1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS MOLLEN
3	HIF198180
4	
5	
6	MARKUP OF H.R. 3128, TO AMEND SECTION 111 OF
7	THE CLEAN AIR ACT TO CLARIFY WHEN A PHYSICAL
8	CHANGE IN, OR CHANGE IN THE METHOD OF
9	OPERATION OF, A STATIONARY SOURCE
10	CONSTITUTES A MODIFICATION, AND FOR OTHER
11	PURPOSES
12	TUESDAY, JULY 17, 2018
13	House of Representatives
14	Subcommittee on Environment
15	Committee on Energy and Commerce
16	Washington, D.C.
17	
18	
19	
20	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 1:00 p.m., in
21	Room 2322 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Shimkus
22	[chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

23	Members present: Representatives Shimkus, McKinley,
24	Barton, Harper, Olson, Johnson, Flores, Hudson, Cramer,
25	Walberg, Carter, Duncan, Walden (ex officio), Tonko, Ruiz,
26	Peters, Green, DeGette, McNerney, Dingell, Matsui, and
27	Pallone (ex officio).
28	Staff present: Mike Bloomquist, Deputy Staff Director;
29	Samantha Bopp, Staff Assistant; Daniel Butler, Staff
30	Assistant; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Kelly Collins,
31	Staff Assistant; Wyatt Ellertson, Research Associate,
32	Energy/Environment; Margaret Tucker Fogarty, Staff Assistant;
33	Adam Fromm, Director of Outreach and Coalitions; Ali Fulling,
34	Legislative Clerk, Oversight & Investigations, Digital
35	Commerce and Consumer Protection; Jordan Haverly, Policy
36	Coordinator, Environment; Peter Kielty, Deputy General
37	Counsel; Ryan Long, Deputy Staff Director; Mary Martin,
38	Deputy Chief Counsel, Energy & Environment; Sarah Matthews,
39	Press Secretary, Energy & Environment; Drew McDowell,
40	Executive Assistant; Brandon Mooney, Deputy Chief Energy
41	Advisor; Brannon Rains, Staff Assistant; Peter Spencer,
42	Professional Staff Member, Energy; Austin Stonebraker, Press
43	Assistant; Evan Viau, Legislative Clerk, Communications &
44	Technology; Hamlin Wade, Special Advisor, External Affairs;

15	Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff Director; Elizabeth Ertel,
16	Minority Deputy Clerk; Jean Fruci, Minority Energy and
17	Environment Policy Advisor; Caitlin Haberman, Minority
18	Professional Staff Member; Rick Kessler, Minority Senior
19	Advisor and Staff Director, Energy and Environment; Jourdan
50	Lewis, Minority Staff Assistant; Alexander Ratner, Minority
51	Policy Analyst; Tuley Wright, Minority Energy and Environment
52	Policy Advisor; and Catherine Zander, Minority Environment
53	Fellow.

54	Mr. Shimkus. The subcommittee will come to order. The
55	chair recognizes himself for an opening statement.
56	Kind of before we do that, we are going to do the
57	opening statements and then the schedule is that votes should
58	be called around 1:20. Then we will go vote and then we will
59	come back and we will probably at that time deal with the
60	amendments.
61	Secondly, I want to embarrass my son, who's in the front
62	row on the right with the short-sleeved white shirt. So
63	that's a to-do list and I got that done.
64	Mr. Tonko. Are we going to share his name?
65	Mr. Shimkus. Oh. What is his name? I don't know.
66	[Laughter.]
67	Mr. Duncan. I'd like to introduce my son in the pink
68	tie on the front there, too.
69	Mr. Shimkus. Daniel Shimkus is my son's name. Yes.
70	Yes.
71	So good afternoon, and welcome to today's subcommittee
72	markup of H.R. 3128, a bill introduced by Mr. Griffith last
73	year which clarifies when changes at stationary sources
74	should be subject to New Source Review preconstruction
75	permitting.

76 The legislative text we consider today is substantially 77 similar to the discussion draft we examined in our May 78 legislative hearing, reflecting the technical feedback from EPA and stakeholders. 79 80 It will be offered as an amendment in the nature of a 81 substitute to H.R. 3128 upon which the text is based. 82 New Source Review program is desperately in need of reform. 83 Witnesses have testified that the New Source Review program is overly complex and is discouraging companies from 84 doing things that we all want them to do like improving 85 86 energy efficiency, making incremental pollution control 87 upgrades, and keeping facilities in good working order. 88 Perhaps the most frustrating aspect of the New Source Review program is that the regulated community and even the 89 regulator themselves are confused about what types of 90 facility upgrades require a company to obtain a New Source 91 92 Review permit. 93 In theory, only projects that result in an emissions increase require a New Source Review permit. However, in 94 95 practice, we have seen examples where the EPA has issued 96 enforcement actions against companies for making facility 97 upgrades that actually resulted in an emissions decrease,

98	which doesn't make any sense.
99	An environmental program to discourage these companies
100	from carrying out environmentally beneficial projects is an
101	environmental program that needs to be reformed and that is
102	exactly what Mr. Griffith's legislation does.
103	Today's bill makes the New Source Review program work
104	better by clarifying that the only types of facility changes
105	that require a New Source Review permit are changes that
106	increase a facilities capacity to emit pollutants at the
107	higher hourly rate.
108	Opponents of New Source Review will claim that this
109	legislation will result in massive pollution increases. This
110	is simply not true.
111	The legislation applies solely to stationary sources and
112	actually removes hurdles to installing pollution control
113	projects and devices.
114	Most important, it does not affect operating permits and
115	other regulatory tools used to study emission limits at major
116	facilities.
117	Two state air regulators testified before this
118	subcommittee that the Clean Air Act currently provides a
119	range of effective tools and programs to successfully control

120	emissions from existing sources and that nothing in this
121	legislation will change that.
122	This bill's clarification in the law will make it easier
123	for companies to invest in, modernize in existing facilities,
124	leading to a stronger economy and more jobs.
125	For these reasons, a wide range of stakeholders have
126	sent letters in support for New Source Review reform,
127	including multiple labor unions representing the building
128	trades, the National Association of Manufacturing, National
129	Rural Electric Cooperative Association, American Public Power
130	Association, American Forest and Paper Association, Portland
131	Cement Association, American Iron and Steel Institute,
132	National Mining Association, U.S. Chamber, Pennsylvania
133	Chamber of Business and Industry, American Energy Alliance,
134	and Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions.
135	I look forward to voting in favor of this legislation
136	and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the
137	same.
138	I now recognize my friend from New York, Mr. Tonko, for
139	three minutes for an opening statement.
140	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and today we are here
141	to consider H.R. 3128, which would make a number of

142 significant changes to EPA's New Source Review program for 143 existing sources of emissions. 144 Over the last half century we have gained a better 145 understanding of how dangerous air pollution can be and how -146 - and have developed impressive technologies to reduce it. 147 During our oversight and legislative hearings on New 148 Source Review, we heard how important the program is to 149 reducing harmful air pollution. But this bill would ultimately enable some polluters, 150 151 many of which were initially grandfathered into the NSR 152 program and have avoided installing pollution controls for 153 decades, to continue operating without taking any steps to 154 clean up their facilities. 155 Today, many old coal-fired power plants are entering the end of useful life unless they undertake significant capital 156 157 investments. 158 Under the current NSR program, if these facilities make 159 a major modification, the grandfathering is over and modern pollution controls would be required to be installed. 160 The discussion draft before us today would create new 161 162 loopholes to enable those old facilities, which have put off 163 adopting pollution reduction technologies for decades to

164	continue polluting our air indefinitely and I do not think
165	that is fair.
166	It is not fair to the facilities that have made the
167	investments to clean up their pollution and it is not fair to
168	the people that live and work near these sites.
169	I understand that businesses need time to transition and
170	plan for the investments needed to install pollution
171	controls. But now we have four decades of evidence of
172	facilities going to great lengths to avoid triggering the
173	major modification requirement and turning to Congress is
174	just the latest attempt.
175	
175	Allowing major polluters to extend their lives while
176	Allowing major polluters to extend their lives while avoiding installation of available technology to prevent
176	avoiding installation of available technology to prevent
176 177	avoiding installation of available technology to prevent unnecessary pollution is unacceptable and runs counter to the
176 177 178	avoiding installation of available technology to prevent unnecessary pollution is unacceptable and runs counter to the bipartisan intent of the Clean Air Act.
176177178179	avoiding installation of available technology to prevent unnecessary pollution is unacceptable and runs counter to the bipartisan intent of the Clean Air Act. I want facilities to be able to invest in efficiency and
176 177 178 179 180	avoiding installation of available technology to prevent unnecessary pollution is unacceptable and runs counter to the bipartisan intent of the Clean Air Act. I want facilities to be able to invest in efficiency and reliability upgrades and I want United States businesses to
176 177 178 179 180 181	avoiding installation of available technology to prevent unnecessary pollution is unacceptable and runs counter to the bipartisan intent of the Clean Air Act. I want facilities to be able to invest in efficiency and reliability upgrades and I want United States businesses to be as competitive as possible.
176 177 178 179 180 181 182	avoiding installation of available technology to prevent unnecessary pollution is unacceptable and runs counter to the bipartisan intent of the Clean Air Act. I want facilities to be able to invest in efficiency and reliability upgrades and I want United States businesses to be as competitive as possible. But it cannot come at the expense of their neighbors'

186	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time and I
187	thank him.
188	The chair looks for the chairman of the full committee.
189	He has not arrived yet. The chair would like to now
190	recognize, if he is ready, the ranking member of the full
191	committee, Mr. Pallone, for three minutes.
192	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
193	The bill before us today is a bad bill that puts
194	polluters before people. If Republicans on this committee
195	were serious about protecting the environment and human
196	health, they would have never brought this bill up for a
197	markup, and that's, of course, not the case.
198	We are here, and, as I said at the legislative hearing
199	in May, the threshold test for any legislation to reform the
200	Clean Air Act is whether it will reduce air pollution and
201	protect public health.
202	The amendment in the nature of a substitute is far more
203	likely to increase air pollution substantially and put the
204	health of the American public at great risk in the process.
205	This bill exacerbates existing loopholes in the New
206	Source Review program to the benefit of old polluting
207	facilities that have avoided complying with modern pollution

208	control standards.
209	These bad actors have been able to game the system to
210	change operations and expand without ever reducing emissions,
211	and this bill only makes this problem worse.
212	In ensures that anyone downwind of these plants will be
213	forced to continue breathing polluted unhealthy air every
214	day.
215	Neighboring communities will get no relief from the many
216	health problems associated with chronic exposure to
217	pollution, asthma attacks, heart and lung disease, and, of
218	course, cancer.
219	This bill amounts to a pro-polluter wish list that is so
220	egregious it would be virtually impossible to compel dirty
221	facilities to clean up their act.
222	The legislation essentially grants a permanent amnesty
223	to bad actors, getting some of the oldest and least
224	economical facilities in the country the green light to
225	pollute without consequence.
226	And it's safe to try to avoid overall increases in
227	pollution using other Clean Air Act authorities, as some have
228	suggested. These reductions will have to come from
229	businesses and other economic sectors.

230	So this creates a very unfair situation where some
231	businesses have no obligation to clean up pollution and
232	others are left footing the bill.
233	The Trump administration has spent its time undermining
234	public health protections and diverting the mission of the
235	Environmental Protection Agency away from protecting public
236	health to protecting polluters.
237	This bill continues that pattern of prioritizing the
238	needs of polluters over people. It codifies the
239	administration's plans to forego enforcement of the Clean Air
240	Act and lets polluters of the hook.
241	I urge my colleagues to oppose it because the American
242	public deserves better from Congress. It's just another
243	handout to the special interests and not worthy of debate in
244	this subcommittee.
245	In fact, this time could have been better used getting
246	answers from HHS on the progress, or lack thereof, that is
247	being made to reunify more than 2,500 children who were
248	forcibly stripped away from their parents by the Trump
249	administration's inhumane immigration policies.
250	And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.
251	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time.

252	The chair now recognizes the chairman of the full
253	committee, Mr. Walden, for three minutes.
254	The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks for your
255	leadership on this and so many other issues.
256	Today, we take an important step in this committee's
257	work to advance reasonable updates to our environmental laws
258	to ensure more effective environmental programs as well as a
259	more productive economy.
260	Now, H.R. 3128 was developed by Congressman Griffith and
261	it addresses a problem that has been identified in a clear
262	Clean Air Act's New Source Review program, and that is the
263	controversy surrounding when a change in a major source of
264	emissions, be it an efficiency improvement, and emission
265	control improvement, or basic upkeep in parts replacement is
266	sufficient to trigger a preconstruction permitting.
267	The uncertainty over this costly time-consuming process
268	creates powerful incentives to avoid making beneficial
269	improvements to manufacturing and other facilities.
270	Now, this deprives communities benefits for the
271	environment and for efficient operations at helping increase
272	jobs and economic activity.
273	So this bill simply adds much needed clarification into

274	the law to say that a change at a facility that warrants this
275	NSR review should be based on a maximum hourly emissions rate
276	a clear and objective measure which, by the way, is
277	consistent with similar provisions in the Clean Air Act.
278	This will greatly accelerate decision making at
279	regulated facilities around the nation.
280	So I want to thank our colleague from Virginia, Mr.
281	Griffith, for his efforts on this legislation. I urge my
282	colleagues to support this common sense bill.
283	And I would be happy to yield or yield back.
284	I'll yield back the balance of my time.
285	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time.
286	The chair looks to see if anyone wants to speak on the
287	bill.
288	If not, without objection, the chair calls up H.R. 3128
289	and asks the clerk to report.
290	[The Bill H.R. 3128 follows:]
291	
292	*********INSERT 1*******

293	The Clerk. H.R. 3128, to amend Section 111 of the Clean
294	Air Act to clarify when a physical change in or change in the
295	method of operation of a stationary source constitutes a
296	modification and for other purposes.
297	Mr. Shimkus. Without objection, the first reading of
298	the bill is dispensed with and the bill will be open for
299	amendment at any point. So ordered.
300	The chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in
301	the nature of a substitute and the clerk will report the
302	amendment.
303	[The Amendment offered by Mr. Shimkus follows:]
304	
305	**************************************

306	The Clerk. Amendment in the nature of a substitute to
307	H.R. 3128, offered by Mr. Shimkus.
308	Mr. Shimkus. Without objection, the reading of the
309	amendment is dispensed with and the chair is recognized for
310	five minutes in support of the amendment.
311	This amendment in the nature of a substitute is
312	substantially similar to the New Source Review and discussion
313	draft that this subcommittee examined in May.
314	The amendment makes some clarifications based on the
315	legislative hearing as well as feedback from EPA and
316	stakeholders on the discussion draft.
317	As with the base bill, it seeks to reduce the complexity
318	and uncertainty that discourage owners from modernizing and
319	maintaining existing facilities by clarifying when a change
320	in an existing facility requires a New Source Review permit.
321	To illustrate why this legislation is needed, one
322	hearing witness told us about a project to switch a
323	manufacturing facility to a cleaner-burning fuel that was
324	canceled because the current New Source Review emissions
325	accounting methodology incorrectly showed that the paper
326	on paper that the project would cause an emissions increase.
327	Yet, the project would have resulted in improved air

quality. In another example a witness described how customers are choosing to not buy and install a particular gas turbine of great technology that is capable of improving turbine performance by 2.6 percent while lowering carbon dioxide emissions per megawatt hour by 6.5 percent because doing so might trigger the NSR -- New Source Review -permitting process. These examples highlight how New Source Review hinders investments that actually lead to environmental benefits. The main reason for this is because the New Source Review program measures future emissions using a complicated annual emissions projection approach projecting future annual emissions is a difficult and confusing process that requires the consideration of many complex factors, which frequently overestimates the facility's future emissions. Rather than go to this costly process, companies commonly choose to forego incremental improvements to their facilities. The base bill improves the new resource review process by specifying the use of an hourly emissions rate test for determining whether an upgrade at an existing facility causes an emission increase, thereby requiring an owner to obtain a

328

329

330

331

332

333

334

335

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350	New Source Review permit.
351	This amendment further clarifies how to implement that
352	test. An hourly rate test is a straightforward to carry out
353	because it only relies upon engineering design factors, not
354	complicated future emission projections and assessments.
355	A separate program under the Clean Air Act, the new
356	source performance standard, has successfully used an hourly
357	rate test with little to no controversy for over 40 years,
358	and I think that's the basic point of our argument and
359	debate.
360	The amendment also specifies more clearly the
361	circumstances by which air pollution control, efficiency, and
362	equipment repairs do or do not trigger New Source Review.
363	This amendment clarifies the base bill and makes target
364	improvements to how the New Source Review program works and I
365	urge my colleagues to vote in support of the amendment in
366	nature of a substitute.
367	Votes have been called. We would like to recess and
368	return to consider the amendments to the substitute amendment
369	after the last vote in the series if that's okay with my
370	ranking member.
371	This markup is recessed.

372	[Recess.]
373	Mr. Shimkus. The chairman calls the markup back to
374	order and we are on the amendment in the nature of the
375	substitute. Are there any are there any bipartisan I
376	hate to ask any bipartisan amendments to the amendment
377	none.
378	Seeing none, are there any amendments to the amendment
379	in the nature of a substitute?
380	Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.
381	I believe it's amendment number one.
382	Mr. Shimkus. The clerk will report the amendment.
383	[The Amendment offered by Mr. Tonko follows:]
384	
385	*********INSERT 3******

386	The Clerk. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of
387	a substitute to H.R. 3128, offered by Mr. Tonko.
388	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman from New York is recognized
389	five minutes in support of his amendment.
390	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
391	As I said earlier, I have a real concern that the bill
392	before us today is going to result in more air pollution.
393	The New Source Review program was intended to ensure
394	that when a facility made modifications to expand capacity or
395	extend design life by replacing major equipment that the
396	facility would also upgrade its pollution control equipment
397	to meet modern standards.
398	This bill will allow facilities to make these
399	modifications without having to install modern pollution
400	control equipment or make any adjustments to reduce their
400	
	control equipment or make any adjustments to reduce their
401	control equipment or make any adjustments to reduce their emissions.
401 402	control equipment or make any adjustments to reduce their emissions. There are still many communities across our country
401 402 403	control equipment or make any adjustments to reduce their emissions. There are still many communities across our country where air quality is not healthy and pollution levels are too
401 402 403 404	control equipment or make any adjustments to reduce their emissions. There are still many communities across our country where air quality is not healthy and pollution levels are too high.

408	My amendment would exclude facilities that are within
409	five miles of a school, hospital, veterans health care
410	facility, or a nursing home from the NSR loopholes of this
411	bill.
412	Children, veterans, the elderly, and people being
413	treated in a hospital are already more vulnerable to air
414	pollution than adults in good health.
415	Shifting the threshold test for whether a modification
416	will trigger a review of a proposed project to a change in
417	the maximum hourly emission rate of a pollutant virtually
418	assures the requirements of the NSR program will never apply.
419	It is unlikely that any construction project including
420	one that would expand a facility's capacity and increase its
421	overall pollution output substantially would alter the
422	maximum hourly rate of pollution produced by the plant.
423	At a minimum, a facility in close proximity to schools,
424	to nursing homes, to hospitals and veterans' health centers
425	should face a threshold for evaluation that ensures pollution
426	levels will not increase.
427	My amendment will not fix all of the problems this
428	legislation creates. It will not limit all of the pollution
429	increases it will allow.

430	But it will offer some protection to those who are the
431	most vulnerable to the diseases worsened or caused by air
432	pollution.
433	With that, I urge my colleagues to support this
434	amendment.
435	Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield?
436	Mr. Tonko. I will yield.
437	Ms. DeGette. Mr. Chairman, thank you, and I speak in
438	favor of this amendment. It really highlights the
439	fundamental problems with the bill, which is it'll make it
440	easier for polluters to increase their emissions and harm
441	vulnerable populations.
442	I am a representative for a nonattainment area under the
443	Clean Air Act so this is not an abstract issue for my
444	constituents.
445	The northern front range of Denver is already plagued by
446	a rise in ozone, which is associated with a wide range of
447	public health harms including an elevated risk of asthma and
448	cardiovascular disease.
449	We know the polluters are already pushing to take
450	advantage of every loophole they can find. For example,
451	Succor Energy has a refinery just outside my district that's

452	in the midst of seeking dozens of permit modifications.
453	They are evading undergoing a New Source Review by
454	claiming all the modifications are below the significance
455	level. Residents of the Swansea Elyria neighborhood, which
456	is right next to this refinery, have expressed grave concerns
457	about these modifications and the facility's ongoing
458	operations.
459	Earth Justice found that the refinery has filed at least
460	40 malfunction reports and 21 permit deviation reports since
461	January 2013.
462	Meanwhile, the Department of Public Health and
463	Environment of Denver has reported that residents from this
464	neighborhood and Globeville increasingly suffer from several
465	diseases associated with elevated air pollution including
466	asthma, cancer, cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, and
467	obesity.
468	As is so often the case for neighborhoods near
469	industrial facilities, these communities have lower median
470	incomes and a higher proportion of minority residents than
471	other areas of my district.
472	That's what's happening today under current law. The
473	bill before us today only will open up further loopholes.

474	Polluters will spew more toxins in the air and vulnerable
475	populations, low income areas, and communities of color will
476	suffer the health consequences.
477	I urge my colleague to support the amendment and to
478	oppose the underlying bill. I thank the gentleman for
479	yielding, and I yield back.
480	Mr. Tonko. Thank you. Anyone else wishing to use 45
481	seconds?
482	Mr. Green. Will the gentleman yield?
483	Mr. Tonko. I yield to Representative Green.
484	Mr. Green. Thank you.
485	Mr. Chairman, members, if this bill passes, the district
486	I represent will have 200 more tons a year in emissions. I
487	have a very industrial area with refineries, chemical plants,
488	and we are challenged on our air emissions already and this
489	bill would make it even worse.
490	And I want to thank my New York colleague for yielding
491	to me. Just wanted to let you know that this is not going to
492	help air quality in my community.
493	Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields and I yield back, Mr.
494	Chair.
495	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time.

496	The chair recognizes for what purpose does the
497	gentleman from Ohio seek recognition?
498	Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this
499	amendment.
500	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman is recognized for five
501	minutes.
502	Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to note that in
503	earlier subcommittee hearings, two state air regulators
504	testified that H.R. 3128 does not reduce the ability of air
505	regulators to successfully control emissions from existing
506	sources and that H.R. 3128 would not allow a facility to
507	operate in a way that would violate any emission limits or
508	air quality conditions specified in the facility's operating
509	permit.
510	We are trying to improve the NSR permitting process so
511	that companies are better able to modernize and maintain
512	existing facilities.
513	Moreover, the bill makes it easier for companies to
514	carry out projects at existing facilities that actually will
515	reduce emissions like incremental pollution control upgrades
516	and energy efficiency improvements.
517	This bill is about providing greater clarity and

518	certainty to the NSR process so that companies can
519	confidently name needed investments and improvements to our
520	nation's existing industrial facilities, which will lead to a
521	stronger economy and more American jobs.
522	And lastly, in no way does this bill allow existing
523	facilities to increase emissions levels beyond currently
524	established operating permit limits.
525	So, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is unnecessary and I
526	urge a no vote on this amendment.
527	Mr. Shimkus. Would the gentleman yield to me?
528	Mr. Johnson. Yes, I will yield.
529	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you. I want to just follow up on my
530	colleague from Ohio. I appreciate him taking the time.
531	The bill, basically, goes from a yearly calculation to
532	the hourly calculation. It's the same standard that we use
533	under the National Ambient Air Quality Standard.
534	I think it's instructive in that we for 40 years we
535	have used it under that program and I don't think any of us
536	have heard complaints on either side on how the environmental
537	rule and regulations implied in that instance.
538	So we are just trying to take a successful regulatory
539	look at in moving the New Source Review program to that type

540	of standard.
541	I would also just add that and I could read the list
542	of all the environmental rules and regs that comply with
543	stationary facilities and there is about 12 this law does
544	not reduce any of the current laws that deal with power
545	plants.
546	So those laws stay in effect. And with that, I would
547	then yield back to the gentleman from Ohio.
548	Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman, unless anyone else needs
549	time, I yield back.
550	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time.
551	For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey seek
552	recognition?
553	Mr. Pallone. Strike the last word in support of Mr.
554	Tonko.
555	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman is recognized for five
556	minutes.
557	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
558	Schools, hospitals, veterans health facilities, and
559	nursing home care for those most vulnerable to health
560	problems created are exacerbated by air pollution and some of
561	these facilities already are in areas of unhealthy air

562	quality.
563	So we should not allow additional pollution in these
564	areas and this bill puts public health at risk. These
565	facilities produce multiple pollutants that are extremely
566	harmful to public health like sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxide,
567	carbon monoxide, and particulate matter, and air pollution
568	around schools is linked to poor student health and academic
569	performance. We should be working harder to improve air
570	quality, not helping polluters to degrade it.
571	Many elderly patients have reduced lung function and
572	weaker immune systems. Air pollutants irritate their
573	conditions and, in some cases, contribute to their premature
574	death.
575	Many of the facilities that will benefit from this
576	rollback of the NSR program have already avoided controlling
577	their pollution for decades.
578	When they expand their output and fail to install modern
579	pollution control equipment they will add tons of additional
580	pollutants to the air every year.
581	So Mr. Tonko's amendment will not fix all of the serious
582	problems with this bill but it will at least prevent
583	facilities in areas that serve our most vulnerable citizens

584	from continuing to avoid doing their fair share to clean up
585	the air that we all have to breathe.
586	So I would urge support for his amendment.
587	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time.
588	The chair recognizes himself for five minutes in
589	opposition just to I saw Gene looking over at me saying
590	Shimkus doesn't know what he's talking about.
591	I think the standard was New Source Performance
592	Standards as what and when I noticed that I go I said
593	something that was incorrect.
594	So the hourly standard is applying to the New Source
595	Performance Standards, part of the other regulation. The
596	other thing that I'd like to highlight is that nothing and
597	we believe this nothing in this bill will negatively
598	impact air quality, and under the law, if a change at a
599	facility would adversely affect public health as this
600	amendment is purporting to assume, then the project must go
601	through the full New Source Review permitting process as
602	specified in Section 2 of the bill.
603	All we want to do is to allow our facilities to be able
604	to update and modernize, either become more energy efficient
605	or, obviously, have a lower profile on emissions by

606	upgrading, and I think it's been stated that there has been
607	folks slow in responding and I think the way the new source
608	program is currently implemented that's the reason why we
609	haven't had updating to the system.
610	So with that, anyone else seeking time? Seeing none, I
611	yield back the balance of my time.
612	Anyone seek time? Seeing none, the vote now occurs on
613	Amendment 1.
614	All those in favor say aye.
615	All those opposed, no.
616	In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it. The noes
617	have it. A roll call vote has been asked for and then is
617 618	have it. A roll call vote has been asked for and then is accepted.
618	accepted.
618 619	accepted. So the clerk will record the roll.
618 619 620	accepted. So the clerk will record the roll. The Clerk. Mr. McKinley.
618619620621	accepted. So the clerk will record the roll. The Clerk. Mr. McKinley. Mr. McKinley. No.
618 619 620 621 622	accepted. So the clerk will record the roll. The Clerk. Mr. McKinley. Mr. McKinley. No. The Clerk. Mr. McKinley votes no.
618619620621622623	accepted. So the clerk will record the roll. The Clerk. Mr. McKinley. Mr. McKinley. No. The Clerk. Mr. McKinley votes no. Mr. Barton.
618619620621622623624	accepted. So the clerk will record the roll. The Clerk. Mr. McKinley. Mr. McKinley. No. The Clerk. Mr. McKinley votes no. Mr. Barton. [No response.]

628	Mr. Harper. No.
629	The Clerk. Mr. Harper votes no.
630	Mr. Olson.
631	Mr. Olson. No.
632	The Clerk. Mr. Olson votes no.
633	Mr. Johnson.
634	Mr. Johnson. No.
635	The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes no.
636	Mr. Flores.
637	Mr. Flores. No.
638	The Clerk. Mr. Flores votes no.
639	Mr. Hudson.
640	Mr. Hudson. No.
641	The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.
642	Mr. Cramer.
643	Mr. Cramer. No.
644	The Clerk. Mr. Cramer votes no.
645	Mr. Walberg.
646	Mr. Walberg. No.
647	The Clerk. Mr. Walberg votes no.
648	Mr. Carter.
649	Mr. Carter. No.

650	The Clerk. Mr. Carter votes no.
651	Mr. Duncan.
652	Mr. Duncan. No.
653	The Clerk. Mr. Duncan votes no.
654	Chairman Walden.
655	[No response.]
656	Mr. Tonko.
657	Mr. Tonko. Yes.
658	The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.
659	Mr. Ruiz.
660	Mr. Ruiz. Aye.
661	The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.
662	Mr. Peters.
663	Mr. Peters. Aye.
664	The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.
665	Mr. Green.
666	Mr. Green. Aye.
667	The Clerk. Mr. Green votes aye.
668	Ms. DeGette.
669	Ms. DeGette. Aye.
670	The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.
671	Mr. McNerney.

672	Mr. McNerney. Aye.
673	The Clerk. Mr. McNerney votes aye.
674	Mr. Cardenas.
675	[No response.]
676	Mrs. Dingell.
677	Mrs. Dingell. Aye.
678	The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.
679	Ms. Matsui.
680	Ms. Matsui. Aye.
681	The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.
682	Mr. Pallone.
683	Mr. Pallone. Aye.
684	The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.
685	Chairman Shimkus.
686	Mr. Shimkus. Shimkus votes no.
687	The Clerk. Chairman Shimkus votes no.
688	Mr. Shimkus. Anyone else seeking to be recorded?
689	Seeing none, the clerk will report.
690	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, there were 11
691	ayes and nine noes.
692	Mr. Chairman, on that vote, there were nine ayes and 11
693	noes.

694	Mr. Shimkus. Nine ayes, 11 noes. The amendment is not
695	agreed to.
696	Is there any other amendments to the amendment in the
697	nature of a substitute?
698	All right. Someone has one.
699	For what purpose does the gentlelady from Michigan rise?
700	Mrs. Dingell. I have an amendment, Mr. Chair.
701	Mr. Shimkus. The clerk will report the amendment.
702	[The Amendment offered by Mrs. Dingell follows:]
703	
704	********INSERT 4******

The Clerk. Amendment to the amendment in the nature of

706	a substitute to H.R. 3128, offered by Mrs. Dingell.
707	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady is recognized five minutes
708	in support of her amendment.
709	Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
710	My amendment proposes to make what I believe is a very
711	simple change to the underlying bill to exempt any source
712	of lead in air emissions from the provisions of this act.
713	Lead is a dangerous and pervasive substance. Once in
714	our bodies, lead is absorbed into and stored in our bones,
715	blood, and tissues.
716	Even exposure to small amounts of lead can have long-
717	lasting and devastating health effects. Lead-poisoned
718	children have decreased neurological function and behavioral
719	issues.
720	Exposures to pregnant women cause irreversible damage to
721	a baby's developing systems and, potentially, stillbirths or
722	miscarriages, and even low levels of exposure in adults have
723	been linked to adverse health effects like high blood
724	pressure, heart disease, kidney disease, reduced fertility,
725	and violent or criminal behavior.
726	Sources of lead emissions vary from one area to another.

705

727 At the national level, major sources of lead in the air are 728 metal processing, particularly lead smelters and other 729 sources are waste incinerators, copper smelting, utilities, and lead acid battery manufacturers. 730 731 The highest air concentrations of lead are usually found 732 near lead smelters. Historically, lead gasoline was also a 733 major source of pollution. We have made great progress and 734 lead emissions sharply declined after it was eliminated from gasoline and remained low. 735 736 But the provisions of the bill before us could undo all 737 of that good work. Major stationary sources of lead emissions like lead acid battery manufacturers or lead 738 739 smelters would be given the green light to expand and ramp up 740 their operations without control or consequence. As long as they maintain a consistent rate of emissions, 741 742 these polluters would be able to increase the frequency and 743 intensity of their operations, triggering an exponential 744 surge in their emissions. And where do you think all of that new lead pollution 745 goes? Into the surrounding and downwind communities. 746 747 will be inhaled while still in the air by children on the playground and it'll be ingested after it settles in water or 748

749	on land by families sitting down for dinner.
750	The people of Michigan can't afford the victims of more
751	lead for there to be more victims of more lead poisoning,
752	and we are not alone.
753	We should be working together to advance policies that
754	help protect the people who live in the communities that
755	represent not the polluters who have been championed by this
756	administration.
757	In the spirit of putting people over polluters, my
758	amendment would ensure any facility that emits lead into the
759	air is barred from the loophole provisions of this act.
760	I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and I
761	yield back the balance of my time.
762	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady yields back the balance of
763	her time.
764	Anyone seek time in opposition?
765	The chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. Harper, for what
766	purposes?
767	Mr. Harper. Move to strike the last word.
768	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman is recognized for five
769	minutes.
770	Mr. Harper. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment is

771	really unnecessary. Under the bill, the EPA administrator is
772	given explicit authority to deal with any situation in which
773	an increase in hourly emissions would cause an adverse effect
774	on human health or the environment.
775	Moreover, this legislation does not affect the very
776	stringent National Ambient Air Quality Standards, or NAAQS,
777	requirement that govern the levels of lead in the air.
778	In cases where a facility does emit lead, this bill does
779	not affect operating permit requirements to relate to
780	emissions levels of lead.
781	Put plainly, NSR reform in no way, shape, or form alters
782	NAAQS or a state's obligation to attain and maintain NAAQS,
783	and NAAQS are set at levels deemed protective of public
784	health.
785	These standards have been tremendously successful. In
786	point of fact, lead levels are down 99 percent from 1990 and
787	facilities in communities that presently do not meet the lead
788	standards are subject to requirements that are completely
789	unaffected by this bill.
790	This amendment would place an unnecessary restraint on
791	certain facilities from seeking to make reasonable changes
792	that would include incremental air pollution controls,

793	efficiency improvements, and other changes that ensure more
794	effective operations to the benefit of the communities they
795	serve.
796	This bill, H.R. 3128, makes it easier for owners to
797	carry out pollution control projects, energy-efficient
798	projects, and equipment reliability and safety improvements.
799	I urge a no vote on this amendment, and with that, I
800	yield back.
801	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time.
802	Anyone seeking time?
803	The chair recognizes the gentleman from New York for
804	what purpose?
805	Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chairman, I want to strike the last
806	word.
807	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman is recognized five minutes.
808	Mr. Tonko. Thank you.
809	I speak in support of Representative Dingell's
810	amendment. Lead is a very serious issue that affects
811	everyone and in particular I am very much concerned about the
812	impact on children.
813	At the request of Member Pallone, our ranking member of
814	the standing committee and myself as ranker on the

815	Environment Subcommittee and the Democrats as members of this
816	committee, we ask that the GAO conduct a report assemble a
817	report.
818	And just today, I believe around 2:00 o'clock, they
819	issued that report that addresses lead in drinking water in
820	our schools.
821	Now, the findings are very troubling. Forty-one percent
822	of schools serving some 12 million students have not tested
823	for lead recently. Of the schools that did test, elevated
824	levels were found 37 percent of the time. Sixteen percent of
825	schools did not even know whether or not they did test for
826	lead.
827	Now, we need to continue to think about the best ways to
	Now, we need to continue to think about the best ways to
828	reduce the risk of lead. Yes, we can do that very well by
828	
	reduce the risk of lead. Yes, we can do that very well by
829	reduce the risk of lead. Yes, we can do that very well by testing drinking water and addressing it that way.
829 830	reduce the risk of lead. Yes, we can do that very well by testing drinking water and addressing it that way. But it's also part of air pollution and that should be a
829 830 831	reduce the risk of lead. Yes, we can do that very well by testing drinking water and addressing it that way. But it's also part of air pollution and that should be a concern also. So given the serious nature of lead
829830831832	reduce the risk of lead. Yes, we can do that very well by testing drinking water and addressing it that way. But it's also part of air pollution and that should be a concern also. So given the serious nature of lead contamination, I, again, support the amendment offered by
829830831832833	reduce the risk of lead. Yes, we can do that very well by testing drinking water and addressing it that way. But it's also part of air pollution and that should be a concern also. So given the serious nature of lead contamination, I, again, support the amendment offered by Mrs. Dingell. I believe it makes the bill stronger and ask

837	Mr. Pallone. Thank you.
838	I wanted to also express support for Mrs. Dingell's
839	amendment. One source category of lead emissions is coal-
840	fired power plants.
841	Under the current New Source Review program any existing
842	coal-fired power plant that wants to modify its facilities or
843	operations must obtain permits to ensure the changes won't
844	worsen air pollution and they also must use up to date
845	pollution controls.
846	However, an existing loophole in the Clean Air Act,
847	which allowed facilities built before 1978, to run without
848	new controls until they retired or did construction that
849	triggered New Source Review has been misused, letting dirtier
850	plants operate longer at the expense of public health.
851	A recent independent investigation found that last year
852	145 coal plants without control technology collectively put
853	out nearly 580,000 tons of sulfur dioxide. Of these, 107
854	were built prior to 1978, meaning they directly benefitted
855	from this loophole.
856	And while this investigation did not focus on the lead
857	emissions from these facilities, it is certainly relevant to
858	the debate we are having today.

The bill before us seems to exacerbate this very
loophole in the NSR program using fuzzy math to virtually
guarantee that existing sources will never have to reduce
their air pollution.
And Congress never intended for existing sources of
harmful air pollution to be grandfathered forever. But these
zombie facilities have been able to game the system for 40
years.
So-called NSR reform is just the latest iteration of
their mission to avoid ever cleaning up their act and with
that reality in mind Mrs. Dingell's amendment ensures that
these dirty facilities do not get a free pass on their lead
emissions and C&C's perpetual grandfathered facilities are
also a source of lead air pollution, they would not be able
to take advantage of the provision of the act.
So I believe it is eminently reasonable to pass this
amendment. It would vastly improve the bill and I would urge
all members to vote yes on her amendment.
And I yield back to Mr. Tonko.
Mr. Tonko. Mr. McNerney, do you want to
Mr. McNerney. I thank the ranking member for yielding.
My congressional district has poor air quality, which

881	has caused a variety of illnesses for my constituents.
882	California has been working to improve the New Source Review
883	and should be an example on how to improve this program where
884	this bill weakens the Clean Air Act and would put the public
885	health at risk and is in historic opposition to the public's
886	overwhelming support of the Clean Air Act.
887	Now, the Clean Air Act was passed on a bipartisan basis.
888	It was signed by a Republican president. It's worked, so
889	this bill looks like an ideological run at eliminating
890	regulations.
891	Let's work together instead of pushing through a
892	partisan message bill. I support the amendment and oppose
893	H.R. 3128.
894	Mr. Tonko. Anyone else choosing to use 30 seconds?
895	If not, Mr. Chair, I yield back.
896	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
897	chair recognizes himself for five minutes in opposition to
898	the amendment.
899	So the air regulation that deals with lead is the
900	National Ambient Air Quality Standards, and this New Source
901	Review bill does not affect that standard.
902	So the standard for lead in the air is left unchanged.

903	The premise of the bill is to make it easier for owners to
904	carry out pollution control projects, energy efficiency
905	projects, and equipment reliability to safety improvements,
906	and I urge a no vote on this amendment and I yield back my
907	time.
908	Anyone else seeking time to speak on the amendment?
909	Seeing none, the vote now occurs on the amendment
910	offered by the gentlelady from Michigan.
911	All those in favor say aye.
912	Those opposed, say no.
913	The noes have it. In the opinion of the chair the noes
914	have it. The noes have it.
915	The gentlelady from Michigan.
916	The gentlelady requests a record of the vote.
917	The record of the vote will be called. The clerk will
918	call the vote.
919	The Clerk. Mr. McKinley.
920	Mr. McKinley. No.
921	The Clerk. Mr. McKinley votes no.
922	Mr. Barton.
923	Mr. Barton. No.
924	The Clerk. Mr. Barton votes no.

925	Mrs. Blackburn.
926	[No response.]
927	Mr. Harper.
928	Mr. Harper. No.
929	The Clerk. Mr. Harper votes no.
930	Mr. Olson.
931	Mr. Olson. No.
932	The Clerk. Mr. Olson votes no.
933	Mr. Johnson.
934	Mr. Johnson. No.
935	The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes no.
936	Mr. Flores.
937	Mr. Flores. No.
938	The Clerk. Mr. Flores votes no.
939	Mr. Hudson.
940	Mr. Hudson. No.
941	The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.
942	Mr. Cramer.
943	Mr. Cramer. No.
944	The Clerk. Mr. Cramer votes no.
945	Mr. Walberg.
946	Mr. Walberg. No.

947	The Clerk. Mr. Walberg votes no.
948	Mr. Carter.
949	Mr. Carter. No.
950	The Clerk. Mr. Carter votes no.
951	Mr. Duncan.
952	Mr. Duncan. No.
953	The Clerk. Mr. Duncan votes no.
954	Chairman Walden.
955	The Chairman. No.
956	The Clerk. Chairman Walden votes no.
957	Mr. Tonko.
958	Mr. Tonko. Yes.
959	The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.
960	Mr. Ruiz.
961	Mr. Ruiz. Aye.
962	The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.
963	Mr. Peters.
964	Mr. Peters. Aye.
965	The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.
966	Mr. Green.
967	Mr. Green. Aye.
968	The Clerk. Mr. Green votes aye.

969	Ms. DeGette.
970	Ms. DeGette. Aye.
971	The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.
972	Mr. McNerney.
973	Mr. McNerney. Aye.
974	The Clerk. Mr. McNerney votes aye.
975	Mr. Cardenas.
976	[No response.]
977	Mrs. Dingell.
978	Mrs. Dingell. Aye.
979	The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.
980	Ms. Matsui.
981	Ms. Matsui. Aye.
982	The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.
983	Mr. Pallone.
984	Mr. Pallone. Aye.
985	The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.
986	Chairman Shimkus.
987	Mr. Shimkus. Chairman Shimkus votes no.
988	The Clerk. Chairman Shimkus votes no.
989	Mr. Shimkus. Anyone else wishing to be recorded?
990	Seeing none, the clerk will report the vote.

991	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were nine
992	ayes and 13 nays.
993	Mr. Shimkus. Nine ayes and 13 nays. The amendment is
994	not agreed to.
995	The question now is on if there are no further
996	discussion the vote occurs on the amendment in the nature of
997	a substitute.
998	All those in favor shall signify by saying aye.
999	Those opposed, no.
1000	The ayes have it. The amendment in the nature of a
1001	substitute is agreed to.
1002	The question now occurs on forwarding H.R. 3128 as
1003	amended to the full committee.
1004	All those in favor say aye.
1005	Those opposed, no.
1006	The ayes have it appear to have it.
1007	Mr. Tonko. Can we have a roll call?
1008	Mr. Shimkus. A roll call is requested. The clerk will
1009	report the roll.
1010	The Clerk. Mr. McKinley.
1011	Mr. McKinley. Aye.
1012	The Clerk. Mr. McKinley votes aye.

1013	Mr. Barton.
1014	Mr. Barton. Aye.
1015	The Clerk. Mr. Barton votes aye.
1016	Mrs. Blackburn.
1017	[No response.]
1018	Mr. Harper.
1019	Mr. Harper. Aye.
1020	The Clerk. Mr. Harper votes aye.
1021	Mr. Olson.
1022	Mr. Olson. Aye.
1023	The Clerk. Mr. Olson votes aye.
1024	Mr. Johnson.
1025	Mr. Johnson. Aye.
1026	The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes aye.
1027	Mr. Flores.
1028	Mr. Flores. Aye.
1029	The Clerk. Mr. Flores votes aye.
1030	Mr. Hudson.
1031	Mr. Hudson. Aye.
1032	The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes aye.
1033	Mr. Cramer.
1034	Mr. Cramer. Aye.

1035	The Clerk. Mr. Cramer votes aye.
1036	Mr. Walberg.
1037	Mr. Walberg. Aye.
1038	The Clerk. Mr. Walberg votes aye.
1039	Mr. Carter.
1040	Mr. Carter. Yes.
1041	The Clerk. Mr. Carter votes aye.
1042	Mr. Duncan.
1043	Mr. Duncan. Aye.
1044	The Clerk. Mr. Duncan votes aye.
1045	Chairman Walden.
1046	The Chairman. Aye.
1047	The Clerk. Chairman Walden votes aye.
1048	Mr. Tonko.
1049	Mr. Tonko. No.
1050	The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes no.
1051	Mr. Ruiz.
1052	Mr. Ruiz. No.
1052 1053	Mr. Ruiz. No. The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes no.
1053	The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes no.

1057	Mr. Green.
1058	Mr. Green. No.
1059	The Clerk. Mr. Green votes no.
1060	Ms. DeGette.
1061	Ms. DeGette. No.
1062	The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes no.
1063	Mr. McNerney.
1064	Mr. McNerney. No.
1065	The Clerk. Mr. McNerney votes no.
1066	Mr. Cardenas.
1067	[No response.]
1068	Mrs. Dingell.
1068	Mrs. Dingell. Mrs. Dingell. No.
1069	Mrs. Dingell. No.
1069	Mrs. Dingell. No. The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes no.
1069 1070 1071	<pre>Mrs. Dingell. No. The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes no. Ms. Matsui.</pre>
1069 1070 1071 1072	<pre>Mrs. Dingell. No. The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes no. Ms. Matsui. Ms. Matsui. No.</pre>
1069 1070 1071 1072 1073	<pre>Mrs. Dingell. No. The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes no. Ms. Matsui. Ms. Matsui. No. The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes no.</pre>
1069 1070 1071 1072 1073	<pre>Mrs. Dingell. No. The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes no. Ms. Matsui. Ms. Matsui. No. The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes no. Mr. Pallone.</pre>
1069 1070 1071 1072 1073 1074	<pre>Mrs. Dingell. No. The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes no. Ms. Matsui. Ms. Matsui. No. The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes no. Mr. Pallone. Mr. Pallone. No.</pre>

1079	The Clerk. Chairman Shimkus votes aye.
1080	Mr. Shimkus. The clerk will report.
1081	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, there were 13
1082	ayes and nine nays.
1083	Mr. Shimkus. Thirteen ayes, nine nays. The bill is
1084	reported to the full committee.
1085	Without objection, staff is authorized to make technical
1086	and conforming changes to the legislation approved by the
1087	subcommittee today. So ordered.
1088	The chairs asks unanimous consent to the following
1089	letters in support of H.R. 3128 be entered into the record:
1090	a joint letter from the Affiliates of North American Building
1091	Trade Unions do I list all these guys?
1092	No. American Iron and Steel Institute, Portland Cement
1093	Association, American Forest and Paper Association, National
1094	Mining Association, American Public Power Association,
1095	National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, National
1096	Association of Manufacturers, U.S. Chamber, Pennsylvania
1097	Chamber of Commerce, Citizens for Responsible Energy
1098	Solutions, and American Energy Alliance.
1099	Without objection, so ordered.
1100	[The information follows:]

1101

1102 *********COMMITTEE 5******

1103	Mr. Shimkus. And the without objection, the
1104	subcommittee stands adjourned and the chair thanks the
1105	members for being present.
1106	[Whereupon, at 2:28 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]