint and gave no other information. It is

hard for us --

Mr. Pruitt. What timeframe is that? I am sorry, Congresswoman.

Ms. DeGette. It was April 20th.

Mr. Pruitt. Okay.

Ms. DeGette. So it is hard for us to develop our oversight if we don't have this information. I am going to work with other members of this committee on those other 22 letters to drill down and see what additional information we feel we need from the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
84
Agency. Can I get your commitment to please also respond to those
and I will give that all to you?
Mr. Pruitt. Yes, ma'am. And I will say we have got a group
of individuals that
Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Thank you very much. You know,
I only have 5 minutes. I am so sorry. One of the things about
the lack of information is the TSCA bill. And I will tell you,
my buddy Mr. Shimkus and I and all of us on this committee, we
worked really hard to revise TSCA and that is one of the crowning
achievements, we think, of this committee.
But since we did this on a bipartisan basis, the Obama
administration proposed banning methylene chloride from use as
a paint stripper based on extensive evidence of unreasonable risk
to human health, and so we haven't heard yet from the EPA whether
they are giving the public an indication about whether they are
finalizing the rule. I just have a couple of questions around
that.
Have you personally met with Dow Chemical or the American

Have you personally met with Dow Chemical or the American Chemistry Council to discuss this rule while we are waiting for the update?

Mr. Pruitt. No, ma'am.

Ms. DeGette. Okay. And will you commit to finalizing this

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
85
TSCA rule for methylene chloride and doing so soon?
Mr. Pruitt. I will commit to reviewing it and giving you
an answer soon, yes.
Ms. DeGette. That would be great. When do you think we
can get an answer?
Mr. Pruitt. I don't know, but we will advise you soon after
this meeting.
Ms. DeGette. Okay. That would be great, thanks. We will
be on top of it, don't worry. Now one last thing, a press account
said that you installed a \$25,000 soundproof booth in your office
at EPA headquarters. Is that true?
Mr. Pruitt. It is a secure phone line.
Ms. DeGette. Okay, so it is a SCIF, what we call a sensitive
compartmental information facility; is that right?
Mr. Pruitt. Yes.
Ms. DeGette. And did you do that because part of the EPA's
mission involves classified information?
Mr. Pruitt. Yes, ma'am, part of that but also
communications with the White House. There are secure
conversations that need to take place at times and that is

Ms. DeGette.

SCIF to talk to the White House?

So you believe it is appropriate to use the

	ommittee's website as soon as it is available.
M	r. Pruitt. I believe that there are secure conversations
that n	eed to take place that I didn't have access to that
M	s. DeGette. Okay. So what percentage of your work would
you sa	y is conducted in this SCIF?
M	Ir. Pruitt. It is hard to predict that
M	s. DeGette. Well, is it 50 percent of your conversations?
Is it	75 percent?
M	r. Pruitt. Cabinet level officials need to have access
to sec	ure communications.
M	s. DeGette. Oh. I am talking about the one that you put
into t	he EPA. How often do you use that SCIF?
M	r. Pruitt. It is hard to predict in the future
M	Is. DeGette. 95 percent?
M	r. Pruitt. I haven't taken any calculations of that.
M	s. DeGette. Well, when you use that
M	r. Pruitt. It is necessary for me to be able to do my job.
M	s. DeGette. Okay, let me ask you. So you use that only
for cl	assified information or for communications with the
Presid	lent. Is that your testimony?
M	r. Pruitt. It is used for secure communications that need
to tak	e place at the office.

Ms. DeGette. And that is what you think is appropriate for

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	sattribu	ted to the
speaker. A	link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Commit	ttee's website	as soon as	it is availabl	le.	

1823 a SCIF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady yields back her time. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, I believe, Mr. Flores, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Flores. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I thank you, Administrator Pruitt, for joining us today. I want to thank you for the EPA's timely rollout of the RFS standards. I think it is the first time in the RFS that that was done, so I appreciate that. There is a bipartisan group of us here in Congress including Chairman Shimkus, Peter Welch, others, and myself that are working on a solution to this, the challenges of the current RFS statute also with respect to RIN reform, so we may need data and input from you and so be expecting a request from us on that.

Moving to ozone for a minute, one of the challenges with ozone regs is that the 2008 standards were rolled out and then there were huge delays in the rollout methodology from the EPA and then the 2015 standards were levied out on top of that. That has created substantial uncertainty in our communities in terms of trying to comply with two standards essentially at one time.

And then when you add to that there is a growing recognition that -- well, before I get to that, today I think most people agree that most of the country even based on some of the EPA's

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	tements
within ma	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be po	sted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

own modeling show that most of the country will be in compliance in 7 years with both standards.

And then you add to that there is a growing recognition that international pollution is causing several communities to not be able to meet the standards. There is actually a recent analysis by the Midwest Ozone Group of the EPA said that but for international contributions the United States east of the Rockies would attain the 2008 and 2015 standards by 2023.

So a couple of questions in this regard, the first one is does it make sense to force new compliance burdens on states before existing controls have been implemented?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, speaking generally to those pollutants that we regulate under NOx, I think the 5-year review process that we engage in should be a review and not necessarily just an automatic ratcheting down, because I think when you look at the 75 parts per billion versus the 70 parts per billion that was the focus of the ozone rule, there are issues that you describe. Air transport issues, background ozone, exceptional events I think came up earlier today. There are issues that we need to calculate and understand as those standards are set.

So going forward, I think the 5-year review process should not be interpreted as an automatic ratcheting down. It should

This is a prelim	minary, unedite	d transcript.	The statements
within may be	inaccurate, inco	mplete, or mi	sattributed to the
speaker. A link	to the final, off	cial transcript	will be posted on
the Committee's	website as soon	as it is availab	le.

be a review of whether the levels are protective of human health.

Mr. Flores. Okay. Do you think it makes sense for states or communities to be punished for ozone that is beyond their control that comes in from other areas or background ozone?

Mr. Pruitt. No. And in the designation process,

Congressman, we try to take that into consideration. I mean there

are areas in Wisconsin as an example that are facing compliance

issues because of air transport issues.

Mr. Flores. Right.

Mr. Pruitt. And we are trying to calculate that into the designation process as best we can.

Mr. Flores. Good. In order to address the situations that we have just talked about, supplementally, in order to comply with my time limit, I would like you to tell me what you think Congress could do to help with this and also what EPA could do under its current statutory authority.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I think that, you know, mentioning background ozone and background levels, I think there are certain parts of the country that really have -- there is no economic activity that could occur and they still would be violative of the standard that has been set. So I think Congress assisting the EPA in how to address background levels would be substantially

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	atements
within n	nay be inaccura	ate, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Com	mittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

1889 | important.

I think also the exceptional events, there is a lot of confusion, better put, lack of clarity on how to apply exceptional events in the designation process and otherwise and so I think some clarity around that would be much appreciated.

Mr. Flores. Okay, great. We are working on that. I wanted to take a second of my remaining time to ask for your help with an agricultural herbicide that is called glyphosate. I think it is more commonly known as Roundup by the manufacturer.

Last month, HHS released an agricultural health study that determined that this particular chemical does not cause cancer, again does not cause cancer, and that is similar to a study, the outcome of a study that the EPA made this past March. The challenge is that the state of California and the International Association for the Research of Cancer claiming that it does and that creates uncertainty among our agricultural community as well as the manufacturer of this particular herbicide.

And of course we have got to get all of this sorted out because you have one group of folks saying it does, you have got two other government agencies saying it does not cause cancer. Can I get a commitment from you to have your team take a look at this to try to sort this out?

This is a prelim	minary, unedite	d transcript.	The statements
within may be	inaccurate, inco	mplete, or mi	sattributed to the
speaker. A link	to the final, off	cial transcript	will be posted on
the Committee's	website as soon	as it is availab	le.

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. And, you know, there has been another study I think at NIH that was similar to the one you cited. So there is some clarity that we need to provide on this going forward and, yes, we need to work with you and others on the committee that are concerned about that.

Mr. Flores. Okay, thank you. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. McNerney, for 5 minutes.

Mr. McNerney. I thank the chairman and I thank the administrator for coming here in front of us today. In response to Chairman Walden's questions, you said that the U.S. should celebrate the progress that has been made in reducing air pollution. I agree. You also said that that is in large part due to technology and innovation. I agree completely. But do you think that the progress that has taken place would have been made without the EPA regulations enforcements? And these are regulations that you are now eliminating.

Mr. Pruitt. I think the EPA's regulation framework has helped, absolutely, in contributing to those outcomes, but I think it has been a partnership between regulatory response as well

This is a prelim	minary, unedite	d transcript.	The statements
within may be	inaccurate, inco	mplete, or mi	sattributed to the
speaker. A link	to the final, off	cial transcript	will be posted on
the Committee's	website as soon	as it is availab	le.

as technology in the private sector. So I think it has been a combination of factors.

Mr. McNerney. Okay. Ozone pollution is one of the most widespread pollutions in the United States and scientists have been studying its effect on health for decades. Hundreds of research studies have confirmed that ozone harms people at levels currently found in the United States. The Clean Air Act requires that the EPA to review the latest scientific evidence and set air quality standards that will protect public health, these standards that we rely on to know whether ozone is safe, what levels of ozone are safe.

Administrator Pruitt, do you agree that the ozone pollution is a problem that the EPA should address?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. It is a criteria pollutant under the NOx program that needs to be addressed.

Mr. McNerney. Good. Approximately 30 percent of the people in my district suffer from asthma partly related to ozone, but your actions, in my opinion, do not demonstrate a commitment to addressing the problem. For example, on October 1st, 2017 marked the legal deadline for the EPA to identify communities with levels of ground level ozone pollution above the EPA's 2015 ozone standard. These are also known as non-attainment areas.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

Administrator Pruitt, you spoke a lot about the rule of law in your statement. Did the EPA announce attainment designations by the October 1st statutory deadline?

Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, we have designated all but 50 sites across the country, approximately, and we have made tremendous progress since the timeframe that you are talking about, so we are very close to finishing that process.

Mr. McNerney. But you didn't make the October 1st deadline.

Mr. Pruitt. Some of those were designated prior to that time, yes, but not all.

Mr. McNerney. Well, I think you sort of mentioned this already, about half of the counties that were not designated by October 1st comprise about half of the United States population.

Mr. Pruitt. Some of that is based upon, Congressman, on information that has not been provided by the states. So sometimes there is insufficient information in which for us to make a determination and so there is a communication to those states to get that in to help us finish that process. It is not exclusively, you know, something we can do without that information.

So it is a combination of factors, but we are working diligently to finish that process. The designations are

Mr. Pruitt. I am not sure in what ways, Congressman. Maybe you can clarify your question, how we are keeping it from those citizens.

Mr. McNerney. Well, you haven't, you didn't meet the

1977

1978

1979

1980

1981

1982

1983

1984

1985

1986

1987

1988

1989

1990

1991

1992

1993

1994

1995

1996

1997

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The st	atements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattribute	ed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be p	osted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.	
	0 5

October 1st deadline and you still haven't fulfilled the entire So you are keeping information from communities that need to know what their attainment levels are.

That is not information, it is a designation Mr. Pruitt. process which is a -- it is a legal process, Congressman, that we are going through to make those designations, which we need information to do that and I think we are making tremendous progress and should be done very soon.

Mr. McNerney. Administrator Pruitt, you have made it clear that you are committed to Superfund cleanup, but what about preventing creation of new Superfund sites? What is your commitment in that regard?

In what regard, Congressman? Mr. Pruitt.

Mr. McNerney. Well, the EPA's job is to protect public health, so it should be the job to prevent companies or entities from creating Superfund sites. Are you committed to that?

Correct. I mean that is something -- when you say creating Superfund sites, sometimes states actually ask for us to put Superfund sites on a list which I was just trying to get clarity about that. Yes.

Mr. McNerney. I am not talking about designation. talking about creating pollution that could be designated as a

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1999

2000

2001

2002

2003

2004

2005

2006

2007

2008

2009

2010

2011

2012

2013

2014

2015

2016

2017

2018

2019

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

2021 Superfund site.

Mr. Pruitt. Obviously lead, uranium, these issues, we want to do all we can to eliminate those things so we don't have those kind of sites across the country, absolutely.

Mr. McNerney. Well, in your rush to eliminate regulations that is exactly what you are doing is creating opportunity for new Superfund sites to be created.

Mr. Pruitt. I wouldn't interpret it that way, Congressman.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Hudson, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Hudson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Mr. Administrator, for making the extra effort to come back and take all of our questions and thank you for your strong leadership at the Agency. I appreciate also your efforts to make the EPA focus on air and water and soil contamination. My state of North Carolina has been shaken by a discovery of a chemical called GenerationX in the Cape Fear River. I know my state reports that GenX is no longer getting into the river and that treated drinking water is within state health goals. The previous EPA administrator permitted use of this chemical within conditions in 2009. Can you say whether EPA has discovered if GenX was used

This is a preliminar	y, unedited	transcript.	The s	statements
within may be inacco	ırate, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to the
speaker. A link to th	e final, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Committee's webs	ite as soon as	it is available	e .	

2043 in an impermissible fashion?

Mr. Pruitt. You know, I am not aware, Congressman. We can provide that information to you. I don't have any information on that today, but we can get that to you.

Mr. Hudson. I appreciate it. I understand the EPA is updating its risk assessment of GenX and is performing an independent laboratory analysis and several other compounds in water samples that are being collected now by the North Carolina DEQ along the Cape Fear River including waste water, surface water, ground water, and treated drinking water samples. Are there any findings that you can discuss on that so far?

Mr. Pruitt. Again on that I would have to get the information from the office and provide that to you to make sure it is complete, comprehensive, and up to date.

Mr. Hudson. Great. I appreciate that. One issue that is a real concern to folks in my part of North Carolina, whether it is agriculture or just property owners in general, is the Waters of the USA regulation. And I have heard some of your critics say that you have done the same thing as your predecessor in that you have already decided the outcome of the rule and are just casting about for justifications. That is sort of the claim that we keep hearing. I would love to give you a chance to respond

This is a	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The state	ements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be pos	ted on
the Comn	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

2065 | to that.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I think oftentimes with respect to issues like Waters of the United States and CPP, it is not deregulation in the true sense. The Waters rule that was adopted in 2015, the stated objective was to provide clarity. That was what the past administration said. If that were the stated objective it was they failed miserably.

Mr. Hudson. I agree.

Mr. Pruitt. Because the confusion across the country on what a Water of the United States is where federal jurisdiction begins and ends. And so there is a process that we are going through to deal with the deficiency. There is a court stay against this 2015 rule that you are aware of, and so our obligation is to provide a definition and that process has begun in earnest and we should have a proposed rule by April of next year timeframe and we are taking significant comment on that along with the withdrawal of the 2015 rule. So it is not deregulation in the truest sense, it is regulatory clarity going forward so we know where federal jurisdiction begins and ends.

Mr. Hudson. Sounds good to me. One of the main arguments in favor of the Obama administration's Waters rule is that it is essential to protecting drinking water and that without this

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	atements
within n	nay be inaccura	ate, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Com	mittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

version of the rule public health would be at risk. The Safe
Drinking Water Act, however, has provisions addressing both the
protection of source water, Sections 1453 and 1454, and
underground sources of drinking water, Part C. Do you agree
that the Safe Drinking Water Act has these provisions and provides
protection to source waters?

Mr. Pruitt. Absolutely. And let me say to members of the committee, one of the things that we are focused upon as we head into 2018 is lead in our water supply, safe drinking water. And I think there are tremendous challenges we have across the country with respect to service lines in particular communities and the lead that is seeping into the water supply of our children. It is one of the greatest environmental threats I think we face as a country.

And one of the things that I hope that I can work with this committee on as we go into 2018 is a strategy over a 10-year period to eradicate those concerns. And it is going to be a very ambitious initiative at our agency and it is something that we have various offices in the Agency working upon. There are about 17 agencies actually that are working on this issue of lead as well.

And I am sending a letter to my colleagues in other agencies

This is a	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	atements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Comr	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

to make this a point of emphasis as we go into 2018. So not only do I agree with what you are saying about the reach on these issues, but I think there are important matters that we can take on lead that will make a difference for our citizens across the country going forward.

Mr. Hudson. Well, thank you for your answers.

And Mr. Chairman, I think I can speak for folks on both sides of the aisle that we look forward to that discussion. And with that I will yield back.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman --

Mr. Pruitt. And I understand, if I may for a second.

Mr. Shimkus. You may.

Mr. Pruitt. I understand that that is a costly endeavor. You know, replacing service lines across the country it has been estimated may cost as much as \$30 billion or maybe upwards of 50-, 30- to \$50 billion. But I will say to you that if we can develop a 10-year strategy on how to address that across the country -- the state of Michigan as an example, right now, is considering lowering its levels from 15 parts per billion down to 10 parts per billion on the standard, but they are also spending a tremendous amount of money to replace those lead lines, as I understand it.

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

And that is good leadership with the governor of Michigan and I think, frankly, we in Washington need to have that kind of conversation with states across the country to focus on that issue. The President has talked about infrastructure, the importance of using some of the infrastructure discussion to address some of these things and I look forward to that discussion with you.

Mr. Shimkus. So if the gentleman would allow me to yield, so we passed a Safe Drinking Water Act out of the full committee which should be helpful in this. My friends on the other side wanted more money, so maybe in a supplemental and stuff in this process, we have already started moving to try to do that legislatively, but executive branch focus would be helpful.

Mr. Pruitt. It is not just -- look, it is not just service lines. It is corrosion control measures that need to be deployed, obviously paint as well. I mean, so there is a multifaceted approach that we need to evaluate on how to declare a war on lead, if you will, but I want to let you know as a committee it is something I desire to work with you going forward in 2018.

Mr. Shimkus. You will have some interest.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. Cardenas, for 5 minutes.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.	The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or mi	sattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript	will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available	le.

Mr.	Cardenas.	Thank	you	very	much,	, Mr.	Chair.

Mr. Pruitt, appreciate the opportunity for us to -- as I quote you, the dialogue that begins today. I hope that future dialogue doesn't span 10 months between these opportunities.

Is your current office, place of work, Washington, D.C.?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes, sir.

Mr. Cardenas. Okay. And prior to becoming the EPA administrator what city or state did you live in?

Mr. Cardenas. Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Mr. Cardenas. Tulsa, Oklahoma, okay. Well, Mr. Pruitt, I would just like to point out for the record that you traveled to Oklahoma for 43 out of 92 days this spring according to the Washington Post. That is almost half of every day in March, April, and May of this year. I am extremely troubled by reports that your frequent travel to and from Oklahoma occurred at the expense of the U.S. taxpayer and cost more than \$15,000 just on those trips alone. And it appears I am not the only one concerned.

At the request of members of this congressional committee, EPA's Office of Inspector General has begun an audit to review issues of potential waste, fraud, and abuse associated with your frequent travel back to Oklahoma at taxpayers' expense. Also, your record of wasting taxpayer dollars does not end there.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

Later news reports uncovered that you along with other members of the Trump administration have been using private jets and military aircraft at tremendous taxpayer expense. One of the most expensive examples was in early June when you and several of your staff traveled on a military jet from Cincinnati, Ohio to John F. Kennedy Airport in New York on your way to Italy. The cost of that flight alone was reportedly over \$36,000. In August, you chartered a private plane to fly from Denver, Colorado to Durango, Colorado, in the same state, costing the U.S. taxpayers over \$5,000. You did so even though the governor of California had reportedly offered to fly you on a state-owned plane.

Mr. Pruitt, the taxpayer bill for your travel on private jets and other non-commercial aircraft is a record total more than \$58,000 since February of this year alone. These costs are especially offensive given the severe cuts you have proposed to essential and lifesaving EPA programs. Take, for example, the Office of Environmental Justice which helps poor communities who are being disproportionately impacted by environmental pollution. This administration proposed to eliminate the Office of Environmental Justice.

So Mr. Pruitt, are the American people supposed to believe

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

that we cannot afford \$2 million to help our most vulnerable communities but we can afford tens of thousands of dollars for you to fly on private jets?

Mr. Pruitt. First, I want to say to you, Congressman, I do look forward to the dialogue and I appreciate your comments going forward. I think there is much work that we can engage in together and I look forward to that discussion.

Environmental justice is something that I met with, actually, internal members of our team, yesterday, talking about issues like East Chicago. Environmental justice is an important issue. It is something that we seek to translate to real action on the ground and we have since I have been serving, with particular emphasis on Chicago in the east, the Superfund situation there.

On the travel that you have highlighted I would just say to you, every trip that I have taken to Oklahoma with respect to taxpayer expenses has been business related. When I was in Oklahoma for a WOTUS meeting, a Waters of the United States meeting, we had three states converge in the Panhandle of Oklahoma that had Kansas, Oklahoma, and Texas come together. There were hundreds of individuals in attendance. That is a very important effort.

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

Bird Creek in Osage County had high salinity levels. Region 6 had not responded to those high salinity levels. There was harm taking place with fish in that water and as such we needed to take action and I was there to address that. There are concerns that affect Oklahoma and Region 6 just like every state. Every dollar that was expended with respect to those travel was business related. When I have traveled back to the state for personal reasons I paid for it and that will bear out in the process.

But let me say this to you, finally, with respect to the travel, commercial travel is what we fly almost exclusively. The situation in Cincinnati, I fly with the President for a meeting on infrastructure. We were going to the G7 in Italy and could not make the flight at JFK unless we got a public transport, so that is why that decision was made. But it has been only four instances during the entire time that I have been serving as administrator and it was always based upon circumstances.

You mentioned the one in Colorado, the reason that occurred is because we were going into Gold King, Colorado to address the needs and concerns of the citizens there and couldn't make it otherwise. And I would dispute the governor's reference that you made earlier.

Mr. Cardenas. Oh, really. Okay. Well, thank you very

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 106 much for stating for the record, because the Inspector General is looking into those details and I hope it all bears out and let's see what the outcome is. Well, I wanted to be respectful of giving you an opportunity to answer and there goes all of my time. So with the last 5 seconds, I just would like to ask that I be able to insert these two letters from the EPA's Inspector General agreeing to investigate this travel. I ask unanimous consent to enter them into the record. Without objection, so ordered. Mr. Shimkus.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements

[The information follows:]

2252

2253

2241

2242

2243

2244

2245

2246

2247

2248

2249

2250

2251

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

Mr. Shimkus. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. Cramer, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Cramer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2254

2255

2256

2257

2258

2259

2260

2261

2262

2263

2264

2265

2266

2267

2268

2269

2270

2271

2272

2273

2274

2275

Thank you, Mr. Administrator, for your candor, for being here, and for your strong leadership. And I might just say you used a term in responding to Mr. McNerney that I think is a new term at the EPA and that was partnership. And I think that my friend from California's line of questioning bears out that you see states as stakeholders and partners not as subordinates. Thank you for going to places like Oklahoma and to North Dakota and other states in the middle of real America that are affected by what for the last 8 years has simply been a dictatorship by So thank you for that and we appreciate your willingness to address us in our home states. I also want to congratulate you on your incredible work on meeting these deadlines, the 27 years that gets done in a matter of weeks and It probably shouldn't seem like such a high standard, but by comparison and doing all that with only one confirmed AA is really quite remarkable. So I look forward to when you have a full staff and a full team and we can really get to it.

And I know CPP and WOTUS are the big topics obviously in North Dakota as you know, but I want to get to the heart of a

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

couple of things that you have emphasized. And like my friend from Texas, Mr. Olson, I appreciate your commitment to process and rule of law. I appreciate your commitment to cooperative federalism.

And I know you are very familiar with a couple of North Dakota cases. One in particular of course, the regional haze case that started in California and North Dakota was blocked from intervening in, which just kind of blows me away that states don't have as a matter of right, constitutional right, standing in cases that affect them especially with regard to regulations that they have primacy over regulating.

The more recent one is one that sort of straddled your memo on sue and settle that I want to bring to your attention and see if we can't work more closely together -- you, me, our attorney general -- on addressing it as we go forward. And that was a RCRA revision of rules that was proposed in 2016, a consent decree was declared between the EPA and environmentalist groups and North Dakota was blocked from intervening.

And this is, it related to oil and gas industry in our state, where our state has primacy we were blocked from intervening.

Oral arguments in October of this year, about the same time as you were putting out your memo, occurred in the D.C. Circuit Court

of Appeals and we were blocked again. The environmentalists and the EPA prevailed.

But what was most disturbing about that and why I want to bring it to your attention is because you have a really big task in front of you to meet not just the rules but the culture change that we hope to achieve, and that is it was the Department of Justice attorneys that argued so effectively against the state of North Dakota in the D.C. Circuit.

So as we go forward, what I would love to do is be able to, you know, maybe have a meeting with my attorney general and you and me and plan, you know, the next phase of this and use the state of North Dakota as a partner as opposed to, you know, a litigant on the other side.

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. As I indicated earlier in my opening comments and I think in response to questions, from your perspective, you know, you have put into place a process by which we are supposed to adopt rules. And rules are supposed to be what, laws of general applicability. And so when you are involved in litigation and you change requirements under a statute, discretionary to nondiscretionary or timelines or otherwise and then you apply it in a general fashion, that is something that I think is offensive with respect to the APA process and should

2320 be dealt with.

And that is why the sue and settle practice is important as we go forward. We may consider codifying that loosely said with respect to rulemaking, but it is important that we implement this directive I have sent to respect the APA as we make decisions.

Mr. Cramer. Well, with regard then to states' rights, because I really feel like it is not just RCRA, it is all of the acts under the EPA, it is several other agencies where it seems like the right for a state to have standing somehow has to be based on some finding of harm or injury. And it seems to me that in a cooperative federalism states should just have that right, especially if it is a regulation that they have primacy over.

I am wondering if we should be doing something, you know, to codify that which it seems to me the Constitution should be adequate for, but whether we should do it broadly or whether we should do it very specifically. And I might add and then you can answer and wrap up my time, should you have some more independent litigation authority, independent of, say, of the DOJ or other --

Mr. Pruitt. Well, look. I think on the first point, I do think that perhaps Congress addressing the standing of states to address some of those. Most of those are state implementation

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
111
plans. Many of them deal with regional haze requirements under
the Clean Air Act, and I do think it is important that the voice
of those states are heard.
And that is the reason as it relates to the directive that
I issued, we asked Justice to take a very accommodating posture
with respect to the state intervention on these issues, but there
probably is more that can be done to make sure that that happens
going forward.
Mr. Cramer. Thank you. And I thank you for your service.
Mr. Shimkus. Time is expired. The chair now recognizes
the young lady from Michigan, Ms. Dingell, for 5 minutes.
Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Administrator Pruitt, it is good to see you here and I was
very glad to hear you talk about this war on lead we need to have.
I share like every one of us, I have met those children in Flint.
I have lived with some of those families. It is a very serious
problem and we all need to work together to make sure it never
happens in another community again.
We have been meeting with my mayors for the last year even
in my own community included the state

in my own community, included the state.

Mr. Pruitt. It is not just Flint either.

Mrs. Dingell. No, it is all -- I have it in my district.

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribı	ated to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	e posted on
the Com	mittee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

I don't have Flint in my district, but it is a concern all over the country. But having said that there are some things I think that are happening at EPA that actually threaten that what you are talking about. So I have got a lot of stuff to talk about, EPA matters in Michigan.

Could I ask for some yes or no questions just to this. For example, the EPA budget for 2018 eliminated two programs that provide grants to states and tribe grants to support their lead training and certification programs for lead paint removal contractors and the lead risk reduction program; is that correct?

Mr. Pruitt. We welcomed Congress restoring that and we talked about that in the appropriations process.

Mrs. Dingell. Okay. But you -- this would represent, it would have represented a 90 percent reduction or a \$26.5 million in funding. In addition to proposed cuts, we have seen delays on several key rulemakings. You talked about one of them which isn't only in Flint. It is another plume that I have got in mind, which is the Agency's long overdue update to the Lead and Copper Rule for drinking water system. It was supposed to be completed by June of this year and now it appears to be delayed to next month. Will we see it next month?

Mr. Pruitt. I mean the Agency, Congresswoman, as you know

	11
has	taken over a decade on that. 1991
	Mrs. Dingell. I nudged them too.
	Mr. Pruitt. No, no. 1991 was the last time we had a Lea
and	Copper Rule.
	Mrs. Dingell. But we need it and you have been promising
it.	
	Mr. Pruitt. And there is much work that has gone on over
a de	cade and I will tell you it is a major part of what we nee
to k	e about with respect to this war on lead.
	Mrs. Dingell. So when are we going to see it?
	Mr. Pruitt. So hopefully we are working on it and it
is s	something I am committed to.
	Mrs. Dingell. All right. And the Agency recently delaye
impl	ementation of a 2015 rule to require steam electric power
plar	ts to install pollution control equipment to limit effluents
incl	uding lead, from being discharged to rivers. The 2015 rul
was	the first update to these regulations in 30 years; is tha
corr	rect?
	Mr. Pruitt. I am not sure about the timeline,
Conc	gresswoman. I take that but I don't know for sure if it ha
beer	n 30 years.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements

Mrs. Dingell. All right. Can we work together to get these

things done, because they matter to our communities. Now I am going to quickly -- but I am going to make one little -- I am not trying to be -- I just care. You know, you made a comment to MDEQ that you should have made about reducing the amount of staff that they had and that they needed to have more people on their team addressing these Flint issues.

Mr. Pruitt. MDEQ.

Mrs. Dingell. Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, do you know that? You recommended that MDEQ hire more staff with water management expertise. I agree with that, but you have only got one person. You are offering buyouts and cutting experience and manpower at your agency, the one with oversight responsibility for all these state programs while advising Michigan to do the opposite. So I would encourage you to look at that.

But I have got to do two more things. First, I am going to go to my -- all politics is local, but it is not just local. It matters to this country. We have an EPA lab in Ann Arbor that everybody -- that is doing critical work for every single state on automotive emissions and fuel economy. The budget would have eliminated that. The auto companies support it. The environmentalist community support it. Everybody knows what

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statement
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted or
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

2430	good	work	i +	hae	done
Z43U	1 900a	WOLK	⊥し	nas	aone.

Will you support keeping that lab open with all the important work we have got coming down the road?

Mr. Pruitt. I will.

Mrs. Dingell. Thank you. You just made my day. But now having said that the Great Lakes. Michigan is, you know, it is not just Michigan. It is all the states that are on the Great Lakes. They matter. They are more than 20 percent of the fresh water supply in the world. The EPA, the President's budget would have eliminated all the dollars for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative or the GLRI. Republicans and Democrats on this committee and in the House and Senate worked to restore that. The EPA had something to do with eliminating that down to zero. Can you explain why and can we work with you to make sure that never happens again?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I actually talked to your senator about this a couple nights ago.

Mrs. Dingell. We care.

Mr. Pruitt. Oh, I know, and not just Michigan, but other region. The Great Lakes Initiative is something that has been very successful. You have an issue with invasive species there with carp.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statemen within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted of the Committee's website as soon as it is available.	he
	.16

	110
2452	Mrs. Dingell. A serious one.
2453	Mr. Pruitt. And it is something we need to pay attention
2454	to and I respected Congress and their restoration of those funds
2455	and appreciate that and we will continue to work with you in that
2456	regard.
2457	Mrs. Dingell. And not cut them again?
2458	Mr. Pruitt. Excuse me?
2459	Mrs. Dingell. And not make an effort to cut them again?
2460	Mr. Pruitt. That is a process that we will go through next
2461	year. I mean that is not something that is unilaterally our
2462	decision as you know. That is a combination of decisions
2463	Mrs. Dingell. We will be back if you do.
2464	Mr. Pruitt. Yes.
2465	Mrs. Dingell. Thank you.
2466	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired. The chair
2467	now recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, believe it or not,
2468	Mr. Walberg, for 5 minutes.
2469	Mr. Walberg. Thank you. And Michigan works together on
2470	these things, so I want to thank my colleague for some of the
2471	questions there.
2472	But also, Administrator Pruitt, I want to thank you for being
2473	here. Thank you for your straight talk. I thank you for the

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	tatements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be j	posted on
the Comn	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

fact that we don't have to watch you use a lot of notes. That says something about your understanding of the issues.

You made a quote in this, or a statement in this Great Lakes Restoration, the Initiative report that had a lot of good things in it, your Interagency Task Force on the Great Lakes that you -- I am grateful -- chair, and you said that the GLRI is protecting public health in the Great Lakes more than any other coordinated interagency effort in the U.S. history in helping to ensure that our children and their children live in safe, healthier communities. I thank you for that statement. I agree with you on it.

I would just follow up my good friend and colleague from the other side of the aisle. My question is this. Can I count on you and your agency to work with my office, our Michigan delegation, and the state to support programs to protect cleanup and preserve the Great Lakes?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes, sir.

Mr. Walberg. I appreciate that and whatever it takes I would assume that that would be the case.

Mr. Pruitt. I mean as an example, Congressman, as was mentioned earlier, the Great Lakes Initiative is similar to the Chesapeake TMDL and how the states came together to address a

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

concern. There it was something different, but this process is, the Great Lakes Initiative is something that we should work together to make sure that it is achieving good outcomes and I think it has and we will continue that discussion as we head into 2018.

Mr. Walberg. Right. Well, thank you. Another issue I feel very strongly about is the environmental threat the algae blooms pose to Lake Erie which is in my district. This committee has worked over the years to address this issue and encourage cooperation between federal agencies and the states.

I supported my colleague from Ohio. It is tough for a Michigander to support Ohio at times especially after the game 2 weeks ago, but I supported Bob Latta's legislation in 2015 that required the EPA to develop and submit a plan to Congress for assessing and managing risks from the cyanotoxins. Could you please update me on the latest efforts by the Agency to address the harmful algae blooms in the Great Lakes and more specifically Lake Erie?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. The algal blooms there, but other parts of the country have been a primary point of emphasis for the Office of Water working with states on nonpoint source discharge for a number of years as you know, Congressman. It is something that

This is	a prelim	inary, ur	nedited	transcrip	ot. The	stateme	nts
within n	nay be in	accurate,	incomp	olete, or	misattribu	ited to	the
speaker.	A link t	o the fina	l, officia	al transcr	ipt will be	e posted	on
the Com	mittee's v	vebsite as	soon as	it is avail	able.		

we actually have a task force internally and a dedicated team of individuals looking at that to try to achieve better outcomes and that is ongoing.

I can provide other specifics to questions that you have as it relates to Lake Erie. I would have to get that from the staff to get an update for you, but it is something that is absolutely a priority.

Mr. Walberg. And we are taking a broad perspective.

Agriculture has its problems, we know that. We also know in Michigan the MAEAP program has attempted to be very effective in trying to address the concerns about excess nutrients, fertilizers, all sorts of things that come from agriculture.

But there are other processes that go into this as well and I would assume that you would be looking at the total.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, look. And I think we need to recognize that there are farmers and ranchers all over the country that have taken very important steps to address those issues. I have said many times those farmers and ranchers are our first conservationists or our first environmentalists. They care about these issues as well and we need to make sure their voices are heard to ensure that we are working together to achieve those outcomes.

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

2540	Mr. Walberg. I thank you for that. What cooperative
2541	efforts has EPA undertaken with other federal agencies in this
2542	matter dealing with algae blooms?
2543	Mr. Pruitt. You know, Congressman, I am not entirely sure
2544	if Department of Ag has been a part of our discussion. I am sure
2545	that they have historically. Sonny Perdue and I have not
2546	addressed it, but it is something that we ought to do going forward
2547	and ensure that there is partnership like with the Department
2548	of Ag and there are probably others, but perhaps the Department
2549	of Interior with certain aspects of Secretary Zinke's shop. But
2550	I think Department of Ag would be a very important partner in
2551	this process.
2552	Mr. Walberg. Okay, invasive species, specifically Asian
2553	carp. What is the involvement with EPA in looking at that? It
2554	is a huge, huge problem for the Great Lakes. The Army Corps of
2555	Engineers, any involvement with them, other federal agencies as
2556	well as state and local governments, what is the EPA doing there?
2557	Mr. Pruitt. A point of emphasis and you mentioned the Corps,
2558	the Corps has been very, very involved in that.
2559	Mr. Walberg. Very, very slow in that as well.
2560	Mr. Pruitt. Well, perhaps we can encourage them.
2561	Mr. Walberg. I would appreciate that and we will look

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

2562	forward to	
Z J U Z	I TOTWATA CO	

Mr. Pruitt. We are working together with the Corps on a multitude of issues, Congressman, not the least of which is WOTUS. But the leadership there has been responsive and so we will take that information and make sure that we communicate that to our partners.

Mr. Walberg. Thank you and I yield back.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair now recognizes the gentlelady from California, Ms. Matsui, for 5 minutes.

Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Pruitt, for being here today.

Mr. Pruitt, I understand that you and President Trump have decided to reopen the Midterm Evaluation, the greenhouse gas emission standards from model year 2022 to 2025. Can you briefly list for us which groups and companies asked you to revisit the evaluation?

Mr. Pruitt. You know, I wouldn't say reopen, Congresswoman, necessarily. This is as you know the Midterm Evaluation was supposed to have taken place in April of 2018. That is when it was supposed to occur. The past administration accelerated that for it to happen in December of '16 into January of '17. And

122

this was simply a restoration of process to ensure that the midterm review took place consistent with the original understanding.

Ms. Matsui. So this is halfway step, it is not a total evaluation?

Mr. Pruitt. That is right.

2584

2585

2586

2587

2588

2589

2590

2591

2592

2593

2594

2595

2596

2597

2598

2599

2600

2601

2602

2603

2604

2605

Ms. Matsui. Okay, all right. Okay, so I will go along with I just want to suggest to you though that this you for that. half-step evaluation I am somewhat concerned about this because these standards to save consumers particularly dollars at the pumps and reduce oil consumption has been validated many times to reduce greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change. And the standard is good for American drivers and good for the environment and it is really necessary, particularly because the International Energy Agency found that the transportation sector is the only area in which the U.S. has become less energy efficient. Now I also believe that our country should be investing in clean transportation options and many auto companies share my opinion. One of our major domestic auto manufacturers recently announced it is cutting spending on internal combustion engines and instead investing billions of dollars in electric vehicle development. Another company plans to release 20 all-electric vehicles in the coming years.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statement
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted or
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

2606	Can you please answer yes or no, do you support efforts to
2607	strengthen American innovation and manufacturing through
2608	electric vehicle R&D and production?
2609	Mr. Pruitt. It definitely should be a part of the mix,
2610	Congresswoman. And I would say this to you as well, the Agency
2611	has not adequately considered with those standards high octane
2612	being used as well. There has been a lot of focus on the design
2613	of vehicles and access to electric vehicles as well, but not as
2614	much on the fuel side and I think that we need to incorporate
2615	that into the discussion as well.
2616	Ms. Matsui. So you have a plan to support the electric
2617	vehicle market in the long term?
2618	Mr. Pruitt. That would definitely be part of the evaluation
2619	as we head into April of 2018 and we continue in the years ahead,
2620	I am sure.
2621	Ms. Matsui. All right. I am pleased to hear that because
2622	EVs will be a significant portion of our vehicle mix in the future
2623	and we need to be positioning the United States to benefit from
2624	their adoption.
2625	Mr. Pruitt. We want to ensure, if I may for a second?
2626	Ms. Matsui. Yes.
2627	Mr. Pruitt. We want to ensure that as we set those standards

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
that you don't want people staying in older model vehicles. I
mean the whole purpose here is to ensure that as the vehicles
are manufactured that they meet efficiency levels and outcomes
that are important to the environment.
Ms. Matsui. I understand.
Mr. Pruitt. And so if you don't look at the cross section
of issues from high octane fuel design and what you have raised,
Congresswoman, the very purposes are not achieved. And so we
are taking all those into consideration as we head into April
'18.
Ms. Matsui. Okay, certainly. Mr. Pruitt, I am now running
out of time. Does California currently have a waiver to set its
own light-duty vehicle emission standards through 2025?
Mr. Pruitt. Yes. There is, as you know, a statutory waiver
for California that is evaluated as part of the midterm review.
Ms. Matsui. Right. Is the EPA involving the state of
California in your review or partial review to a 2022 through
2025 emission standards?
Mr. Pruitt. I missed the first part of the question, I am

Ms. Matsui. Are you involving the state of California in your review of the 2022 to 2025 emission standards?

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The statements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be posted on
the Comr	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available) .

Mr	.]	Pruitt.	As	par	t of	the	midterm	review	the	California
waiver	is	necessai	cily	_Z a	part	of	that pro	cess.		

Ms. Matsui. Okay, great. That is encouraging because I believe that the communication of all involved stakeholders is very important. And Mr. Pruitt, can you please answer yes or no. Do you believe that environmental laws envision a cooperative relationship between states and the federal government?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes.

Ms. Matsui. In the past you have said that the previous administration was, quote, aggressive about dictating to the states and displacing their authority, end quote. Is this correct?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Matsui. Given your support for states' rights under federal environmental laws, do you support California's ability to seek a waiver to set its own Clean Air Act light-duty vehicle standards?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, federalism principles, Congresswoman, do not say that one state can dictate to the rest of the country the standard for the entire country. So there are a multitude of considerations with respect to the waiver and those we

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The states within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be post	o the
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.	126

considered in due time.

2673

Ms. Matsui. That we will definitely work with states in order to do this.

2675

2674

Mr. Pruitt. We have already reached out to the governor of California and are waiting for a response.

2677

2678

2679

2676

Ms. Matsui. Okay, great. So as I mentioned previously, certain auto manufacturers asked for changes to the emission standards. Some have specifically asked for flexibilities under the current program. Are you considering providing these types

26802681

of flexibilities or are you also looking at relaxing the standards

2682

2683

entirely?

Mr. Pruitt. As part of that midterm review all things will be considered.

2684

Ms. Matsui. Okay. NHTSA has made --

26852686

Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired.

2687

Ms. Matsui. All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

2688

Mr. Shimkus. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Duncan, for 5 minutes.

2689

Mr. Duncan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

26902691

Administrator Pruitt, thank you for being here today. This hearing has been extremely informative to me for learning the

26922693

Trump administration priorities within the EPA and I have to say

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	atements
within n	nay be inaccura	ate, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Com	mittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

I have been extremely impressed and supportive with the EPA thus far under the Trump administration and your leadership. You all understand what the intended role of the Agency is and have effectively worked to roll back the bureaucratic overreach and power abuses of the Agency under the previous administration.

Through cooperative federalism you prioritized what should be left up to the states when it comes to both energy and environmental matters. The states should be the ones to set their own limits in regards to the environment and I thank you for understanding the crucial role the states and localities play in this process. A quick question about the February 28th presidential executive order on Waters of the U.S., could you inform me of the status of that AEO?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. On February 28th, the President issued an executive order asking the Agency to review that definition from 2015. We in fact are doing that. There is a two-step process presently that is ongoing. One is a proposed withdrawal of the Waters rule and that is in the marketplace.

There is comment being taken upon that, in fact the comment period is closed. And we have a substitute definition of what a Water of the United States is that will come out sometime in April of next year. So there is a substantive replacement that

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

is forthcoming and a withdrawal that is already in the marketplace that makes up the response to the February 28th executive order.

Mr. Duncan. Thank you. A lot of us were alarmed when we saw what was defined as a navigable waterway under the previous administration. A lot of times these were ditches that didn't hold any water, no stream bed, only had water during a significant rain event, but yet they were regulated under the Waters of the U.S. and that was to the detriment of the developer, the landowner, the farmers, and what not. So I thank you and the administration for doing that.

I want to shift gears to ports. The South Carolina port regulated by the Ports Authority in South Carolina, our Charleston port, is important. One in every 11 jobs in South Carolina is attributed to some sort of port activity. So could you explain how under the Trump administration the permitting process for ports is carried out in a more timely and efficient manner to ensure that these ports continue to maintain, be a main economic driver while still protecting the environment?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes, it is not just a port issue, Congressman, but I think the permitting process at the EPA has been very inconsistent. I talked about this, this morning, with respect to the ten regions and how individuals in Region 8 or Region 6

are being treated differently than Region 5 and Region 10. And so we are trying to get processes in place to ensure that there are timely responses. You know, a permitting process shouldn't go on for years and years and years, and we have many examples at the Agency where, literally, the decision on whether to grant or deny a permit has taken over a decade. That is entirely unacceptable. And what we are doing is trying to set an outside time limit that a decision will be made up or down on whether a permit should issue.

In fact, I have been told, I mentioned the chief operating officer earlier today, it is our goal by the end of 2018 to have processes in place to ensure an answer up or down on permits within 6 months as we go forward. So that is something states are doing across the country. It is a major undertaking at our Agency but we are trying to reform the processes internally to provide answers with more clarity and more certainty.

Mr. Duncan. I applaud you for that and I wish this committee had jurisdiction over the Corps of Engineers and we could encourage them to manage river systems in this country on a regional basis instead of a one-size-fits-all. Because I can tell you, eastern river systems like the Savannah River system is different than western river systems, and how the Savannah

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	.	

River Basin is managed from a Corps of Engineers standpoint and possibly even an EPA standpoint is different than how a western river system should be managed. That is important to my district that has core lakes and downstream flows that affect Mr. Carter's district.

So Mr. Administrator, I appreciate you being here. With that Mr. Chairman, I yield back a minute of my time.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, if I may, I really appreciate the comment about regional variation, because as we look at the Waters of the United States rule as an example, I mentioned this earlier today. The states have, North Dakota has something called prairie potholes and as I spent time in North Dakota I had never seen a prairie pothole. But that is a unique aspect of that state that needs to be taken into consideration as we look at these issues. So I really appreciate your feedback. That is the reason we were reaching out to governors and these DEQs, DNRs across the country to make sure that we are making informed decisions not only on just permitting, but the substantive rules that we are talking about.

Mr. Duncan. Yes. That is critical. I yield back.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Carter, for 5

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	tatements
within mag	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribut	ted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	_

2782	minutes

Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I appreciate you being here today very much. Pardon me?

Mr. Shimkus. My apology, talking to another member here.
Mr. Carter. No worries.

Administrator Pruitt, I have got a -- during the last administration, toward the end of the last administration there was a rule that was titled Greenhouse Gas Phase 2 Rule for Medium and Heavy-duty Trucks. And in my opinion this had a lot of overreach in it because it included regulating truck trailers as self-propelled vehicles. And I have introduced legislation to deal with this and I just wanted to ask you. You issued a statement on this rule back in November and in that rule you issued a statement on the review of glider kits, but you didn't include anything about tractor trailers. Do you intend to do that? Are you familiar with this at all?

Mr. Pruitt. I actually appreciate you bringing it to my attention. I was aware of the latter that you mentioned but not the former, so that is something that I will definitely take a look at.

Mr. Carter. Okay. I appreciate it because it is something that is very important to us, particularly to the tractor trailer

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

industry which is a big industry down in our area as well.

I also wanted to ask you, in my district in the coastal region of Georgia, the entire coast of Georgia I have the honor and privilege of representing that area. We have got three significant Superfund sites, and very briefly can you just bring me up to date where we are at with that with the Superfund sites and the status of the program and the improvements you may have made with this?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. There were 42 recommendations that we would be happy to make available to the committee, but in the month of May-June timeframe we commissioned this task force to evaluate how we can better manage the Superfund portfolio and out of that came 42 recommendations. Those recommendations are being implemented as we speak and the great progress is being made.

And we are trying to address because there are certain areas, and in Portland -- I am sorry. I can't recall the member that brought it up this morning, but the City of Portland and the harbor there were substantial issues. It was a large area that was impacted. There was progress that could be made in certain parts of the Superfund area and not others. And so we made a call to get started on those areas, because what has happened historically

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

is that we delayed taking any positive action until the entire area had been decided upon on how to proceed.

So we are trying to make those kind of changes to provide clarity to the communities and also ensuring that we are hearing the voices of those cities and towns and citizens about those decisions. I think that has been neglected in the past. So there are many things we are looking at, but ultimately it is to ensure that we get outcomes and we get decisive outcomes and decisions are made and responsible parties are held responsible for the harm they have caused in those areas.

Mr. Carter. Is there any kind of legislative actions that you feel like you need that we would be able to make that would help you in that area?

Mr. Pruitt. You know, it is a good question because in the brownfields program as an example this body has been very, very successful with respect to changes in the brownfields program. I think there are some reusability opportunities with respect to Superfund sites, sites that are more marketable going forward. I mean, ultimately, our goal in the Superfund portfolio should be to remediate those sites, protect human health, and see those sites redeemed as far as using them going forward. And so there may be some things we can work on together to adopt a brownfields

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

kind of approach to some of the Superfund areas within the portfolio.

Mr. Carter. Good. As I mentioned before, I represent the entire coast of Georgia, over a hundred miles of coastline. So as you can imagine, we have a lot of boaters in that area and our office has been getting a lot of calls about the tiers of engine classes that are available for specialized boats particularly among the harbor pilots and the bar pilots. They are having a lot of trouble with the lack of flexibility that is in the framework.

They have got situations where we have heard requirements of them forcing people to, in the scenarios where the manufacturers don't necessarily make an appropriately tiered engine for a boat type and they are having a lot of trouble with this and it is causing them problems with being able to order these boats. Are you familiar with this or is this something that you have been addressing at all?

Mr. Pruitt. It is not something that I have been privy to as far as discussions at the Agency, but I would be happy to look at it.

Mr. Carter. Okay. And if it is okay I would like my office to be able to send you this information so that you can review

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or mis	
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript	will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available	e.
	135

it bed	cause	it i	s a	sei	riou	ıs	pro	ble	m do	wn here	e. The	ey war	nt to	comply
and t	hey wa	ant	to	do	thi	S	to	do	the	right	thing,	but	they	need
some	flexi	oili	ty	wit	ch i	_t	as	wel	11.					

Mr. Pruitt. Okay.

2870

2871

2872

2873

2874

2875

2876

2877

2878

2879

2880

2881

2882

2883

2884

2885

2886

2887

2888

2889

2890

2891

Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Administrator. One last question, as I understand it, Mr. Administrator, you are from Oklahoma; is that correct?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes, sir.

Mr. Carter. Can you say Go Dawgs?

Mr. Pruitt. It is hard. It is hard.

Mr. Shimkus. I think the gentleman is out of order.

Mr. Carter. Out of order.

Mr. Pruitt. Yes, Boomer Sooner comes out easier.

Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Harper, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Harper. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thanks so much for being here, Administrator Pruitt, and congratulations on a great, almost 10 months I guess that you have been in this role. And while I was born in Mississippi, my late father was born in Altus, Oklahoma and grew up there,

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

so we have a great affinity for the state of Oklahoma in my household. So I appreciate you taking the time to be here and go through this.

Yesterday, I was appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations here in Energy and Commerce, an important responsibility that I will now have and I certainly don't take that lightly. Many of the matters that we have reviewed and will review will concern the EPA.

While I cannot comment on the minority's interest and agenda, I can pledge to my colleagues across the aisle and to you that I will work with you when at all possible and that in the weeks ahead I will be reviewing available information with the chairman of the full committee and committee staff to determine our oversight agenda regarding the many agencies under the committee's jurisdiction including EPA.

I will also work closely with the chairmen of the other subcommittees to identify issues we think deserve focus and attention. In addition, I wanted to emphasize that as with all agencies in the committee's jurisdiction, we do anticipate and expect that the EPA will cooperate with our inquiries and I hope you, Administrator Pruitt, will respect our constitutional prerogatives and will be fully responsive to our inquiries and

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	tatements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribut	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be j	posted on
the Com	mittee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

2914	requests for information, and I assume we can count on that.
2915	Mr. Pruitt. Yes, Congressman.
2916	Mr. Harper. Thank you.
2917	Mr. Pruitt. And it is good to meet you and I am glad to
2918	hear about your connection to Altus.

Mr. Harper. Thank you so much. You know, the Obama administration's EPA rule on wood heaters had two steps. Step one took effect in 2015 that reduced emissions up to 90 percent. Step two is scheduled to take effect in 2020 and will reduce emissions a bit more. The 2015 step one has already gone into effect.

But the wood heater industry, many of them are having great difficulty developing models that meet the 2020 step two standards. So one of the things we have looked at is giving more time in a matter that was actually marked up yesterday to extend that by 3 years. Do you believe that it makes sense to give this industry a little more time to meet the step two standards rather than seeing companies going out of business and letting workers go?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I think it is always helpful,

Congressman, in response to your question, for Congress to provide

those kinds of direction to the Agency, and I am glad to hear

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements
	within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
	speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on
	the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
ı	

and encourage that this body is looking at that to give us the path forward in that regard. And as that occurs we will make sure we work with you to address the issue.

Mr. Harper. You know, many of the customers for these wood heaters, many of them will be in the rural areas, many low-income individuals or households. So, you know, it is a feeling I would assume that you would agree that the EPA needs to make sure that its rules don't drive up prices unnecessarily.

Mr. Pruitt. I mean all those things have to be considered in the regulatory process, but I very much appreciate the congressional response as well on those deadlines.

Mr. Harper. One last thing in the time we have. Last week, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee held a hearing on the Regulatory Reform Task Force. During the hearing, Deputy Associate Administrator Bolen testified that retrospective review of regulations was nothing new to EPA. What are some regulations that have been repealed and what are some others that have been proposed but maybe not yet finalized?

Mr. Pruitt. Goodness. Are you talking about Brittany Bolen?

Mr. Harper. Yes.

Mr. Pruitt. And I am not sure. I haven't reviewed her

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The statements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be posted on
the Comr	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available) .

testimony, but are there any specific rules or areas that you are concerned about?

Mr. Harper. Just wondering if there is something that you have got on your radar that we need to be aware of that you are looking at.

Mr. Pruitt. I mean I think that we have been very, you know, regulatory reform pursuant to the executive order and that task force is something that I think is going to be ongoing as we head into 2018. The agenda that we have spelled out there is very apparent and I think we have addressed some of those here today.

If there are certain rules or regulations that are of concern to you or others on the committee, we look forward to that discussion but I can't point to any particular one that hasn't been discussed already. My apologies in that regard, but.

Mr. Harper. Administrator Pruitt, we want to thank you for your time and your insight. We look forward to working with you in the years ahead. Thank you.

Mr. Pruitt. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. Just an announcement of my apologies to my colleagues who have been here for a long time, the committee rules dictate that members who don't serve on the committee go by seniority on the full committee.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

So with that I recognize the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Rush, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Rush. I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to thank you, Administrator Pruitt, for your attendance here. After your confirmation hearing in January you were submitted questions for the record asking you to define environmental justice and whether you considered it a serious issue. And in your response you seemed to give the issue, in my opinion, short shrift as you reported as saying that you were, quote, familiar with the concept of environmental justice, end of quote.

You then went on to say in a vague way, and I quote you directly, the administrator plays an important role regarding environmental justice, end of quote. And this statement you repeated 11 times in your written response. Then a few months later, after you took over the Agency, the former Assistant Associate Administrator for Environmental Justice, Mr. Mustafa Ali, an individual who worked with my office on several occasions, Mr. Ali resigned in March after 24 years of service stating that he did not see any indication that you or the rest of the Administration are interested in any way in helping vulnerable communities.

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attribı	uted to the
speaker. A	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

I just want to say this is deeply disturbing to me because as you know protecting these communities is an essential aspect of the EPA's mission and is one that appears to have been, in my opinion, summarily neglected. So Mr. Administrator, how would you prioritize EPA's responsibility to protect the nation's most vulnerable populations from pollution? Is it a high, medium, or low priority in your -- how would you define it?

Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, thank you for your comments. And let me say to you it is a priority and I will give you feedback.

Mr. Rush. Is it a high, medium, or low priority?

Mr. Pruitt. It is a very important priority at the Agency, and I will give you an example. East Chicago, an area that I am sure you are familiar with, with respect to a Superfund site there, there are threats to water supply and there is a community in East Chicago that has faced those threats for a number of years.

I traveled to East Chicago, met with members of the community there that make up the constituency group, those that have not had a voice in some of these areas, and met with them about a progress and an answer on that East Chicago area. In fact, we have sent staff there multiple times since I left to ensure progress. So it is something that I consider an important priority.

I met with internal members of our team as recently as yesterday, the NEJAC group that meets internal to the EPA on environmental justice, and we talked about these very issues of making sure that individuals who historically have not had voice to impact outcomes with respect to Superfund or other issues that we take that seriously and actually take that into account going forward. So it is something that is an important priority going forward.

Mr. Rush. So it is an important priority, all right. The record shows that you -- let me ask you another question then. The record shows that you have met either in person or by phone with the API on at least three different occasions, on the 28th of June, on the 29th, and also on the 6th of November. My question to you, there is as an individual who is a scientific advisor for the API and her name is Ms. Una Blake. Are you familiar with this individual?

Mr. Pruitt. The name doesn't sound familiar, Congressman.

Mr. Rush. So have you had any occasion to discuss her position on hydraulic fracturing? She indicated that hydraulic fracking is a health benefit to minority communities, to African American communities specifically and this is in contrast to NAACP study that found that many African American communities face an

This is	a prelim	inary, ur	nedited	transcrip	t. The	stateme	nts
within n	nay be in	accurate,	incom	olete, or	misattribu	ited to	the
speaker.	A link t	o the fina	l, officia	al transcr	ipt will be	e posted	on
the Com	mittee's v	vebsite as	soon as	it is availa	able.		

element of risk of cancer due to air toxic emissions in natural gas. Are you familiar with the NAACP study?

Mr. Pruitt. The person to whom you refer, I am not familiar with that person. So I am sorry.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Griffith, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Guthrie. Thank you very much, Administrator Pruitt. I also want to thank you personally for meeting with me earlier this year to discuss some of the issues in the 9th congressional district of Virginia, and I appreciate that you will continue to work on those. One of those that I think that we talked at that time but I want to discuss again today dealt with the EPA's regulations affecting medium and heavy-duty vehicles. Now the problem that I have is that the prior administration wanted to regulate both the tractor and the trailer.

But the code says that the motor vehicle which is the area where the authority comes from, the term motor vehicle means any self-propelled vehicle designed for transporting persons or property on a street or highway, and of course a trailer is not self-propelled. It has to have the tractor component and we make both in my district. I have Volvo which makes the tractor and

then I have companies that make the trailers and about 2,000 employees just making trailers in my district. So it is a very important question.

And so I guess what I have to ask is, is that with that reading of the law -- and look, I have to applaud you all for agreeing to reconsider those regulations overall, but at some point the EPA needs to either acknowledge that there is no authority over the trailers or come and ask Congress for that authority. Do you know how long it will take before you get to that point?

Mr. Pruitt. And I agree wholeheartedly. I mean it is one of those areas where the text of the statute is something that governs whether we have authority or not and we need to provide clarity on that and do it soon and advise Congress if there is a deficiency. So I agree wholeheartedly with your position.

Mr. Griffith. Well, I appreciate that. In fact, one of the folks there before said that since you had to have goods in the trailer to move anything that that is how they got authority. And I made the analogy at the time, well, that gives the EPA the authority to restrict the weight of the driver because you can't drive at least at this point until we get to the driverless trucks. At this point you have still got to have a driver in the truck and if you are going to get to weights and that kind

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
of thing on things that aren't self-propelled motor vehicles then
you can do anything.
All right. I do want to talk about some New Source Review
issues and I am concerned that the EPA has been using New Source
Review programs inappropriately in the past as a weapon against
coal-fired power plants using enforcement actions to change the
way the program is supposed to work and making it hard for these
plants to do the type of maintenance projects that are needed
to keep them running reliably and efficiently.
I have introduced legislation to address this problem. A
lot of us are hoping that you will help on this. Can you give
me some yes or no answers to the following questions? One, EPA
has taken New Source Review enforcement actions against

coal-fired power plants because they have taken steps to become more efficient. Are you aware of this?

Mr. Pruitt. I am.

Mr. Griffith. And do you think that this is the way the program is supposed to work?

Mr. Pruitt. I don't.

Mr. Griffith. To be more efficient?

Mr. Pruitt. I don't.

Mr. Griffith. Do you think that a power plant should be

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

3090

3091

3092

3093

3094

3095

3096

3097

3098

3099

3100

3101

3102

3103

3104

3105

3106

3107

3108

3109

3110

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

required to go through a long and costly permitting process before it can do something to improve its efficiency including less pollutants?

Mr. Pruitt. I don't.

Mr. Griffith. And do you believe that such a requirement might actually discourage plant owners from doing things to make their plants more efficient?

Mr. Pruitt. In fact it is happening across the country. And I would say to you, Congressman, we have a task force. I mentioned earlier today that Bill Wehrum, who is an AA for air recently confirmed, there is a task force internal to the Agency to address NSR steps going forward in 2018. It is a very important area as you have indicated. There are companies across this country that seek to invest capital to improve emissions and they are very concerned if they do that it will trigger new permitting requirements and it is a disincentive. And that is not the way that it should work and we are trying to address that and believe it is a very important issue.

Mr. Griffith. Well, I appreciate that and look forward to working with you on that issue because I do believe it is a very important issue. And while I do represent a coal district, it is also, I think, important for those who are concerned about

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

pollution because we are going to continue to need coal well into the future at least at some percentage level to keep our grid reliable. And as we use that coal we want to do it more cleanly and more effectively and more efficiently and to discourage people from taking on the new technology because it might put them out of business is not a good idea.

Mr. Pruitt. I mean we should remember that this is really an issue that affects all utility companies that seek to invest monies to improve emission outcomes. We celebrate that and encourage that. We don't want there to be disincentives in place to impact that adversely.

Mr. Griffith. And I know the technology is changing. I am going to switch gears on you a little bit. But I know the technology has changed, but I would like to allay some people's fears. Every rock, every rock system is a little bit different and I know that too, but they have been fracking in my district for probably about 40, 45 years. And so for those people who are afraid of it, if you have the right rock and you are taking a look at the ingredients that are being put into that rock, I think it can be done very safely.

Mr. Pruitt. I mean to your point, Congressman, hydraulic fracturing itself is not new technology. It has been around for

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	tatements
within mag	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribut	ted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	_

decades. And the uniqueness, the shale revolution that has occurred is largely because of horizontal drilling combined with the fracking process. So --

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair will now recognize the gentlelady from Illinois, Ms. Schakowsky, for 5 minutes.

Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate being allowed to be at this hearing today.

Thank you, Secretary Pruitt. I have a number of questions so I am going to try and push through these. Last Congress, Assistant Administrator McCabe appeared before the subcommittee on Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection -- I am the ranking member there -- to discuss EPA and NHTSA technical assistance report, the technical analysis that supported the decision to retain EPA's greenhouse gas standards for the 2022 to '25 model year cars and light trucks. You reopened the midterm review after receiving a request from the auto industry in February, and I have a number of questions that may help me understand why you agreed to their request.

So first, let me ask you this. Is there a revised technical report that you used as a basis for reopening the midterm review of the EPA fuel efficiency standards?

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

Mr. Pruitt. The reopening, Congresswoman, was to keep consistent with what was committed on the midterm review when it was supposed to happen initially. It was supposed to occur April of 2018. This was not a change of that date, it was just a commitment to keep the date that was agreed to at the beginning.

And that date was not -- actually accelerated by the previous

administration, December of '16, January of '17, so this was just restoring order to the process to make sure that the original date was upheld and enforced and it occurred in the time it was supposed to occur initially.

Ms. Schakowsky. Okay. So you are saying there were no change and is that already closed now again?

Mr. Pruitt. No, the review is ongoing. But the review is ongoing because the initial commit was April of 2018. So this is a restoration of process to say that the midterm review should occur pursuant to April 2018 as originally discussed.

Ms. Schakowsky. Well, my understanding is that it was already approved in the last Congress. So in answer to my question, is there a revised technical report that you used as a basis for reopening and is it --

Mr. Pruitt. The Agency accelerated the review process inconsistent --

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
Ms. Schakowsky. All right.
Mr. Pruitt with the original understanding and this
was a restoration of that process.
Ms. Schakowsky. So let me ask you this. I would like to
know if you agree or disagree with the information your agency
provided to us at that time, that is, last Congress. I don't
have any
Mr. Pruitt. What timeframe is that? What timeframe would
that be as far
Ms. Schakowsky. So that was in September of 2016. Do you
have new agree or disagree with the information that your agency
did provide, now your agency, provided to us at that time?
Mr. Pruitt. I think my comment is what I said earlier,
Congresswoman. It is consistent with the commitments were made
that the midterm review would occur in April of 2018.
Ms. Schakowsky. Okay. So I am a bit confused, because Ms.
McCabe testified that the EPA found that fuel efficiency
technology development was moving faster than they had expected
and is being implemented in the early years of the program. Has
this finding changed?

Ms. Schakowsky. The EPA found that to meet the proposed

Mr. Pruitt. I am not aware, Congresswoman.

This is a	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ited to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Comn	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

standards automakers do not have to manufacture and sell large numbers of hybrids and electric vehicles. The Agency projects that the 2022 through '25 standards can be met largely with more efficient gasoline powered cars. Has this finding changed?

Mr. Pruitt. That will be part of the review that occurs in April of '18.

Ms. Schakowsky. So all of these are dependent on a review that was opened earlier than expected. In other words you decided --

Mr. Pruitt. The Agency concluded their process,

Congresswoman, inconsistent with the original timeframe that was established and we have restored that process. So this review that you are referring to will occur and culminate in April of 2018.

Ms. Schakowsky. Okay, so we are going to be interested then. And the transportation sector accounts for a third of the total greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. With light-duty truck vehicles making up more the 60 percent of the emission standards in that sector, the EPA found in that original review that these standards are a critical part of any program to reduce greenhouse gases. Would you agree and do you expect that that finding may change?

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

Mr. Pruitt. The progress made in the mobile source category has been significant and the auto industry has made significant progress over the years. That is why the process matters and we are going to go through that and it will culminate in April of '18.

Ms. Schakowsky. And EPA and NHTSA found that the average cost increase for a car by 2025 due to the standards will be about

cost increase for a car by 2025 due to the standards will be about \$1,200 and that that cost would be offset by an estimated fuel cost savings of about \$1,900. Are you aware of that finding that there would actually be a savings in the cost of a car?

Mr. Pruitt. The vehicle emissions and efficiencies are dramatically more than people anticipated several years ago so there has been great progress as I indicated.

Ms. Schakowsky. The gentlelady's time has expired. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Bilirakis, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

Thanks for letting me sit in on the subcommittee as well. And

I thank you for your testimony, Administrator, and your patience.

Administrator Pruitt, this subcommittee recently held a hearing regarding the status of the hurricane response in Florida, Texas, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. A key issue of

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.	The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or mis	sattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript	will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available	e.

concern was how EPA addressed the Superfund sites both in advance of and in the wake of the hurricanes. This is a big priority for me because in my district I have the Stauffer Chemical Company Superfund site.

I want to thank you for having your staff be so responsive again during and leading up to the hurricanes as well. I appreciate that very much. Can you walk us through EPA's process to secure Superfund sites before and after a hurricane and how does EPA coordinate with state and local agencies?

Mr. Pruitt. Thank you, Congressman. And there are assessments that are made in conjunction with governors, Governor Abbott in Texas, Governor, the Florida governor, Governor Scott. That is going to be bad because he is going to call me a little bit later.

Mr. Shimkus. And I knew it. I am from Illinois, so.

Mr. Pruitt. The governor of Florida and the governor of Texas, we were in conversations with them leading up to the hurricanes in both instances to talk about how to secure those sites. So you have conversations that are ongoing with responsible parties, the governors in those states, the DEQ, DNR at the state level.

There is a pre-assessment on whether proper steps are being

This is a	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ited to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Comn	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

taken to secure those sites, and there is constant evaluation during the storms. And then postscript a determination whether there has been any release. So it is both a pre-, during, and post process that occurs with those states and members of our agency.

Mr. Bilirakis. Okay, thank you. Again the Stauffer --

Mr. Pruitt. Governor Scott is a great governor.

Mr. Bilirakis. And Governor Scott -- I will repeat it.

Governor Scott is a great governor and did a great job during

Mr. Pruitt. He is. And I will say he showed tremendous leadership. In fact, I will tell you with respect to the fuel waivers that occurred, access to fuel is a key issue for citizens during those kinds of storms and working with Governor Abbott in Texas and Governor Scott in Florida we were able to address that in a proactive way to ensure better access to fuel during those storms and Governor Scott was a tremendous leader in that regard.

So I really commend his leadership, the leadership of the state of Florida, the DEQ there, but also in the state of Texas as well.

Mr. Bilirakis. Ditto. I agree. Okay, the current status

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The s	statemen	ts
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to th	ıe
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted o	n
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.		

of the Stauffer site, the Superfund site that I referred to earlier, is better than most of the sites on the national priority list in that the remedy is largely in place and the most recent 5-year review found that the remedy was protective of people and the environment. I know that not all sites on the National Priorities List are in such good shape. I have a couple questions for you about the Superfund cleanup program if I may. Number one, how does EPA plan to work through the sites on the National Priorities List and how does EPA prioritize existing sites on the National Priorities List?

Mr. Pruitt. We have had some changes at the Agency to address sites that are over \$50 million, because historically regions have been the primary place where that has been decided and we have had inconsistency on large sites based upon it being a region by region evaluation. And so what we did is institute a change that on sites of over \$50 million, that would actually be a decision made at headquarters to ensure greater consistency and uniformity and urgency to address those sites.

So that is ongoing based upon the task force recommendations that came out in June of this year, as I previously referred to that. And the other thing we are looking at is to ensure that if we have sites as I indicated earlier that have the ability

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

to be cleaned up partially, you know, where it is a large site and we can make progress, instead of waiting until there is a remedy or proposed remedy for the entire site, we are trying to address those hot spots, if you will, throughout the process to get some clarity and success, if you will, through the cleanup process. So those are just a couple of examples.

But the Superfund program, overall, in my view, has lacked a sense of focus, a sense of leadership and management over making decisions. It is really unacceptable for an agency to take decades to make a decision on how you clean up sites. I would love to tell you that that is an isolated situation at the Agency. It has not been historically.

I have had individuals in the Land and Emergency Management Office that have been in EPA for a number of years that really appreciate how we have vitalized that area and really focused in this and they look forward and are actually making a difference in as early as, you know, the time we have been in there.

Mr. Shimkus. I am going to ask my colleague to yield back that time so we can get -- and also make an announcement that they are going to call votes real soon. We are going to try to drive through our last colleagues. And with that --

Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair?

	This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
3354	Mr. Shimkus. Yes.
3355	Mr. Tonko. Yes, just quickly. If I might ask the Fumes
3356	Across the Fence-Line issued by the Clean Air Task Force and NAACP
3357	referenced by Congressman Rush be entered into the record.
3358	Mr. Shimkus. Without objection, so ordered.
3359	[The information follows:]
3360	
3361	**************************************

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The sta	tements
within ma	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attributed	to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be po	sted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

Mr. Shimkus. And the very patient Kathy Castor is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. Castor. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pruitt, I appreciate the work that the EPA professionals out of Region 4, the work they did before and after Hurricane Irma, so thank you for that.

Mr. Pruitt. They worked very diligently.

Ms. Castor. But clean water and clean air are vital to our economy in Florida. And I had to choke a little bit when you called our governor a great governor, because one of the things — and I wasn't going to mention this. One of the things he has done is to deny the rising cost of the changing climate. Florida is probably one of the most impacted states when it comes to that looking at flood insurance, property insurance, property taxes from these extreme weather events and hurricanes.

And I hope that EPA was not taking a page out of Governor Scott's book. Governor Scott at one point prohibited folks at our environmental agencies from using the term climate change at all and also scrubbed websites. And now you have an unfortunate, now you are laying down that same legacy and I think that is unfortunate as well. To be great you have to great things and not -- and work in the public interest and not for private

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within ma	y be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ted to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Comm	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

3384	interests.	And	
------	------------	-----	--

Mr. Pruitt. I think the Governor did exercise tremendous leadership during the hurricanes. And --

Ms. Castor. On climate he has been a denier and that is a problem and that is going to cost us dearly in the state of Florida. Mr. Pruitt, prior to becoming administrator of EPA you served as attorney general of Oklahoma. In that role you sued the EPA repeatedly, in fact, 14 different times fighting clean air protections, fighting clean water protections.

And interestingly, the CEO of one private company, Murray Energy, was a co-plaintiff in eight of the 14 lawsuits. You also acted with other energy companies and special interests such as Peabody Energy, Southern Power Company, the American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, Oklahoma Gas & Electric, and others. How many of these groups have you met with during your 10-month tenure at the EPA?

Mr. Pruitt. Look, the claims that were made by those companies were separate from the claims of the states --

Ms. Castor. No, just answer that question because we have limited time.

Mr. Pruitt. -- and the state interest.

Ms. Castor. How many times have you met with those

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is a	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within m	ay be inaccura	ite, incom	plete, or mis	attribu	ited to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be	posted on
the Comn	nittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e .	

100	
406	companies
100	compania .

Mr. Pruitt. I don't know, Congresswoman.

Ms. Castor. All right, so please submit that information for the record. These groups also reportedly contributed money to you or your political action committees. Murray Energy CEO Bob Murray was a top donor to your Super PAC. In fact, according to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, you have received over \$345,000 in campaign contributions from these fossil fuel interests.

You previously served two terms as chairman of the Republican Attorneys General Association, correct?

Mr. Pruitt. That is correct.

Ms. Castor. And Murray Energy donated not only to your Super PAC but also to the RAGA. In fact, in 2014, press report describes a, quote, secretive alliance between energy firms and attorneys general, according to this report, under your leadership at the RAGA that set up a separate entity called the Rule of Law Defense Fund which could accept unlimited anonymous donations from companies benefiting from your lawsuits.

Under this arrangement, fundraising reportedly skyrocketed.

The report also states that quote, the work in Mr. Pruitt's office has sometimes seemed to blur the distinction between his official

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statement
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted or
the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
16

101
duties and the advancement of his political career. And I have
to be frank. Many of us are very concerned that you continue
to blur the distinction between your official duties and your
political ambitions. You pledged that while you are
administrator you would recuse yourself from any active cases
where Oklahoma is a party/petitioner/intervener; is that correct?
Mr. Pruitt. I have, in fact.
Ms. Castor. So given your extensive history of suing the
Agency you now oversee and the vast amounts of money you have
raised from the fossil fuel industry, offering to recuse yourself
from only active cases and only cases from where Oklahoma, itself,
is a party is grossly inadequate. So will you commit to recusing
yourself from cases involving your past co-litigants and donors
to the Rule of Law Defense Fund?
Mr. Pruitt. It has not been inadequate according to the
ethics official at the EPA who is a career employee. And that
Ms. Castor. So you are saying you will not commit today?
Mr. Pruitt. I follow the advice of counsel.
Ms. Castor. So yes or no, you will not
Mr. Pruitt. Mr. Chairman, if I may.

Mr. Shimkus. The time is the gentlelady's from Florida,

within	s a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the er. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on
the Co	mmittee's website as soon as it is available.
	102
so.	
М	s. Castor. So I understand
М	r. Pruitt. If I may.
M	r. Shimkus. Well, let the gentlelady ask her question.
М	s. Castor. So if you cannot do that you will cement your
legacy	as one who serves the powerful special interests and not
the pul	blic interest. I am also deeply concerned that you have
not re	cused yourself from regulatory proceedings on specific
rules	you have previously targeted despite the fact that your
positi	on on the issue is clearly already established. Will you
commit	to recusing yourself from rulemakings and other regulatory
action	s that were the subject of your past lawsuits?
М	r. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired. The chair
now re	cognizes the gentleman from Maryland for 5 minutes.
М	s. Castor. He can answer that.
М	r. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired. The chair
recogn	izes the gentleman from Maryland.
М	r. Pruitt. No, you don't, Congresswoman. These issues
have b	een addressed by the ethics official at the EPA.
M	r. Shimkus. The gentleman will suspend. The chair

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Mr. Sarbanes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for being

recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.	The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or mis	sattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript	will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available	e.

here	Mr.	Pruitt,	and	stav	/ina	until	the	end.

President Trump has promised the American people he and his administration would drain the swamp in Washington, overturn, quote, decades of special interest dealing. Do you agree that as EPA administrator your job is to protect public health and the environment by serving the public interest and not wealthy special interests?

Mr. Pruitt. A very key mission of the Agency.

Mr. Sarbanes. Yes.

Mr. Pruitt. Yes.

Mr. Sarbanes. That is a yes answer. The Democracy Reform Task Force, which I am privileged to chair, has been monitoring the Administration's progress with respect to draining the swamp. And as you might suspect from the title of our most recent report, it is still swamped and it is only getting deeper. We didn't want to do this report, but we felt compelled to do it when we looked at all of the ethical lapses that exist within this administration.

On March 30th you met with CropLife America which is a trade association run by several large pesticide companies including Dow Chemical; is that correct?

Mr. Pruitt. If that is what the calendar reflects.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

Mr. Sarbanes. Okay. This was a day after you denied a science-based petition to ban a widely used pesticide tied to developmental delays in children and that action was strongly supported by Dow Chemical, which I will mention donated a million dollars to President Trump's inaugural committee. On April 26th you met with Southern Power, one of the nation's largest coal-burning utilities, and had dinner with Alliance Resource Partners, a major coal mining company. Is that also correct?

Mr. Pruitt. If that is what the calendar reflects.

Mr. Sarbanes. Well, I think that is what the calendar shows. Since then, the EPA has announced that the Agency will consider rolling back rules that protect mining communities from toxic coal ash, and Alliance Resource Partners CEO donated almost \$2 million to elect the President. I am not mentioning this stuff as a gotcha thing. I am mentioning it because it really makes a lot of Americans anxious when you consider the conflicts of interest that this suggests.

Let me turn now to a topic of importance to my home state of Maryland, if I can, the Chesapeake Bay Program. In your confirmation hearing before the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, you commended the state and federal partnership to restore the Chesapeake Bay and you committed to enforcing the

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

3516 Bay pollution diet or the TMDLs; is that correct?

Mr. Pruitt. That is correct. In fact, Senator Cardin and I had wonderful conversations during that process.

Mr. Sarbanes. Yes, I am going to get to that conversation you had with the senator. Despite the fact that as Oklahoma attorney general you sued the EPA challenging the Bay TMDLs previously, you also pledged with Senator Cardin that you would support the federal government's role in Chesapeake Bay partnership through funding critically important programs and supporting the grantmaking role of EPA; is that correct?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes.

Mr. Sarbanes. You would say that is correct. And yet if you look at the President's fiscal year 2018 budget, it completely eliminated the Chesapeake Bay Program at EPA. Now we have pushed back against that, but that is hardly a follow-through on the pledge that you made to Senator Cardin and the statements that you made about the Chesapeake Bay Program. So that is not standing up and enforcing the TMDLs, making the grants that we need to support Bay restoration. It appears rather that under your leadership that commitment is being zeroed out.

Mr. Pruitt. I think, Congressman, that the comments that I made during the appropriations process should also be

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.	The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or mis	sattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript	will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available	le.

referenced, which I spoke to members of this body as well as the members of the Senate on the very issue and expressed my commitment.

Mr. Sarbanes. I appreciate that. What I guess I am looking for is a follow-through on the original commitment that you made in the sense of fighting back inside the Administration and saying programs like the Chesapeake Bay Program are valuable, the funding needs to be there. Don't just rely on Congress to restore these things, which by the way we have tried to do on a bipartisan basis demonstrating the commitment to the program here --

Mr. Pruitt. Those discussions happen.

Mr. Sarbanes. -- but become an ally of ours --

Mr. Pruitt. Those discussions in fact have taken place historically.

Mr. Sarbanes. -- in that respect. Okay. Well, I appreciate you continuing to do that. Let me finish real quickly to speaking to Executive Order 13770, which relates to ethics commitments by executive branch appointees, which requires, quote, every executive agency appointed on or after January 20th, 2017, agency employee to be, quote, contractually committed to an ethics pledge; is that correct?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes.

This is	a preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The st	atements
within n	nay be inaccura	ate, incom	plete, or mis	attribute	ed to the
speaker.	A link to the f	inal, offici	al transcript	will be p	osted on
the Com	mittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

Mr. Sarbanes. Yes. And that pledge stipulates that Administration appointees are prohibited for 2 years from the date of their appointment from participating in any matter involving specific parties that is directly or substantially related to the former employer or former clients including regulations and contracts.

Executive Order 13770 states that appointees have a 2-year cooling off period in terms of handling matters related to their previous lobbying. But I am concerned that several of your personnel decisions deviate from those guidelines. There is a growing list of appointees at EPA that appear to have substantial conflict.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman needs to wrap it up.

Mr. Sarbanes. So I hope that you will bring some real attention to these conflicts as we move forward and I yield back my time. I thank the chairman for allowing us to participate off the committee and I would ask for unanimous consent to submit these Still Swamped --

Mr. Shimkus. Yes. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information follows:]

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within mag	y be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attrib	uted to the
speaker.	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ittee's website	as soon as	it is available	e.	

Mr. Shimkus. And you are welcome. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Loebsack, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Loebsack. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do appreciate the opportunity to be here today.

And Administrator Pruitt, I am sorry I haven't been able to meet you yet, even though I am from Iowa and I know you were just there last week. Thank you for coming to Iowa. I am sure that you heard a lot about the RFS while you were there. I know you have heard a lot about it since you have been administrator. We have bipartisan concerns in Iowa, as you well know, about the RFS in making sure that the Administration lives up to what the RFS demands and what the statute says we should be doing. And I am a Democrat but I also held the Obama administration accountable. I probably wore my Do Not Mess with the RFS button to the White House on one occasion and talked about that with folks there.

The renewable fuels industry as you know, including biodiesel, supports over 40,000 jobs in Iowa. And simply put, I think the RFS works for Iowa. I think it works for America. I think it works to make sure that our economy grows when it comes to jobs. I think it works for our environment. And there is no question that it works for our energy security, because

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

when we are able to produce biofuels I think that contributes to a reduction in our dependence on foreign oil and I think that is really, really critical. It is a security issue as much as it is an economic issue. During your confirmation hearing, you affirmed without question your belief that Congress intended for the RFS to increase the amount of renewable fuel blended into our transportation fuel supply, yet on November 30th as you know you finalized the 2018 RVO that lowers the amount of cellulosic biofuels called for in the statute and flatlines biodiesel volumes. I have the numbers in front of me here as well.

How can you explain these actions when it is clear that these two industries have enormous potential for growth?

Mr. Pruitt. By the way, Congressman, the visit to Iowa last week was very good. I enjoyed the conversation with your constituents. I met with my farmers and ranchers on this issue along with others and it was a very good dialogue. And I think as you look at the volume obligations you reference cellulosic, as you know under the statute there is a waiver authority that is given to the EPA to address production levels. The most we have ever produced domestically is around 190 million, 190 million gallons of cellulosic. The Agency has routinely set those levels higher than that and we did this year

	within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
	170
3626	as well. I think it was around 280 million gallons of cellulosic.
3627	So it is in excess of production levels that we have seen.
3628	Mr. Loebsack. After you increased it by 50 million over
3629	your previous proposal, the light proposal.
3630	Mr. Pruitt. That is right.
3631	Mr. Loebsack. But actually it is down 23 million from last
3632	year.
3633	Mr. Pruitt. It is, but it is
3634	Mr. Loebsack. Far short of what the statute calls for.
3635	Mr. Pruitt. But the statute calls for billions of gallons
3636	to be and that waiver authority is there for a reason. Congress
3637	gave it to us to address, you know, real market issues, production
3638	and demand, and that has been utilized in that area. With
3639	biodiesel we did keep it flat. There is some consideration
3640	that it is 2.6 billion as far as capacity, but we never breached
3641	the 2.1 billion in production. In fact, we imported about 700
3642	million gallons last year from Argentina. So that is the reason
3643	those were flatlined and we discussed those numbers in Iowa last
3644	week.
3645	Mr. Loebsack. And a lot of us that issue is with the logic
3646	of what you are saying, and I understand what you are saying and

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements

I have heard that from Gina McCarthy as well as from you. But

This is a	preliminary,	unedited	transcript.	The	statements
within may	be inaccura	te, incom	plete, or mis	attribı	uted to the
speaker. A	A link to the fi	inal, offici	al transcript	will b	e posted on
the Commi	ttee's website	as soon as	it is available	2.	

I think a lot of us in Iowa and other places have real concerns about the logic of those statements. I will move on.

When it comes to the Reid vapor pressure issue, I know that is something that EPA is looking into. I have introduced legislation along with Adrian Smith, bipartisan legislation — that is what is great about the RFS, I think, is we have bipartisan support for the RFS — to lift the restrictions on the sale of E15 in the summer months. I am a strong supporter of doing that.

And this is something as you know that will put more biofuels into the market. It will help to stabilize the RIN market as well, I believe, create jobs, support farmers, and quite frankly I think consumers are demanding it. I think if we had more infrastructure out there, if we had more opportunities for E15, I know at least in Iowa but I think around the country, folks would in fact buy the E15.

I know you have talked about a legislative fix achieving that goal. Members of this Administration including your deputy administrator have indicated that the RVP fix can be made through the administrative process through EPA and that EPA is committed to completing the analysis. Can you update us at this point where you are in that analysis?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I am not sure to whom you refer as far

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.	The statements
within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or mis	sattributed to the
speaker. A link to the final, official transcript	will be posted on
the Committee's website as soon as it is available	le.

as the deputy, but I will say to you that I have been personally involved in the evaluation of the statutory authority for us to grant a national waiver 12 months a year and it is something we are evaluating, but that has not been concluded yet.

Mr. Loebsack. I really hope that you will move in that direction, then we wouldn't have to have a legislative fix. It is clear that the demand is there for that and it is clear that I think what was done previously by the EPA was the wrong way to go. So I would look forward to you moving forward on that.

Mr. Pruitt. What I would say to you is I appreciate that and I would say to you that as I shared with the folks there in Iowa on Friday, if the statute permits us to do that we will proceed that direction, if it doesn't we will advise Congress.

Mr. Loebsack. All right, thank you very much. And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back. I thank my colleagues. Seeing no further members wishing to ask questions, I would like to thank our witness again for being here.

Mr. Pruitt. Thank you, Chairman.

Mr. Shimkus. We have a unanimous consent request. Earlier today we entered into the record a 2012 letter response to the committee from Administrator McCarthy regarding policy decisions

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

173

concerning the use of particulate matter. This information was also entered into the record of an EPA hearing last year along with the initial committee letter and EPA's supplemental response.

To ensure this hearing is just as complete, I ask unanimous consent to enter the full correspondence surrounding that letter into the hearing record as well. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information follows:]

3700

3692

3693

3694

3695

3696

3697

3698

3699

3701

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

174

Mr. Shimkus. Pursuant to the rules, I remind all members that they have 10 business days to submit additional questions for the record and ask the witnesses to submit their responses within 10 days of receipt of the questions. Without objection, the committee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:34 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

3702

3703

3704

3705

3706