	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	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS MOLLEN
3	HIF099180
4	
5	
6	FISCAL YEAR 2020 EPA BUDGET
7	TUESDAY, APRIL 9, 2019
8	House of Representatives
9	Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change
10	Committee on Energy and Commerce
11	Washington, D.C.
12	
13	
14	
15	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:01 a.m., in
16	Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Paul Tonko [chairman
17	of the subcommittee] presiding.
18	Members present: Representatives Tonko, Clarke, Peters,
19	Barragan, Blunt Rochester, Soto, DeGette, Matsui, McNerney, Ruiz,
20	Dingell, Pallone (ex officio), Shimkus, Rodgers, McKinley,
21	Johnson, Long, Flores, Carter, Duncan, and Walden (ex officio).
22	Also present: Representatives Sarbanes, Loebsack, and
23	O'Halleran.

Staff present: Jacqueline Cohen, Chief Environment Counsel;
Adam Fischer, Policy Analyst; Caitlin Haberman, Professional
Staff Member; Rick Kessler, Senior Advisor and Staff Directory,
Energy and Environment; Brendan Larkin, Policy Coordinator;
Dustin Maghamfar, Air and Climate Counsel; Teresa Williams,
Energy Fellow; Mike Bloomquist, Minority Staff Director; Adam
Buckalew, Minority Director of Coalitions and Deputy Chief
Counsel, Health; Jerry Couri, Minority Deputy Chief Counsel,
Environment & Climate Change; Margaret Tucker Fogarty, Minority
Staff Assistant; Ryan Long, Minority Deputy Staff Director; Mary
Martin, Minority Chief Counsel, Energy & Environment & Climate
Change; Brandon Mooney, Minority Deputy Chief Counsel, Energy;
James Paluskiewicz, Minority Chief Counsel, Health; and Peter
Spencer, Minority Senior Professional Staff Member, Environment
& Climate Change.

Mr. Tonko. The Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change will now come to order. The chair now recognizes himself for 5 minutes. This morning we welcome EPA Administrator Wheeler to the subcommittee to discuss the President's proposed fiscal year 2020 budget for the Agency. Mr. Wheeler, thank you for being here.

When your predecessor last testified, we were tough but, in my opinion, fair given his record. While I am relieved that you have not continued his pattern of indiscretions and ethical violations, I do have serious concerns about the course this Agency, the EPA, has plotted under your leadership, and I believe my colleagues on this side of the dais will have questions and disagreements on policies your Agency has been putting forth.

The President as we all know has proposed a 31 percent cut to EPA's budget from last year's levels. The House will certainly reject this budget which would undermine the Agency's ability to fulfill its basic mission that being of protecting Americans' health and our environment.

I am also concerned and confused that the President's proposal includes significant reductions to programs that the administration publicly claims are top priorities. For example, Administrator Wheeler has called unsafe drinking water the greatest environmental threat, but the budget fails to reflect

4

that sentiment. Bipartisan legislation that originated in this committee last year reauthorized funding for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund at some \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 2020, but President Trump's request is far less than even last year's level.

The committee has recognized the need to protect our drinking With that in mind, I hope to receive updates on the lead service line replacement grant program, the Lead and Copper Rule revision rulemaking which was expected in February, and the regulatory determination for PFAS which your Agency has said will happen this year. EPA is not acting urgently or comprehensively enough to address serious risks to Americans that go beyond our drinking water. Administrative actions have moved through the Agency that will undermine protections for clean air and chemical safety, but perhaps the clearest example is the Agency's climate change agenda. The administration has sought to undo modest and achievable climate protections including gutting the Clean Power Plan and vehicle emission standards. The Administrator's recent remark that climate is not a very urgent threat is not supported by science and ignores the countless families losing their homes to hurricanes to flooding and to wildfires.

We are spending billions of dollars each year responding

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

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.

to natural disasters and we know that climate pollution emitted today will stay in the atmosphere for decades. There is no excuse for sitting on our hands. We need to be doing much more to rein in emissions, and right now there are meaningful and noncontroversial steps EPA could take on this front.

One easy example is to strengthen the popular, consumer-friendly Energy Star program. It is my understanding that Mr. Wheeler has not been directly involved with this program, but I have been informed that actual spending on the program is significantly less than what Congress has directed in recent years. That is not how this is supposed to work. This program is critically important to America's consumers and manufacturers, so I hope this concern will be raised with the appropriate people at EPA. Congress does expect our spending directions to be followed.

In addition to advancing the mission of the Agency to safeguard public health, I also believe the Administrator has a responsibility to protect the health of the institution and yet we continue to see employees leave including engineers and scientists with decades of experience and knowledge. These dedicated public servants are being replaced at much lower rates.

We are seeing a lax approach to enforcement of existing laws.

Enforcement actions against polluters have reached a 25-year

low under this administration. The Agency has stressed allowing polluters to self-report violations all while conducting fewer inspections to catch them if they are breaking the law. That is not just taking the cop off the beat, it is asking the lawbreakers to come down to the station at their own convenience.

We are also seeing a systematic devaluing of science by the Agency's leadership. Robust science was included as a major goal in the budget, but science funding was recommended for a 45 percent proposed cut. When EPA ignores science in its decisionmaking, we are essentially ensuring the Americans will be put in unnecessary danger. Americans will get sicker and they will die sooner. It is critical that public health rules be grounded in robust science, but instead we are witnessing the continued dismissal, politicalization, and suppression of science at the Agency.

Finally, more must be done to improve transparency. When we ask for documents or urge EPA to be more transparent or responsive, we are not trying to set up a "gotcha''. We do it because it is our job to conduct oversight of the Agency on behalf of the American people, the people we are all charged with serving and the people this Agency is charged with protecting. I hope this morning that Administrator Wheeler, you will renew your commitment to deliver thorough and timely responses to our

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.

131 requests.

Mr. Wheeler, again thank you for joining us. I look forward to your testimony. With that I now recognize Mr. Shimkus, our Republican leader for the Subcommittee on Environment and Climate Change, for 5 minutes for his opening statement.

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to join you in welcoming Administrator Wheeler before our committee today to discuss the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 2020 for the Environmental Protection Agency. We appreciate you being here today, Administrator, and look forward to our discussions.

This also just going off script here, it is good to see behind you Ryan Jackson. For those on the committee who were around during the TSCA legislation, Ryan was our point of contact with Senator Inhofe. I will be asking questions on that, so maybe, Administrator, you want to talk to Ryan, find out what our intent was and what we were trying to do. But Ryan it is great to see you again, so thanks.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress is not the first time that I have been the lead Republican on this subcommittee or some version of it. Some of you may know this, but I was also lead Republican on this subcommittee in the 110th Congress. That Congress followed 12 years of Republican control of the House and a new Democrat majority was eager to bring the Republican-run EPA to

criticize their budget proposal because it wasn't as robust as the majority felt as necessary.

I left that hearing that day with a couple of thoughts in mind. First, the Constitution gives Congress the sole authority to raise and spend revenue, so when Congress examines administration budget requests as we are today, we cannot divorce ourselves and our decisions from that discussion. Speaker Pelosi often says "show me your budget, and I will show you our values,'' and I think that is true. I am glad we have a budget proposal from the EPA to warrant today's hearing, as I understand it is unlikely that the House will have an opportunity to vote on a budget proposal of our own this year.

My second thought from the 2010 hearing is that we need to know that we are getting a good return on our investment in environmental protection for the billions we are giving the Environmental Protection Agency to spend. There are lots of worthy ideas and programs that the EPA could address, but does it make the most sense to have EPA be the one to do everything all the time? We should not advocate for more funding if all of it is buying us bureaucracy regulatory confusion with other agencies or woke-sounding programs that don't really improve public health and the environment. Finally, and to tie both points together, the money is not the end-all be-all when

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.

it comes to an agency's success. More money does not necessarily make a person care about their environment. There are other considerations including fidelity to the laws Americans ask us to pass, stewardship of the Agency to ensure it is doing the best it can with what it has, concrete metrics that can demonstrate progress is being made, and responsiveness to the environmental and public health concerns of the American people.

Before I yield back my time, Mr. Chairman, I do want to thank Administrator Wheeler for some of his recent comments regarding safe drinking water. As our colleagues on this subcommittee know, improvements to and reauthorization of the Safe Drinking Water Act was a bipartisan priority and a success of the last Congress. I applaud you, Administrator, for recognizing that access to safe drinking water is the most imminent environmental threat we face globally.

Again, welcome, Administrator Wheeler, and I look forward to asking you questions later this morning. I thank the chairman for yielding me this time and for holding this important hearing, and with that seeing no one else wanting my remainder of the time, I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes Representative Pallone, chairman of the full committee, for 5 minutes for his opening statement.

200 Chairman Pallone?

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

2.2.1

222

The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A budget is an expression of priorities and it should be clear to anyone reading the EPA budget proposal that President Trump does not prioritize public health or the environment. The budget would cut EPA funding by 31 percent, more than any other Cabinet-level agency. It would eliminate important programs like beach grants to help coastal communities like mine ensure that the water is safe to swim in. It also fails to deliver on many of the promises the Trump administration has made on dangerous toxins like lead and PFAS.

And today we will have an opportunity to measure EPA's progress over the past year, since the subcommittee heard from then-Administrator Pruitt on EPA's budget last year. That hearing last year showed bipartisan concern about Administrator Pruitt's scandals, Agency mismanagement and repeated attacks on public health. And when Administrator Pruitt resigned, there was hope on both sides of the aisle that the situation at EPA would improve.

And I was pleased when Mr. Wheeler, then the Acting

Administrator, personally committed to make staff available to

the committee for briefings and to testify. Unfortunately, when

I look at the past year, it does not seem that EPA has come very

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.

far. In fact, on some issues it seems the Agency has actually moved backward. With Administrator Wheeler at the helm, EPA has continued to attack science, transparency, and public health, and the Agency is working to abandon action on climate change and air quality, in my opinion.

EPA scrapped the sensible carbon reduction requirements in the Clean Power Plan and replaced it with a scam that is more costly and less protective than no rule at all. EPA also walked away from negotiations with California over the Trump's administration's rollback of clean air standards. And Administrator Wheeler publicly vowed to revoke California's waiver to implement stronger vehicle pollution control requirements.

And in a move that I think makes absolutely no sense, EPA took the first step on a path to sabotage the successful mercury and air toxic standards. These standards protect communities from dangerous mercury and hazardous air pollution that spew from coal and oil-burning power plants. This action is so bad that even the power industry opposed it.

So I am very concerned that EPA's implementation also of the revised Toxic Substances Control Act, or TSCA, is leaving workers, children, low-income communities, communities of color, and the general public at an unacceptable risk. The regulation

of asbestos is still heading in the wrong direction. EPA is still allowing new uses of asbestos under the new chemical program and still ignoring legacy asbestos exposures and its risk assessment. And last month, the EPA finalized a rule on methylene chloride that fell far short of what is needed to protect public health and what was promised to this committee and me. EPA is also still working to remove important protections in the Risk Management planning program that might have prevented or reduced the impacts of two recent fires in the Houston area.

So, I also remain concerned that a lot of troubling activities that began on Administrator Pruitt's watch are still happening. EPA is still hiring industry lobbyists as regulators and that raises red flags on ethics issues. It is also still shortening comment periods, hiding science from the American public, and refusing to provide requests to documents to Congress. And members of both parties in both the House and the Senate are unable to get answers from EPA and the administration, and this is unacceptable because Congress must be able to conduct oversight. The Agency's refusal to provide information also creates the distinct impression that the EPA has something to hide.

So the track record of the EPA is abysmal, in my opinion.

I am hoping, Mr. Wheeler, that we can look forward, well, I look

forward to your testimony and hope that we can begin some changes and answers to this committee's questions today. And with that unless someone wants my time I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tonko. Seeing no one, the gentleman yields back.

In the absence of the Republican leader of the full committee, Mr. Walden, the chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Johnson, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the recognition and I am sure if Chairman Walden were here, he would offer these words himself.

But I would like to welcome our fellow Ohioan and EPA
Administrator Andrew Wheeler this morning. Because of Mr.
Wheeler's years of experience as a special assistant at the
Pollution Prevention and Toxics Office and as a majority staff
director and counsel at Senate EPW and through his work with
stakeholders affected by EPA regulations, I know that EPA's
mission and objectives are in good hands.

It is possible to have both a vibrant and growing economy along with sound policies that protect our environment. These goals are not mutually exclusive and I know Administrator Wheeler understands that especially as the Agency works on critical drinking water issues, continued TSCA implementation, and cleaning up and redeveloping contaminated lands while

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.

simultaneously seeking to reduce unnecessary regulatory burdens for our small businesses and job creators.

So, Mr. Wheeler, thank you for being here today and for your testimony on EPA's fiscal year 2020 budget. These are really important issues and I look forward to the discussion. With that unless someone else wants some time, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. The chair would like to remind members that pursuant to committee rules, all members' written opening statements shall be made part of the record.

I now have the pleasure of introducing our witness for today's hearing, the Honorable Andrew Wheeler, Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency. Before we begin I would like to explain the lighting system. In front of you, Administrator, are a series of lights. The light will initially be green at the start of your opening statement. The light will turn yellow when you have 1 minute remaining. Please begin to wrap up your testimony at that point. The light will turn red when your time expires. And at this time, the chair will recognize Administrator Wheeler for 5 minutes to provide his opening statement. Welcome, Mr. Wheeler.

This is a pre	eliminary, unedi	ted transcript. The	statements within
may be inaccu	rate, incomplet	e, or misattributed	l to the speaker. A
link to the f	final, official	transcript will be	posted on the
Committee's w	vebsite as soon	as it is available.	•

STATEMENT OF ANDREW WHEELER, ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you. Good morning, Chairman Tonko, Ranking Member Shimkus, and members of the subcommittee. I am joined by Holly Greaves, EPA's CFO, and we are here today to discuss EPA's proposed 2020 budget. The budget resolution ensures that the Agency can continue President Trump's bold agenda and the tremendous progress we have made over the past 2 years.

The U.S. is a global leader in clean air and access to safe drinking water and we are cleaning up contaminated lands at the fastest pace in over a decade. At the same time, EPA has finalized 38 deregulatory actions, saving Americans more than \$3 billion in regulatory costs, and we have an additional 39 actions in development proposed to save billions more. The Trump administration is proving that environmental protection and historic economic growth can go hand in hand. My testimony will highlight how the President's budget will continue this progress.

I believe that water issues from drinking water to marine litter to infrastructure are the largest and most immediate environmental issue facing the world today. The budget request provides critical support for water quality protection. One challenge we face is lead exposure. Through the new federal lead

action plan, EPA is coordinating with our federal counterparts to reduce childhood lead exposure. Last week, we issued a status report to hold ourselves accountable to the public and clearly communicate the steps we are taking to implement the action plan.

To bolster these efforts, the budget proposed \$50 million to establish a new Healthy Schools Grant Program to reduce exposure to lead and other toxins in schools. We are also moving forward to update the Lead and Copper Rule for the first time in over 2 decades. Our proposal would ensure that we address the most corrosive pipes in the most at-risk communities first.

Another challenge is addressing potential sources of contamination. In February, EPA released its PFAS Action Plan, the most comprehensive, multimedia research and action plan ever issued by the Agency to address an emerging chemical of concern. On the marine litter issue, billions of pounds of waste enter our oceans each year, harming marine life and coastal economies. EPA's Trash Free Waters program is stepping up to help the international community capture marine litter or prevent it from reaching the ocean.

On infrastructure, the President's budget includes a 25 percent increase to WIFIA from last year's request. This new program is already producing tremendous results. Today, EPA has issued eight WIFIA loans totaling more than \$2 billion in federal

credit assistance. I was in Miami-Dade County on Friday to announce a \$99 billion WIFIA loan to help protect Florida's beaches and water resources. We recently announced our third round of funding which could support \$12 billion in water infrastructure projects and create more than 180,000 jobs.

To expand on these efforts, President Trump signed America's Water Infrastructure Act or AWIA. While funding for AWIA was not included in fiscal year 2019 appropriations that Congress enacted, EPA does propose funding of 83 million in this budget request to begin implementation of this important new law. The budget request also includes approximately \$2 billion in federal dollars towards the two SRFs. The combination of federal grants, state matches, repayments, and interest all flow back into each revolving fund creating \$80 billion in the nationwide fund as of this year. Regarding the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, as the President stated, this is a unique and important program and I fully support his decision as it relates to funding the program.

When it comes to reducing air pollution, we are moving forward with common-sense reforms that will help more communities reach attainment of the NAAQS standards. For example, last week we announced that the Cleveland area is now meeting the standards for particulate matter. The cleanup of contaminated lands also

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.

plays a crucial role in revitalizing communities throughout the country. In fiscal year 2018, EPA deleted all or part of 22 sites from the National Priorities List, the largest number of deletions in 1 year since fiscal year 2005.

Our next responsibility is ensuring that chemicals used in commerce and sold in the marketplace are safe for public use.

I am proud to report that EPA continues to meet the major statutory deadlines of the amended TSCA. Earlier this month, we finalized a ban on retail sales of methylene chloride for consumer paint and coating removal, the first risk management action under Section 10 of amended TSCA.

To ensure efforts are effective and durable, EPA has a healthy and robust enforcement program. At one end of the spectrum we are increasing compliance through self-audits which are often the quickest way to correct environmental harms. At the other end of the spectrum, we are deterring noncompliance by increasing the number of new criminal cases, reversing a downward trend that began in 2011. This is the type of leadership that gives confidence to the public, the regulated community, and our allies around the globe.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today and I look forward to answering your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Wheeler follows:]

19

404

405 | ********* INSERT 1******

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. Tonko. Thank you. That concludes the Administrator's opening statement. We will now move to member questions. Each member will have 5 minutes to ask questions of our witness. And I will point out that we are going to stay very strict with the 5 minutes because I am told that the Administrator has a hard-out at 12:30, is it? So we will be very strict about the 5-minute effort. Since our witness can only be here to 12:30, we are going to--moving forward now with questions of our guest, I will start by recognizing myself for 5 minutes.

Administrator Wheeler, in the past we have spoken about the Strengthening Transparency in Regulatory Science proposed rule which is issued by your predecessor and widely criticized by the scientific community. Can you provide us an update on the status of that proposal?

Mr. Wheeler. We are still working on that. We intend to move forward with it. You know, it is important—there has been a lot of criticism. I think a lot of the criticism is from people who don't fully understand what we are doing with the proposal. I cut my teeth at EPA on the community right to know and I believe the more information we make available to the public, the more robust our regulations will be.

Mr. Tonko. So when can we expect, you know, a better, a proposal that is outlined for us?

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. 21 Mr. Wheeler. Before the end of this year. Mr. Tonko. Okay. And how EPA chooses to collect and evaluate scientific research is an incredibly important step in the regulatory process including for assessing a chemical's potential risk under the TSCA law. Before your confirmation to this position, you sent a letter to Senator Carper where you committed to submit EPA's systematic review method for TSCA risk evaluations to the National Academy of Sciences for review and to make public any feedback that the Agency receives. What is the status of that National Academy review? Mr. Wheeler. I believe we submitted some of the data so far, but it is for the first ten chemicals and those risk assessments aren't supposed to be finished until the end of this year. Will the Academy have complete discretion to Mr. Tonko. select scope and membership of the review team? Mr. Wheeler. I believe so. I don't believe we can even dictate to the Academy who is on the review. Mr. Tonko. So they will have complete discretion.

developed a review report for the Office of Pesticides Programs on the epidemiology and health effects research regarding

In 2017, the Office of Research and Development

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, is my understanding.

Mr. Tonko.

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

	22
452	exposure to glyphosate. Why was the work not included in your
453	public release of that research and will you release it now?
454	Mr. Wheeler. I am sorry. I have to get back to you on that.
455	I am not familiar with the
456	Mr. Tonko. Okay, the Integrated Risk Information System
457	or IRIS handbook was ready for release in December of 2018. Will
458	you publicly release the IRIS handbook now?
459	Mr. Wheeler. I don't believe it was ready for release.
460	I believe we are still working through the handbook. I don't
461	believe it is ready to be released yet, but it will be released.
462	Mr. Tonko. When should we anticipate the
463	Mr. Wheeler. I will have to get back to you on a deadline
464	for that.
465	Mr. Tonko. Formaldehyde was recently designated as a high
466	priority candidate for risk evaluation under TSCA. It has also
467	been the subject of a long-delayed review under IRIS. What is
468	the status of the IRIS formaldehyde assessment and will that work
469	inform the risk evaluation process under TSCA?
470	Mr. Wheeler. Yes. That work will inform the risk
471	evaluation under TSCA. At this point we are not moving forward
472	with the IRIS review. We decided to put formaldehyde through
473	TSCA. If you put a chemical through the TSCA program you can
474	regulate the chemical at the end of the process. IRIS is not

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.

a regulatory mechanism.

Mr. Tonko. Well, will the IRIS assessment be released for interagency review and what are the plans for external scientific peer review?

Mr. Wheeler. What we did last summer was go back to all of our program offices and ask them what their high priority chemicals are for IRIS and formaldehyde did not come back as one of the high priority chemicals selected. If we were to move forward with the formaldehyde IRIS assessment it would be a minimum of 18 months and we decided that it was more important to go ahead and put formaldehyde through the TSCA program, because at the end of the day we can regulate formaldehyde under TSCA. You cannot regulate a chemical under IRIS.

Mr. Tonko. Given TSCA's requirement to make publicly available all health and safety data being used in risk evaluations, when can we expect the IRIS formaldehyde assessment to be released?

Mr. Wheeler. We are not planning on moving forward with the IRIS assessment for formaldehyde. We are moving forward under TSCA.

Mr. Tonko. Mr. Wheeler, going back to the transparency in science proposed rule, the proposal indicated that the Administrator would be empowered to grant exemptions at his

discretion to address issues on a case-by-case basis. Do you have any thoughts as to how an administrator should go about granting exemptions if this proposal moves forward?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, I think if there is an important scientific study where the data is not available to the public, the Administrator should weigh whether or not it is important to move forward with that study as part of the regulatory process. And I believe that that is a decision that administrators can make on a case-by-case basis, but it is important to remember that the proposal only is for studies going forward. It is not retroactive.

Mr. Tonko. Well, I believe Mr. Pallone may ask about PV29, but we have seen EPA under your leadership keep data and reports hidden for the benefit of industry even when it was not allowable under the law in the case of PV29, all while promoting a transparency rule which scientific and medical experts say will make it more difficult for EPA to use robust science in its rulemaking process. I urge you to release the reports I have raised, along with others which I intend to submit for the record.

With that, I yield back and I recognize Representative Shimkus for 5 minutes.

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Administrator Wheeler, I want to focus my questions in two

areas of interest, the substantial backlog of applications in the Toxic Substance Control Act, or TSCA new chemicals provision, and the Renewable Fuel Standard. According to the Agency's website, as of 3 weeks ago the number of notices awaiting completion of review since this law was enacted 34 months ago was 62 percent higher than the historical caseload of new chemical applications.

More importantly though, is that to avoid delays in getting innovative, greener, safer chemicals to the market—and I mean that is one of the benefits, we want to get safer chemicals to the market versus chemicals that may not be as safe that is in the market right now—TSCA specifically mandates completion of new chemical reviews within 90 days, but not later than 180 days.

How many of those 527 pending applications are older than 180 days?

Mr. Wheeler. 270 at this point. It is lower than what it was. We are working to reduce the backload. It has been within the time frames for both the new chemicals and the existing chemicals program under the new TSCA there has been some challenges, but we are processing them faster than we were a year ago.

Mr. Shimkus. Right. And the media asks me about this like every week, so that is why I don't think it is any surprise that

Committee's website as soon as it is available. 26 544 I am going down this part of the questioning because the whole 545 idea is to get this process moving. How many are older of these 546 527 or whatever, were older than 90 days? 547 Older than 90 days would be 110 to 120 in the Mr. Wheeler. 548 over 90, but under 180. 549 Mr. Shimkus. So are these delays an EPA labor or a legal 550 problem? 551 Mr. Wheeler. It is more a labor problem at this point. 552 We had to work through the program on how the program was going 553 to be implemented, then during that working through the 554 implementation phase we got the backlog. So we are trying to 555 process the new chemicals as they come in as quickly as possible and also work on the backlog. 556 557 Right. Do you have--Mr. Shimkus. 558 Mr. Wheeler. But we are reaching out to manufacturers to 559 let them know about the timing on a case-by-case basis. 560 Mr. Shimkus. Do you have a plan to devote resources to 561 addressing the backlog of old, pre-manufactured notices that have 562 been languishing for many months or years? 563 Mr. Wheeler. We do, and we have been, you know, and it is 564 in part a staffing problem. Last year we hired 25 new people 565 to work on TSCA, but at the same time we lost 25 people. So it 566 is kind of keeping our head above water at times on staffing.

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

567 Mr. Shimkus. Will you try to quickly place more experienced 568 scientists and engineers in the TSCA program to complete more 569 timely, new chemical reviews and risk evaluations? 570 Mr. Wheeler. Yes. 571 Mr. Shimkus. I think that is--your answer preceded my 572 Before my time concludes, I want to touch on the 573 Renewable Fuel Standard. I see David Loebsack here. 574 he is going to direct some questions in that area also. As you 575 know, after 2022, EPA has a great deal more flexibility to set 576 the targets in the RFS. Has the Agency already begun to prepare 577 for the RFS post-2022? 578 Mr. Wheeler. No. Right now, we are focused on the E15, the RIN price mechanism, the reset, the RVO for this year and--579 580 Mr. Shimkus. You have some other issues on your plate. 581 Mr. Wheeler. Right. 582 Mr. Shimkus. Okay. We have five pending regulations on the RFS. 583 Mr. Wheeler. 584 Mr. Shimkus. Well, and as you know we were dealing, trying 585 to do something legislative, et cetera, in law that would help give you more direction. 586 587 Mr. Wheeler. That would be great. 588 I still think that is very, very important Mr. Shimkus. 589 because this 2022 debate is real. We don't know if you will be

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.

This is a prelimina	ry, unedited	transcript. The	statements within
may be inaccurate,	incomplete, o	r misattributed	to the speaker. A
link to the final,	official tran	script will be p	posted on the
Committee's website	as soon as i	t is available.	

there. We don't know if we will have a new administration. We don't know who the new EPA Administrator would be. It is kind of a roll of the dice, don't you think?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes. I think there is a lot of discussion that needs to take place between now and 2022. And while the administration, I don't believe, has an official position on RFS legislation, I do think the program could, for post-2022 would be strengthened by congressional views on this.

Mr. Shimkus. Do you expect the demand for biofuel would be higher, lower, or about the same? Again, I am just talking a crystal ball. Where do you think we are headed in just biofuel in the mix?

Mr. Wheeler. Post-2022, well, I mean it really depends on the use of fuel in the automobile industry. You know, I worked as a staffer on both the 2005, 2007 energy bills and at that point in time we did not project the vehicle miles traveled would be going down or the gasoline usage would be going down. We thought it would be going up. And the legislation as you remember was drafted with the expectation that we would continue to use more gasoline and that hasn't been the case with more fuel-efficient cars, electric vehicles, natural gas-powered vehicles.

So, and there is a lot of drivers as far the fuel usage, and then by increasing like the E15 should also help increase

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. 29 the volumes for ethanol. Mr. Shimkus. Thank you. My time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Tonko. You are welcome. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from California, Representative Peters, for 5 minutes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to start with two thank yous, you may not get from this side of the aisle. One is, I think I am the only former EPA employee on the committee. I worked in the TSCA program and though they need people, I am done with that particular phase of my career. Mr. Shimkus. We could use you. I think there is some forms. Mr. Wheeler. We could use more help. I also saw on their behalf I want to say I am Mr. Peters. a little concerned about the cuts in general. I think these people work very hard. They do important work and we need to I also want to thank you for the loan that San support them. Diego received, \$614 million loan for our water recycling project known as Pure Water. And connected with that though, as you pointed out that is a very important program, unfortunately you are requesting \$300 million less than the enacted level in 2019. I will just, without, we don't have time to go into that but

I will just flag, I think that is the wrong way to go for such

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

an important program that provides so much leverage to communities for environmental protection. But I did want to talk about the U.S.-Mexico Border Water Infrastructure Program or BWIP.

As you know, the City of San Diego has for decades struggled to end the continuous discharge of sewage along the border into the city from Tijuana. Millions of gallons of sewage still routinely close beaches. In fiscal year 2020, you propose eliminating resources and staff for the U.S.-Mexico Water Infrastructure Program. The program, quote, supports the planning, design, and construction of water and wastewater treatment facilities along the border with all projects benefiting communities on the U.S. side of the border.

The EPA has identified nearly \$125 million in drinking water and wastewater infrastructure projects along the border in need of funding to protect public health and environmental impact in the United States, and yet the budget would eliminate the U.S.-Mexico border program as part of the effort to restore, to focus resources on core environmental work. Now since the program began in 1997, it has provided hundreds of thousands of U.S. households along the border adequate drinking water and wastewater infrastructure. Initially funded with \$100 million per year, however, it has been reduced over the last 20 years to less than 10 million. Why would you say BWIP is no longer

considered as part of the effort to focus resources on core environmental work?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, first of all, Congressman, thank you for the comments of San Diego and the WIFIA loan that we provided them. I think that is a good example on how we can continue to support border projects. The budget does eliminate most regional voluntary programs, but we can still address those same problems and concerns through existing programs at the Agency such as the SRF.

I am told that between with the border states--Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas--there is 400 million available through water infrastructure that can go towards the border through the SRF. With the WIFIA we can continue to look at new, innovative ways of funding border initiatives with the WIFIA loan program. We did ask for 25 million more than what we requested last year for WIFIA, and then we also have the new AWIA, which Congress just passed last year, where we are asking for 83 million which we believe will really help smaller communities address water problems.

So we are trying to spread our money among different programs to address water concerns--

Mr. Peters. Right, and obviously the concern we have is that the BWIP program is focused on the border. So the SRF

projects are only, the money is only going to projects in the United States. To be eligible for the BWIP funding, projects must be located within 100 kilometers or 62 miles of the U.S.-Mexico border. So are you going to do something specifically to make sure that border projects have dedicated funding from the SRF?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, again, you know, we will spend the money appropriated by Congress, if Congress does give us money for the program. But we are also working with the Department of State and other federal agencies to determine what else we can do on the border. And my regional administrator, Mike Stoker, in California, has been down to the border numerous times and talking to our Mexican counterparts. I will be down in Mexico for the CGC, I believe. It is the Canadian, U.S., Mexican environmental administrators meeting in June and this is, or actually the end of May.

Mr. Peters. Okay.

Mr. Wheeler. This is a high priority for me when I meet with my counterparts--

Mr. Peters. I just expressed the concern. I appreciate that too and I appreciate the administrator from Region 9 has been active and present. But as you know, this is unique among federal funding programs because it is the only federal program

that can fund projects on both sides of the border with all projects benefiting communities on the United States side of the border, so I express that concern. I raise that objection and hope to be able to provide you and your administrator with specific tools for the U.S.-Mexico border by preserving the BWIP. And I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the Republican leader of the full committee, the gentleman from Oregon, Representative Walden, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Walden. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for having this hearing. And to the Administrator, welcome back.

I know your years as a Senate staffer make you no stranger to this kind of body and we are glad to have you over here on the people's house today.

I appreciate your commitment, Mr. Administrator, this administration and its budget to three goals to the Agency core mission, cooperative federalism, and rule of law and process. I think that is all really important and I appreciate your leadership on so many issues including Waters of the U.S. In my district I heard about it again when I did a series of town halls a week ago. Farmers and ranchers pretty concerned, but appreciative of where you are taking that rule and I think that gives them some certainty while protecting the environment, but

not going too far.

3 weeks ago you gave a speech about the importance of water to global public health, particularly safe drinking water and how unsafe drinking water poses the greatest, most immediate global threat to the environment. Can you please expound upon that position and how would you rate water quality in the good old U.S. of A.?

Mr. Wheeler. Our water quality, I believe, is the safest in the world. Back in the 1970s, 40 percent of our water systems failed to meet EPA standards. Today, 92 percent of our water systems meet the EPA standards every single day, but worldwide it is a huge issue. You have one to three million people dying based on water, unsafe drinking water or water sanitation issues. The U.N. estimates 1,000 children die every single day from lack of potable water. I think that is a huge issue and I think that we have the skills, we have the technology to help solve this problem worldwide.

Mr. Walden. Now obviously you know, Mr. Administrator, the Energy and Commerce Committee in the last Congress rewrote the Safe Drinking Water Act. We did that in a bipartisan way. We had some good, vigorous negotiations and that became law, the President signed it. And so I would like to ask you a bit about the longstanding priority of this committee that when it comes

to safe drinking water, Congress, last year, increased the authorization for the Drinking Water Revolving Loan Fund. Does the administration support a robustly funded Drinking Water State Revolving Fund?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, we do. And I point out that at this point in time because money is added to the SRF every year, we loan it out, it comes back to the program, at this point in time there is \$80 billion circulating through the two SRFs that are currently out in projects around the country and that is key. But we did focus on our budget request, additional money for the WIFIA program, 25 million more than we asked for last year, and then we also asked for 83 million for AWIA which Congress passed last fall, but which we did not receive any funding for this year.

We actually have a number of deadlines that we are unfortunately not going to be able to meet this year because of no funding for AWIA, but we are asking for 83 million because I believe there are several really new, innovative programs in the AWIA legislation that will help smaller communities, rural communities with their drinking water systems. And so I think it is important to get those programs up and running as quickly as possible.

Mr. Walden. Yeah, I do too and we will look forward to working with you on those. Are any states having trouble with

their matching fund requirements under the act? What are you hearing from states?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, we certainly had issues with Puerto Rico even prior to the hurricanes there on the SRF. At this point I am not aware of any states in particular with matching fund issues. We can get back to you on that, but I am not aware of any the state matching fund issues.

Mr. Walden. Okay, that is good. We are just trying to see what works and what doesn't, what we need to tweak. I understand the Agency continues its Lean program or its effort to assess and align its work force for better outputs. Is your team looking at succession planning and aligning expertise with offices?

Mr. Wheeler. Absolutely. The Lean management system, I think, has already shown a lot of success. It has shown success on our permitting side, also on enforcement side. We are getting the enforcement reports out to the regulating community faster, which gets environmental improvements done faster. And I am very concerned about succession planning at the Agency. Right now, 40 percent of our work force is eligible to retire over the next 5 years.

We hired a new Human Resources director 2 months ago. I actually interviewed the person and I am told that that is not typical for the Administrator because about three levels below

me, but I thought it was important for me to interview the new Human Resources director because I didn't want to hit her with a dozen issues on her first day without having met me first.

Mr. Walden. And I appreciate that. And I just want to close with this, Mr. Chairman. In the last Congress we had some level of difficulty getting your predecessor up here to testify on the budget. We appreciate your willingness to do so and to work on the committee on this and all host of other issues, so thank you and I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the chair of the full committee, the gentleman from New Jersey, Representative Pallone, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Wheeler. Mr. Chairman, before he begins could I correct one thing that I said? I have said twice that we had a 25 million increase in WIFIA request. It was actually 25 percent. I have said that twice. I just want to correct that for the record.

Mr. Tonko. Okay. Thank you very much.

The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Administrator Wheeler, you could tell from my opening that I am deeply concerned about the direction of the EPA. As I said in my opening, I had hoped when Scott Pruitt resigned that EPA would return to its mission of protecting human health and the environment, but I think that this budget shows that protecting

inib is a preliminary, anearcea cranscript. The scatements 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.

public health is not a priority. So I have a lot of questions, but I am going to try to move quickly and ask you really to answer yes or no. And, you know, if you can't answer yes or no then I am probably just going to assume it is a no.

Well, let me start. In 2017, Scott Pruitt committed to me in this room to expand the risk evaluation for asbestos to include exposures to legacy asbestos, but that hasn't been done. I think it is unconscionable that we are still importing and using asbestos 40 years after EPA started work on a ban, despite knowing that it is killing 40,000 people a year in this country. So my question is will you commit to banning ongoing uses of asbestos under TSCA, yes or no?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, we are doing more on asbestos than any administration in the last 25 years.

The Chairman. All right, I appreciate that. Let me just keep going. Last year, Scott Pruitt committed to me and to the public that he would ban methylene chloride. But now you have moved forward with only a partial ban, leaving commercial uses in place. And this chemical has killed scores of workers and needs to be banned for commercial uses as well, in my opinion. So will you commit to banning commercial uses of methylene chloride?

Mr. Wheeler. We are taking comment on a training and

certification program for commercial users.

The Chairman. All right. Well, so far, the answer I guess is no.

We have also heard a lot of talk from EPA on PFAS chemicals, but we haven't seen action to go along with it. All we have so far on drinking water is an intention to reach a regulatory determination on two PFAS chemicals by the end of the year. I don't think that is enough. So the question is, will you commit to setting a strict MCL or drinking water standard for all the PFAS impacting drinking water in this country and will you commit to ensuring that any MCL or drinking water standard that you set actually protects public health? That should be an easy yes.

Mr. Wheeler. We have already started the MCL process, but we haven't slowed down. We are still enforcing cleanups around the country. We have taken eight enforcement actions. We have assisted states in dozens of enforcement actions around the country.

The Chairman. All right. Well, it sounds like that is a no, too. I just don't see how the American people can trust you to protect their health and environment if you don't, you know, commit to what I just asked with regard to the MCL. And to make matters worse, we have seen serious efforts during your tenure to circumvent transparency and hide important risk information

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.

from the public. So I don't, in my opinion, these efforts have gone beyond what we saw in the Pruitt administration and are really cause for concern. Now let me ask, on Pigment Violet 29 you have so far refused to share the scientific studies you used to exonerate a chemical many believe to be dangerous and I had to send you two letters to get those studies released. And when you do release them you still redacted the main data tables you relied on which I thought was unacceptable. Will you commit to sharing those data tables with this committee and with the American public? Do you follow what I am asking you?

Mr. Wheeler. The data that was redacted was confidential business information. As you know under TSCA we are required to keep CBI confidential.

The Chairman. So the answer is no again.

Mr. Wheeler. Under the law we can't, sir.

The Chairman. Well, that is a question of interpretation.

Oftentimes the Trump administration says they are following the law and they don't, but whatever.

On PFAS, EPA recently released a notice of violation against Chemours, I guess that is Dupont, one of the main PFAS manufacturers, for issues at two PFAS plants. This notice should be an important tool for the communities around these plants, but the notice and report is so heavily redacted I think again

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.

it is ridiculous. My staff was able to find much of the redacted information already available to the public, but even a generic chemical identity which exists just to inform the public while protecting CBI was redacted. And again, this over-redaction, I know you said it with regard to the previous question is, you know, you think you are required to do it. But I think it is way beyond what the law requires and I think it is over-redaction, really is, is I think offensive to the communities that are dealing with this PFAS pollution.

So let me ask you on that, on this Chemours or Dupont, will you commit to sharing an unredacted version of the Chemours notice of violation report with this committee and the American public?

Mr. Wheeler. Again we have to safeguard confidential business information as required under our statutes. But we have directed Chemours to test hundreds of water supplies within the areas around the two facilities and they are doing that and we are using our enforcement tools to make sure that it is getting done.

The Chairman. Well, I think again the answer is no and I disagree with what you think needs to be redacted, but I think you are just not doing enough to protect public health and the environment. And I appreciate your willingness to come here today, but we need more from you in terms of transparency,

responsiveness, and action to address serious threats to our health. I just, you know, that is just my opinion and I want you to know that. I appreciate your coming, but we are not getting a lot of this information. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia, Representative McKinley, for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And welcome-Mr. Wheeler. Thank you, sir.

Mr. McKinley. --my friend. Over the years, the various regions of the EPA, the ten regions, have come under a lot of criticism autonomously operating as they do, often each region operating with its own individuality contrary to others. I know in West Virginia that the compliance in West Virginia is out of Philadelphia, can be entirely different a thousand feet across the river in Ohio that comes out of Chicago. And I saw that last week you were putting out a reorganization on that long overdue. GAO came out with something back in 2006 called for some reorganization. I know that Senator Inhofe back in 2006 also called for that. So I am curious to see a little bit--thank you for--hopefully you are going to address it thoroughly, but there are a couple of things with it. What is your objective and, secondly, what are going to be the metrics that we can measure

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 we have now finally gotten control over the ten agencies, or ten entities?

Mr. Wheeler. Certainly. Thank you, Congressman. First of all, our administration when we were selecting our regional administrators for the regions, we wanted to make sure that we selected people that had state experience. And I think that has helped us a lot in the regional management of all ten regions, having ten regional administrators with former state experience.

But what our regional reorganization, and it takes effect on Monday the 15th, we are realigning the regional offices to mirror the headquarters. You know, probably the biggest change, six of the regions had enforcement divisions, four of the regions did not have enforcement divisions. They sprinkled their enforcement people throughout each of the program offices. One region didn't even have an air division in the title. So people had a problem trying to figure out who to go to from region to region if you needed a permit or if you needed help on a particular issue.

So what we did was realigned all the regions to mirror the headquarters and it is going to allow, for example, the enforcement office at EPA headquarters to work more closely with the enforcement divisions around the country to make sure there is continuity and to make sure that there is consistency between

	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.
	44
958	the regions and we will do that as well in the program offices.
959	Mr. McKinley. I think the consistency is long overdue, so
960	thank you for doing that. Two quick questions back to the State
961	Revolving Fund. I know you have said that there is \$80 billion
962	now floating through the system, but the optics of cutting \$300
963	million out this year is hard to promote. Can you explain that
964	a little bit better about how cutting \$300 million out of an
965	appropriation for the State Revolving Fund actually is going to
966	help
967	Mr. Wheeler. Well, we are asking
968	Mr. McKinleyget more sewer and water lines built, or
969	water lines built around the country?
970	Mr. Wheeler. We are asking for close to \$2 billion in our
971	budget request. It is not as high as what Congress appropriated
972	for this year, but we are also asking for an increase in the WIFIA
973	program from what we requested last year.
974	Mr. McKinley. But the SRF, you are cutting the SRF
975	Mr. Wheeler. We are also requesting
976	Mr. McKinley\$300 million or so. I am just trying toI
977	am hung up on the optics.
978	Mr. Wheeler. I understand.
979	Mr. McKinley. Because my issue, every time I go to a county
980	commissioner or whatever, they are asking for more money finding

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

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.

they need to have water and the infrastructure. And I am having a hard time to explain that there is \$80 billion flowing through the system--

Mr. Wheeler. There is.

Mr. McKinley. --but they are not getting it.

Mr. Wheeler. But at this point in time we believe the WIFIA program offers some more innovative ways of funding some of these water projects and we are very encouraged by the legislation in the AWIA legislation from last year. So we are asking for more money for those two programs because we want to see if there is a different way of trying to solve the water problems for communities around the country.

Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Administrator. Maybe we need to have more of a conversation later about this. The third and last question has to do with a small refinery in West Virginia. It is the only refinery we have. It is Ergon, 25,000 gallons a day trying to compete with Marathon that is, what, three million gallons a day of preparation. But under the DOE and the EPA you are treating them all the same.

I am troubled with that and I am hoping that you will look at that dealing with the RINs, how we might be able to take care of that. DOE has made some kind of recommendation to you, but it is up to you now with the EPA to make a determination of whether

testified that President Trump and the EPA are, quote, focused

NFALR GROSS

At your Senate confirmation hearing earlier this year, you

1004

1005

1006

1007

1008

1009

1010

1011

1012

1013

1014

1015

1016

1017

1018

1019

1020

1021

1022

1023

1024

1025

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.
Committee's website as soon as it is available.
on putting Americans first, end quote. You specifically cited
the administration's commitment to expanding access to safe
drinking water and protecting Americans living near hazardous
sites from health risks.
Mr. Wheeler, I would like to just start off with a few like
simple one word, yes or no questions. First, do you stand by
that commitment?
Mr. Wheeler. Yes, I do.
Ms. Blunt Rochester. Yes. Secondthank youdo you
believe that the Agency's actions under your leadership along
with this budget proposal reflect that commitment?
Mr. Wheeler. Yes.
Ms. Blunt Rochester. And, Mr. Secretary, is it true that
your fiscal year 2020 budget proposes to eliminate the safe water
for small and disadvantaged communities program?
Mr. Wheeler. Yes, I believe so.
Ms. Blunt Rochester. Isn't it true that the purpose of that
program is to support drinking water projects and activities in
small and disadvantaged communities that are unable to finance
projects to comply with drinking water regulations under the Safe
Drinking Water Act?
Mr. Wheeler. Yes, but we are looking to use the AWIA

may b link	is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within e inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A to the final, official transcript will be posted on the ttee's website as soon as it is available.
COMMIT	48
same	communities. We think the flexibilities of AWIA might be
a bet	ter use of the dollars.
	Ms. Blunt Rochester. So I am going to ask you a question
becau	se it is my understanding that this money had already been
appro	priated before. Can you give me the rationale? Is there
a stu	dy or something that shows why you made this decision?
	Mr. Wheeler. We are moving forward with the money that was
appro	priated, but as far as for next year, 2020, we believe funding
the A	WIA program which would target the same communities might
be a	more innovative way of using the funding from Congress.
	Ms. Blunt Rochester. Has the program even been established?
I me	an it was appropriated, it is my understanding, before this
year,	before you even came on board.
	Mr. Wheeler. I am not sure I understand what you mean.
	Ms. Blunt Rochester. I was aware that \$45 million had been
appro	priated for this program, correct?
	Mr. Wheeler. And we are moving forward with the money that
has b	een appropriated. But for 2020
	Ms. Blunt Rochester. But you are shifting.
	Mr. Wheelerwe are suggesting the money should go to
AWIA,	83 million to AWIA to address some of the same communities.
	Ms. Blunt Rochester. So again I just want to be clear.
Does	that mean it is not going to be specifically targeted toward

Committee's website as soon as it is available. 49 1073 small and disadvantaged communities? Just so I can have that 1074 on the record. 1075 Not from that program, but there are other Mr. Wheeler. 1076 ways of targeting small, disadvantaged communities through the 1077 AWIA program. 1078 Ms. Blunt Rochester. So we do have a commitment that at least \$45 million will be targeted to small and disadvantaged 1079 1080 communities? 1081 Mr. Wheeler. I don't know the dollar amount. It depends 1082 on what the appropriations that we do receive for AWIA, but the 1083 program that you are asking about that money will be going out 1084 this year. Ms. Blunt Rochester. Okay, so first of all, my concern is 1085 1086 that--1087 So \$45 million will be going out there. Mr. Wheeler. 1088 Ms. Blunt Rochester. -- there was a program, the money 1089 wasn't appropriated, now we are kind of putting it all together. 1090 I just want to share with you, in Delaware we have a small town 1091 called Ellendale and it is a community that has struggled to have 1092 clean, safe drinking water. They have had elevated levels of 1093 bacteria and nitrates and iron in the water and fortunately they 1094 have had residents like Mr. Harold Truxon and Ms. Delores Price

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

who have determined and worked hard to make sure that they passed

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.	
	50
a referendum after two failed ones, after 35 years of trying t	to

a referendum after two failed ones, after 35 years of trying to get safe drinking water, 400 people in this small community, 20 percent poverty level, and to me budgets and calendars reflect priorities.

I am concerned that in addition to this, there is also the elimination of the small minority business assistance program, and so if we have priorities our budgets should reflect that.

What I would love to hear is a commitment that small, rural, and disadvantaged communities that need the support and leadership can count on that kind of support and commitment and that we can see these dollars that were targeted for those areas actually go to those areas. Do I have that commitment?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes. And the money for the assistance for small, disadvantaged communities of 45 million will be going out this summer, and again we believe under AWIA next year we can target those same communities.

Ms. Blunt Rochester. Thank you and I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentlelady yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from the state of Ohio, Mr. Johnson, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Mr. Wheeler, thank you again for joining us today.

A few years ago I helped to get language added to Section 8 of

the Toxic Substances Control Act to create a negotiated rulemaking between EPA and regulated stakeholders to reduce duplicate reporting of unintended byproducts. Unfortunately, the legal and procedural venues were not conducive to producing a satisfactory result.

I understand that the Agency is close to proposing a rulemaking under TSCA Section 8. Will that rulemaking make any effort to address duplicate reporting to the Agency?

Mr. Wheeler. I believe it will, but I will have to get back to you with the details on--

Mr. Johnson. Okay, yeah, could you please? I appreciate that. Thank you. In the last Congress, the subcommittee examined Clean Air Act provisions that could be updated to reflect what we have learned over 30 years such as the NSR program. We heard witnesses express concern that innovative technologies and systems to improve facilities are being left on the shelf, unfortunately, because of current NSR processes. We learned how the NSR program can make things like incremental pollution control improvements, carrying out energy efficiency upgrades and keeping facilities in good working order for safety and reliability purposes very, very challenging. I believe we also learned that we can accomplish most or all of the anticipated environmental benefits of the NSR at considerably reduced cost with creative

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

reforms to this program.

So, Administrator Wheeler, can you speak broadly about why updating the NSR program would be beneficial and what you are going to do or what you are doing to explore administrative changes to the program?

Mr. Wheeler. Absolutely. First, to answer your second part, we have a number of guidance documents we have issued over the last year and a half from the Air Office on New Source Review including the once in always in guidance and we are now working to put those into regulatory text and to offer public comment. Previously, NSR regularly discouraged companies from investing and deploying the cleanest and most efficient technologies. Through our NSR reforms we are providing clarity to permitting requirements, we are improving the overall process. We are also incentivizing investments in the latest energy technologies.

So we are trying to modernize the NSR program to make sure that it is not a deterrent to pollution prevention going forward.

Mr. Johnson. Okay. Would reforms that make it easier to make decisions to upgrade equipment that led to reduced greenhouse gas emissions help our nation's climate policies, do you think?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, it would.

Mr. Johnson. Okay. What is the status of your proposed rulemaking to replace the Clean Power Plan and how does that

proposal address New Source Review?

Mr. Wheeler. In the proposal we had a section on New Source Review to allow companies to install the latest energy-efficient equipment at their facilities and without having to trigger NSR which will get reductions faster. We are looking at whether or not to include that in the final regulation or that add as a separate NSR regulation, but in either event we will either move forward with it together or separate, but we will move forward with both pieces.

The ACE proposal, once it is fully implemented, will reduce CO2 emissions from the electric power sector by 34 percent which will go a long ways to meeting our CO2 goals for the country.

Mr. Johnson. Okay. Are there other initiatives you could pursue this year to provide greater certainty to facilities and will make the steps to upgrade without fear of triggering NSR?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, we have several. As I mentioned, we have several NSR regulatory rulemakings in the process. We have additional guidance documents that will be going out, but we are trying to modernize the NSR program which has kind of been stuck in 20 years and has not allowed for innovation for new pollution prevention control technologies.

Mr. Johnson. Okay. I have about 33 seconds left.

Recently, the Agency released a multi-prong PFAS action

link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 54 1188 There are 4,000 PFAS chemicals and yet only 18 can be plan. 1189 detected in water, and health effects are known about one-half 1190 of one percent of the substances. Can you talk just real briefly 1191 about the importance of getting the work right to understand how 1192 best to approach PFAS issues moving forward? 1193 Mr. Wheeler. Absolutely. You know, there are thousands 1194 of different PFAS chemicals. We have some of the best researchers in the world working on this in our research labs. 1195 The same 1196 control technologies can't be used for the different PFAS 1197 Some of the long-chain compounds, the control 1198 technologies don't necessarily work for the short-chain, also 1199 the detections are different. 1200 Mr. Tonko. Okay, the gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Florida, Representative Soto, for 1201 1202 5 minutes, please. 1203 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Soto. 1204 Administrator Wheeler, is climate change real? 1205 Mr. Wheeler. Yes. 1206 Mr. Soto. And is it caused by human activity? 1207 Mr. Wheeler. Human activity certainly is a causing factor 1208 of climate change, yes. 1209 Mr. Soto. And is fossil fuels and other carbon emissions 1210 part of that human activity causing climate change?

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A

Mr. Wheeler. Yes.

Mr. Soto. And there was a recent NOAA report, the Federal Climate Assessment, on November 23rd, 2018. Do you agree with the assessment of what could happen based upon climate change in that NOAA report?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, the assessment at least in the press focused more on the worst case scenario, which is the 8.5, RCP 8.5, which that worst case scenario is actually no longer being used by the U.N.'s IPCC, so I think the news reports at least of the assessment are slightly misleading. But the underlying science, I have been briefed by my staff a few times on it. I read the assessment when it came out and we are moving forward.

As I mentioned a minute ago, our ACE proposal is going to reduce CO2. Our CAFÉ standards will also reduce CO2. So we are moving forward with the authorities that Congress has given us under the Clean Air Act to address CO2.

Mr. Soto. Thank you. And we had some op-eds in my local district where local constituents of mine were concerned about stacking science advisory groups with industry folks and a reduction in monitoring and enforcement. Can you give us an idea of the number of cases brought in 2016 versus '17 and '18 and what you are looking like this year as far as cases brought?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, the cases do vary from year to year

particularly on the fines. This year is going to be particularly large with the recent Fiat Chrysler enforcement action that we took in January. Our criminal cases last year was an uptick, the first time we had an increase in criminal cases since 2011. We also have an increase on the audit side, so we are trying to prevent the pollution from happening through the audits. But if it does happen, we are making sure that people realize we are going to be taking criminal cases if we need to, to make sure that people are compliant with the law.

Mr. Soto. So there has been an uptick in criminal and audits, but a downtick overall with civil cases; is that fair to say?

Mr. Wheeler. There was a slight downtick, I believe, in civil cases last year. You know, one of the things that we have been criticized is a downtick in the number of inspections. But as we delegate more programs to the states, the states have the primacy there and they conduct the majority of the inspections. And we are providing technical assistance through our criminal lab in Colorado to a number of states around the country to help them with their inspections to make sure that they are done properly.

Mr. Soto. Thank you, Mr. Wheeler. And, you know, I come from the state of Florida. We have a big issue with the red tide

This is	a prelimina	ary, unedit	ed transcr	ipt. The st	atements	within
may be i	naccurate,	incomplete	, or misat	tributed to	the spea	ker. A
link to	the final,	official t	ranscript v	will be pos	ted on th	ıe
Committe	e's website	as soon a	s it is ava	ailable.		

and toxic algae blooms. We have had researchers say that the warmer weather may now be a key determinant of algae blooms in Lake Okeechobee. And scientists have found that over the last 25 years, Lake Okeechobee has continuously warmed and according to NOAA the, quote, harmful algae blooms in general expected to increase in a warming world thanks to warming sea surface temperatures, end quote.

And then the director of Florida Sea Grant at the University of Florida said, I quote, at this time it is not clear if the ecosystem services provided by Lake Okeechobee can be protected if climate change in the future decades includes both increased temperatures and less rainfall.

Do you agree with those scientific assessments?

Mr. Wheeler. I would have to look at those assessments specifically. I rather not give a general agreement without having read the actual assessments.

Mr. Soto. Does the EPA generally agree that warming seas could exacerbate algae blooms?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes. That is one of the factors exacerbating algae blooms. Also, nutrients are as well and we are working on that through a number of innovative ways. We just released a new market-based mechanism program in February to try to help farmers on nutrient-loading--

1280 Mr. Soto. And would a reduction in emissions help combat 1281 climate change and potentially fix this potential damage in the 1282 future? 1283 Mr. Wheeler. If you are referring to reductions in CO2--1284 Mr. Soto. Yes. 1285 Mr. Wheeler. --yes, but it is on the margins. I think 1286 adaptation is very important. And why it is important, the 1287 President was down at Lake Okeechobee last week or the week before 1288 and committed to fully funding the program there for the dike. 1289 I think that is very important. We are working on the other 1290 side with the nutrient-loading and we have some of the best 1291 researchers in the world on the algae blooms at a number of our 1292 research facilities including RTP in North Carolina which is doing 1293 some groundbreaking research on how to better protect--1294 Mr. Soto. Thank you, Mr. Wheeler. And we appreciate the 1295 President being there. We were concerned about the budget cuts, 1296 but obviously we will be working on those. 1297 Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce a letter to the record 1298 from nearly a dozen public health groups declaring that climate 1299 change is, in fact, a health emergency for both algae blooms and 1300 Lake Okeechobee. 1301 Mr. Tonko. At the end of the hearing we will take up all 1302 the offers for submission to the record.

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.

59 1303 Mr. Soto. Thank you. 1304 Mr. Tonko. But we are pleased to do that. 1305 The gentleman yields back and now the chair recognizes the 1306 gentleman from Missouri, Representative Long, for 5 minutes. 1307 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Long. 1308 And, Mr. Wheeler, 362 days ago, the President issued a memo to EPA directing the Administrator to take specific actions to 1309 1310 ensure more efficient and cost-effective implementation of the 1311 Agency's national air quality standards program. The President 1312 requested more timely processing of state implementation plans. 1313 Can you give us an update and report card on yourself on that? 1314 Mr. Wheeler. Yes. We are moving forward to conduct the 1315 five-year review for both PM and ozone and conduct them both on 1316 time. It will be the first time the Agency has ever completed 1317 We have taken a number of steps to shorten the review that. 1318 period. The Clean Air Act directs us to review it every 5 years 1319 and we are on schedule to get it done in the 5-year period which is the end of 2020. 1320 1321 Mr. Long. Okay. The President also requested engagement 1322 with states on regional haze plans. How are you doing on that? 1323 Can you give us an update? 1324 Mr. Wheeler. I think we are doing very well on that. You 1325 know, the previous administration issued a record number of

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.

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.

federal implementation plans, most of them around the Regional Haze Program. In fact, they issued more FIPs than the previous four administrations combined. What we have done since March of 2017 is, on average, turn one FIP into a SIP each month, and turn it from a federal implementation to a state implementations plan.

So we are working much closer with the states to make sure that they are moving forward, but we are working cooperatively and collaboratively with the states.

Mr. Long. The President in that memo also requested more timely processing of pre-construction permit applications which has been a big issue. How are you doing there?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, I think we are moving forward on that very well and again working closely with the states.

Mr. Long. Okay. In the past two Congresses we have been trying to enact reforms to air quality standards that help prevent areas from being unfairly penalized for emissions beyond their control. I am reminded of a hearing we had in here in the last Congress when we had several folks in from California and they said that their cities, they were concerned if you took every motorcycle, every big truck, every car, every everything off, every train, everything off the highways and rails of California, they could still not comply with the ozone standards.

So the President asked in his memo that you respond more quickly to states' petitions for relief under exceptional events and international emissions provisions of the Clean Air Act.

What are you doing to implement this directive?

Mr. Wheeler. We are working more closely with the states. I think I mentioned in my opening statement that we moved Cleveland from a non-attainment to attainment last week for particulate matter. We have another one that we are announcing this week, I don't believe it is public yet, where we are going from non-attainment to attainment.

We are trying to work with those communities and also working with them on the exceptional events and things outside their control such as forest fires or emissions from China. We know a lot more on modeling on where the emissions are coming from and a lot of the emissions that are impacting Western states, Colorado, for example, is coming from overseas.

Mr. Long. And that continues to be a huge issue because if you have ever traveled to Beijing or several places in China, you can't see across the street.

The President's memo also directed you to fully implement the Clean Air Act providing that require the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee to advise you on the adverse health or other effects that may result from implementation of revised air quality

Committee's website as soon as it is available. 62 1372 standards. In previous administrations, the legal requirement 1373 to look at other adverse impacts including welfare, social, 1374 economic, and energy effects was ignored by the EPA. 1375 Have you provided direction or a charge to the Scientific 1376 Advisory Committee to provide you with advice about other adverse 1377 impacts that may result from efforts to meet air quality 1378 standards? 1379 Mr. Wheeler. I have. We have asked them to provide advice 1380 on all the issues you just named. Mr. Long. And that is going fairly well? 1381 1382 Mr. Wheeler. Yes. 1383 Mr. Long. Okay. Will you provide for the record an update 1384 on each item in the President's memo that again 362 days ago when it came out and how EPA is addressing those directives? 1385 1386 Mr. Wheeler. Yes, happy to, sir. 1387 Okay, thank you. Mr. Long. 1388 And, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1389 Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. The chair now 1390 recognizes the gentlelady from the state of California, 1391 Representative Barragan, for 5 minutes. 1392 Ms. Barragan. Thank you. 1393 Mr. Wheeler, I want to ask you about the drinking water 1394 infrastructure portion of the budget. My understanding is 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. 63 1395 EPA is requesting approximately \$300 million less than the fiscal 1396 year 2019 amounts were enacted; is that correct? 1397 Mr. Wheeler. Yes. That is correct. 1398 Ms. Barragan. Have you ever gone to a community and been 1399 served brown water to drink? 1400 Mr. Wheeler. Brown water to drink? Yes, probably in parts 1401 of--no offense, sir, but probably parts of West Virginia over 1402 the years. 1403 Ms. Barragan. And have you drank that brown water? 1404 Mr. Wheeler. 1405 Ms. Barragan. Is there a reason why you haven't drank that 1406 brown water? 1407 Mr. Wheeler. I wasn't sure of the safety of it. As I said 1408 in my opening statement though, 92 percent of the water systems 1409 in the country today meet EPA standards every single day. 1410 Well, do you know that brown water in some Ms. Barragan. 1411 communities are deemed to be safe, yet it is still brown, yet 1412 children get--they are straight-out concerned about the brown 1413 water. They are afraid of the water. They don't want to drink 1414 the water, it tastes bad. Have you heard of these reports before? 1415 Mr. Wheeler. Not specifically. But when we hear those 1416 reports we work with the communities to make sure that the water 1417 is, in fact, safe.

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

Well, let me tell you--Ms. Barragan.

Mr. Wheeler. We work with states and local communities to test the water.

Ms. Barragan. I appreciate that.

1418

1419

1420

1421

1422

1423

1424

1425

1426

1427

1428

1429

1430

1431

1432

1433

1434

1435

1436

1437

1438

1439

1440

Mr. Wheeler. Everyone regardless of their ZIP Code deserves safe drinking water.

Ms. Barragan. I want to share with you what happened in my congressional district. In Compton, California, the water was coming out brown from the faucets. It was tested and my constituents were told that the water was okay to drink, that it was completely safe. And I guarantee you that nobody, none of the elected officials in my district wanted to drink that water.

And, Mr. Wheeler, if you were served that water you wouldn't want to drink it either. This is where there is a huge disparity in environmental justice. In black and brown communities in particular and low-income communities across the country are being told it is okay, that they have to drink brown water even though it tastes terrible and even though children are afraid of it, and even though when they bathe with this water they develop rash and they have other health impacts like an upset stomach. And it is completely unacceptable that anybody would have to drink brown water. And so I invite you to go to some of those communities to see the water. If you think it is safe like

inib is a preliminary, anearcea cranscript. The scatements 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.

it is tested, drink it. Show the community that if it is good enough for them it should be good enough for you as well. And I see this cut by \$300 million and it concerns me and this is exactly why we are not having infrastructure projects for safe drinking water and what I would call clean water for our constituents. And so, I would ask you to visit these communities and I would invite you to some of them.

I want to move on to another topic. My district also includes the Port of Los Angeles. Now it is one of the busiest shipping facilities in the country. Heavy-duty trains and trucks carry cargo back and forth between the port and major rail yards. Diesel exhaust from rail traffic is a significant source of air pollution including particulate matter. Diesel exhaust is linked to higher deaths and higher incidences of asthma, cancer, stroke, heart attack, and premature deaths.

My constituents have to breathe this polluted air. These are low-income communities of color that live, work, and go to school near the port and the rail corridors. They disproportionately bear the burden of this pollution. What are you doing to help these communities by reducing air pollution from locomotives and other rail facilities?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, we are working with the state of California. When I was in private practice I actually

link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 66 1464 represented the South Coast Air Quality District, so I am very 1465 familiar with the issues around the port. We are working through 1466 our Region 9 office out of San Francisco to help reduce the 1467 pollution of those areas. We have a number of grant programs 1468 that help areas like that. 1469 And we also, in addition to the locomotives issue we also 1470 have the heavy-duty diesel truck issue as well. And we announced 1471 this year that we are going to reduce NOx from the heavy-duty 1472 trucks even though it is not required by statute or by law. 1473 Ms. Barragan. I want to focus on rails, sir. I appreciate 1474 you wanting to tell me about the truck program, but could you 1475 maybe tell me on the rail program what you all are doing? Mr. Wheeler. 1476 I will have to get back to you, specifics on 1477 the rail program. I don't want to give you wrong data. 1478 Ms. Barragan. Well, will you commit to bringing EPA's 1479 regulatory power and ability to drive market incentives to bear 1480 to move the rail industry toward a zero emissions technologies? 1481 Mr. Wheeler. We are working with the rail industry and we 1482 are trying to reduce the pollution across the board. 1483 Ms. Barragan. So you won't commit. Okay, thank you. I 1484 yield back. 1485 The gentlelady yields back. The chair now Mr. Tonko. 1486

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A

recognizes the gentleman from the state of Texas, Representative

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

Flores, for 5 minutes, please.

Mr. Flores. Thank you, Chairman Tonko and Leader Shimkus, for today's meeting. Administrator Wheeler, thank you for being here.

I would like to comment before I get into my questions about a quote from Chairman Pallone a few minutes ago. It says that a budget is an expression of priorities. I would like to remind everyone in the audience today that the Democratic House majority has recently said that they don't intend to put forward a budget, so I think the American people are rightly curious about what the Democratic House priorities are.

Administrator Wheeler, in response to the design flaws of the RFS the way it is today, the statutory design flaws as well as the pending expiration of the RFS in 2022, Leader Shimkus and I put together a proposed piece of legislation that was based on input from the brightest minds and engineers not only in the vehicle space, but also in the renewable fuel space, refining community, those in the retail community for vehicle fuels. And it was done so that it proposed a high-octane standard so that we could get the most desirable level of efficiency and emissions in one solution. Do you have views on the effectiveness of that approach of having an integrated solution for fuels and vehicles in one piece of statutory legislation?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, as far as a nationwide octane standard, we don't believe we have the authority to create one absent congressional authorization.

Mr. Flores. That was actually my next question, so.

Mr. Wheeler. I am doing them in reverse.

Mr. Flores. Okay. So you are saying the EPA doesn't have the authority. What do you think about that type of solution in terms of having a statutory solution in order to address emissions and efficiency to combined vehicle design and fuel performance specifications?

Mr. Wheeler. I can't at this point give you specific administration approval, you know, acceptance or acquiescence on congressional legislation without going through the OMB In general terms, I do think we need to be creative in how we look at the next generation of the RFS post-2022, and I think everything should be on the table. And I think the program does need to be modernized with the way that we have seen the data develop over the last 10 years.

Mr. Flores. That is what Mr. Shimkus and I were Okay. attempting to do is to be creative and to think outside the box. But we did it with having the brightest minds and engineers working on this from all parts of the space including the environmental community.

1510

1511

1512

1513

1514

1515

1516

1517

1518

1519

1520

1521

1522

1523

1524

1525

1526

1527

1528

1529

1530

1531

I want to follow up on Mr. Shimkus' questions regarding vehicles and fuels. Some folks in Washington would like to see a heavy reliance on electrical vehicles in the future. I think that makes some sense. However, there are some issues that we need to be concerned about in doing that, particularly the environmental impact of lithium batteries. Is the EPA studying the impact of a much higher use of electric vehicles in terms of environmental impact of lithium batteries?

Mr. Wheeler. I am not aware of specifically the greater use of lithium batteries. We are not approaching the automotive industry as social engineering as I believe the previous administration did. The Obama CAFÉ standards would have required 30 percent electric vehicles in order to comply with these standards by 2025. We are looking at what the American public is buying and trying to set standards regardless of the type of automobile.

So we are not doing social engineering, but there are certainly issues, environmental issues around all choices including electric vehicles and lithium batteries. But every form of energy has environmental tradeoffs and oftentimes those are not recognized by proponents of one form of energy over another.

Mr. Flores. Well, I appreciate your comments. I would

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

encourage the EPA to keep an eye on that. As electric vehicles come into more common usage there is going to be an environmental impact from lithium batteries, so I would encourage you to keep that in mind.

I am going to run out of time before you get a chance to answer this question, so I am going to ask you if you would supplementally respond. In terms of the RVO reset that you are working on today, I would like to know if the EPA is looking into any sort of EV RINs, if they are looking at the impact of higher ethanol on RIN prices and gas prices, the impact on legacy vehicles, and the impact on storage facilities and retail pumps. So if you would supplementally respond that would be great.

Mr. Wheeler. I would be happy to submit that for the record.

Mr. Tonko. And the gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentlelady from the state of Colorado,
Representative DeGette, 5 minutes, please.

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

Administrator Wheeler, I just want to make one point with respect to the statement you made about the pollution in Colorado, the air pollution coming from Asia. And you are right, some of that seems to be coming from other places. But our former colleague and now Governor Jared Polis has announced that he is not going to seek an exemption for that because irrespective of

	link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the
	Committee's website as soon as it is available.
1579	the source, the fact is that the air pollution is still harming
1580	Coloradoans. And so we need to do everything we can, not just
1581	in Colorado but around the country. We need to help work with
1582	these other countries to minimize their sources, but we also need
1583	to work on it here because it makes our people sick no matter
1584	where it comes from.
1585	I want to follow up on some of the questions that my colleague
1586	was asking about environmental justice because I represent an
1587	urban area, as you know. Are you familiar with the EPA's EJ 2020
1588	Action Agenda which is on the EPA's website?
1589	Mr. Wheeler. Yes, I am.
1590	Ms. DeGette. And has the current administration adopted
1591	this Action Agenda?
1592	Mr. Wheeler. I would have to get back to you on the specifics
1593	of the answer.
1594	Ms. DeGette. You don't know whether you have adopted it?
1595	Mr. Wheeler. We elevated environmental justice to the
1596	Administrator's Office
1597	Ms. DeGette. Right.
1598	Mr. Wheelerto give greater emphasis on environmental
1599	justice. And to go back to a comment
1600	Ms. DeGette. But so the Action Agenda is on your website
1601	right now.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A

Committee's website as soon as it is available. 72 1602 Mr. Wheeler. Yes. I believe we are implementing all of it. 1603 1604 So if you would get back to me and let me know Ms. DeGette. 1605 if you support it. 1606 Mr. Wheeler. Absolutely. 1607 One of the things that the Action Agenda has Ms. DeGette. done is it asked the EPA to identify, quote, 100 of the most 1608 1609 overburdened communities where data indicate that facilities 1610 present a high likelihood of serious noncompliance issues 1611 impacting those communities and address serious violations, if 1612 found. Are you familiar with that provision? 1613 Mr. Wheeler. Not specifically that provision. That is why 1614 I would like to get back to you on those. Ms. DeGette. Do you know if the EPA has identified the 100 1615 1616 most overburdened communities? 1617 Mr. Wheeler. We are in the process of identifying 1618 communities around the country that are under the new economic 1619 development process where I think there is overlap between that 1620 list and the EJ list. 1621 Okay, so when do you think you will have that Ms. DeGette. 1622 done? 1623 Mr. Wheeler. I am not sure. I have to get back to you on 1624 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

Ms. DeGette. 1 month, 6 months, a year?

Mr. Wheeler. I would have to get back to you on that.

Well, I would appreciate if you would get back Ms. DeGette. to me, because you do have some communities in my district--Swansea, Elyria, and Globeville--that warrant specific attention and have for years, so this is of great urgency. Ιt sounds like the administration realizes this is of great urgency; is that right?

In my first week on the job as the Deputy Mr. Wheeler. Yes. Administrator I sat down with our Environmental Justice Office to talk to them about what they are working on.

Ms. DeGette. Well, that is wonderful, but we need to know which communities you are targeting.

Mr. Wheeler. Right.

1625

1626

1627

1628

1629

1630

1631

1632

1633

1634

1635

1636

1637

1638

1639

1640

1641

1642

1643

1644

1645

1646

1647

Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Now actually the fact that you keep saying you are going to get back to me leads me to another set of issues that I have. You probably know I am the chair of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of this committee, and one of the things that we are looking at in my committee is what the EPA is doing which could undermine actions against mercury, which is a toxic chemical emitted from coal-fired plants, which can lead to brain and nervous system damage in young children.

74 1648 So do you know how many electric generating facilities 1649 nationwide have installed pollution controls to limit mercury 1650 emissions under the current mercury rule? 1651 Mr. Wheeler. I don't have the number off the top of my head, 1652 but that rule has been fully implemented at this point. 1653 Ms. DeGette. So does the EPA--We are not rolling back anything on the mercury 1654 Mr. Wheeler. 1655 proposal. 1656 Okay. Does the EPA have the number? Ms. DeGette. 1657 Mr. Wheeler. Yes. I am sure we have the number, I don't 1658 have the number off the top of my head. 1659 Ms. DeGette. Can you get that number to me? Mr. Wheeler. 1660 But that regulation has been fully implemented 1661 and we are not rolling that back. 1662 Ms. DeGette. Okay. Okay, great. Do you have the number? 1663 Mr. Wheeler. I will get you the number. I don't have the 1664 number off the top of my head. 1665 Ms. DeGette. Thank you. And do you know how many 1666 facilities requested an extension for complying with federal 1667 mercury standards? 1668 Mr. Wheeler. And I believe all the facilities are currently 1669 in compliance with that standard. 1670 Ms. DeGette. Okay, so you are not aware of any that have

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.

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. 75 requested an extension? Mr. Wheeler. Off the top of my head, no, I am not. Now, so I and other members of the Ms. DeGette. Okay. committee sent your Agency several requests for documents specifically relating to the last two questions I asked you and we have not gotten any documents back and so I am glad that you are saying you are going to get me information today. you are saying you are willing to work with the committee. But we have not gotten these documents, so I just want to ask you, do I have a commitment from you that we are going to get responsive documents to the requests that we are making? Mr. Wheeler. Absolutely, Congresswoman. Ms. DeGette. Okay. We have received seven letters from this Mr. Wheeler. committee. We have provided substantive responses to six of those letters, and the seventh one should be with you all in the next few days. Well, we--Ms. DeGette. Okay. Mr. Wheeler. We have provided over 4,000 pages of documents to this committee already this year. Ms. DeGette. We have a whole bunch of pages of documents. Mr. Wheeler. Yes.

Ms. DeGette.

1671

1672

1673

1674

1675

1676

1677

1678

1679

1680

1681

1682

1683

1684

1685

1686

1687

1688

1689

1690

1691

1692

1693

A lot of them have a lot of redactions, sir.

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. 76 But they don't relate to the specific requests that we are making. Mr. Wheeler. Okay. So I would just ask if you can go back and Ms. DeGette. work with your staff to look at the specific requests that we are making and try to be responsive to those. Mr. Tonko. The gentlelady yields back. Ms. DeGette. Thank you very much. Mr. Tonko. And the chair now recognizes the gentlelady from California, Representative Matsui, for 5 minutes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you very

much, Administrator Wheeler, for coming here today.

I have several questions about the proposed rollback of fuel economy and air pollution standards for light-duty trucks and Now this proposed action is a perfect example of how EPA prioritizes boosting industries like oil industry over public health and safety. Last year, EPA announced a proposal to replace the Obama-era standards with a watered-down rule that would result in increased air pollution and less efficient cars on our roads, harming Americans' public health, American jobs, and the economy.

As you know, California is uniquely situated. It has some of the worst air quality in the country. It also has a unique authority under the Clean Air Act to regulate pollution from cars to try to meet federal clean air standards and improve public

1694

1695

1696

1697

1698

1699

1700

1701

1702

1703

1704

1705

1706

1707

1708

1709

1710

1711

1712

1713

1714

1715

1718

1719

1720

1721

1722

1723

1724

1725

1726

1727

1728

1729

1730

1731

1732

1733

1734

1735

1736

1737

1738

1739

Mr. Wheeler. That was our proposal that we released last summer was our CAFÉ proposal. And I was told--I met with Mary Nichols three times. She said that she would get us a counter

Committee's website as soon as it is available. 78 1740 within 1 to 2 weeks. We waited over 3 months--1741 Ms. Matsui. My understanding is that--1742 Mr. Wheeler. --before we got a response from California. 1743 Ms. Matsui. --the back-and-forth was really not a 1744 back-and-forth at all. I mean it was nothing that was different 1745 than was proposed earlier. 1746 Mr. Wheeler. That was our proposal, Congresswoman. 1747 Ms. Matsui. Well, it didn't go anywhere with us. 1748 Mr. Wheeler. We never got a real counterproposal from the 1749 state of California. 1750 Ms. Matsui. It was the same proposal that you kept moving 1751 forward and you weren't listening to our proposal. 1752 Administrator Wheeler, if you actually engaged in good faith 1753 negotiations with California automakers, with the automobile 1754 manufacturers, you could achieve a 50-state solution through a 1755 negotiated agreement. And the fact is even though you dispute 1756 this, you really never tried. I want to turn attention to the climate crisis. Last week 1757 1758 at the D.C. Auto Show when asked about the carbon impacts of your 1759 SAFE proposal, you said that your proposed rule as compared to 1760 the Obama standards gets about the same amount of CO2 benefit. 1761 In fact, your staff gave a presentation in September 2018 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 on the

the Clean Air Act Advisory Committee that explained that your

proposal would increase carbon pollution by 3.8 billion tons through 2050.

And the draft environmental impact statement for the proposed rule concluded that your recommended standards would increase carbon pollution by over seven billion tons throughout the end of the century. That is more than the total annual carbon pollution across the entire United States. Administrator Wheeler, either you are wrong or your staff and the draft environmental impact statement are wrong. What do you think it is?

Mr. Wheeler. I have been told by my staff that the CO2 reductions, the impact of the CO2 reductions are pretty similar to what the Obama administration would have received under their--would have gotten under their proposal.

Ms. Matsui. Well, that is not exactly what the--

Mr. Wheeler. Because the Obama proposal, I had a number of exemptions and off-ramps and the car automobile manufacturers aren't complying with the Obama standards today.

Ms. Matsui. Well.

Mr. Wheeler. Only three companies today are able to comply with this year's standards.

Ms. Matsui. Well, I still believe that this is not--it sounds awfully confusing to me.

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

80 1786 Mr. Wheeler. We have to take that into account too. 1787 Ms. Matsui. It sounds awfully confusing to me. 1788 Another issue that we would like to bring up is that there 1789 is no dispute that EPA used the OMEGA model in the rulemaking 1790 process to roll back fuel economy standards. EPA has refused 1791 to release the model. Will you commit to releasing the latest 1792 version of the model, yes or no? 1793 Mr. Wheeler. We did not use the OMEGA model for the 1794 proposal. We have been working with the OMEGA model. The last 1795 version of the OMEGA model that was finished in 2016 was released 1796 publicly, but we do not release models while we are in the middle 1797 of a rulemaking process. 1798 Ms. Matsui. Not at all. We would like a little more 1799 transparency here. 1800 Mr. Wheeler. Not during a rulemaking process. 1801 Ms. Matsui. Okay. Now you may pretend that climate change 1802 is not an imminent threat, but Americans across this country are 1803 reeling from natural disasters that climate change is 1804 exacerbating and it is only getting worse. We urgently need to 1805 reduce carbon pollution not recklessly boost it, and with that 1806 I yield back. 1807 Mr. Tonko. The gentlelady yields back. The chair now 1808 recognizes the gentleman from California, Representative

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.

1809 McNerney, for 5 minutes, please.

1810

1811

1812

1813

1814

1815

1816

1817

1818

1819

1820

1821

1822

1823

1824

1825

1826

1827

1828

1829

1830

1831

Mr. McNerney. I thank the chairman and I thank you, Mr. Administrator, for testifying this morning.

Mr. Wheeler. Thank you.

Mr. McNerney. My district, California's 9th, is located at the northern end of the San Joaquin Valley and it is home to one of the nation's worst air quality which routinely fails to meet the federal standards for ozone and particulate pollution. That is why I was disheartened but not surprised by the budget request. Part of your Agency's mission is to protect the quality, the air quality, yet your fiscal year 2020 budget proposes a 46 percent cut in funding for that purpose. Notably, the proposed cuts and categorical grants include a 35 percent cut in funding for air and radiation primarily to support state, local, and tribal air quality management programs.

So how can the EPA tout principles of cooperative federalism and simultaneously undermine these principles by not providing nearly enough resources for states to conduct their own air quality programs?

Mr. Wheeler. We believe the resources we have requested through the budget will allow us to return the Agency to its core mission of protecting public health and the environment and we have a number of different tools where we can help the states

and local governments meet the standards.

Mr. McNerney. I think you will find there is pretty universal disagreement with that assessment, Administrator.

PFAS are also of pressing concern in my district and nationwide. I had good hopes for your PFAS Action Plan, but now we see that it fails to address these exposures and the concerns of the American public. The plan does not deliver drinking water standards, Superfund cleanup requirements, waste limits, water discharge limits, air emission limits, or even report on releases. We need real action to address PFAS in our drinking water, our soil, and our air.

I want to focus though on air releases because I don't think they have gotten the attention they need. I was pleased when David Ross, your assistant administrator for the Office of Water, recently told Congress that the Agency was investing in stack emissions research related to PFAS, but I don't see that or other key emission testing research in your budget. Will you commit, Mr. Wheeler, to fully funding the Office of Research and Development air emissions testing and methods for development of PFAS, will you make that commitment?

Mr. Wheeler. We have not cut the research for PFAS/PFOA.

We have a lot of research going on in a number of our labs around the country. It is a high priority and we are moving forward

with a lot of research. We are looking at both identifying the chemicals, trying to identify the human consequences from the different versions of the PFAS/PFOA. There are several thousand different chemicals in this family of chemicals and we are looking at the different clean-up technologies. So we are doing groundbreaking research by our EPA career employees at a number of our facilities in looking at the entire lifecycle of the PFAS/PFOA.

Mr. McNerney. Okay, that sounds good. But evidence is coming in showing that air emissions of PFAS end up in our water, so we can't ignore this pollution source either. Emerging contaminants such as PFAS demand more investment in science, not the kind of cuts that we are seeing in your proposed budget.

Linda Birnbaum, the director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, recently testified that the Institute's research on toxicity of PFAS chemicals, it is essential that EPA make use of this research in doing what it does to address PFAS. Will you commit to using the research of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences has done on PFAS chemicals and ensuring that the regulatory actions you take on PFAS are consistent to address the hazards that the Agency has identified?

Mr. Wheeler. Absolutely. We are working with all of our

1878 federal partners on this. And as I said earlier, this is the 1879 most comprehensive multimedia action plan this Agency has ever 1880 developed for an emerging chemical of concern like this. 1881 Mr. McNerney. But when you use words like "ever,'' that 1882 is ever developed--Mr. Wheeler. 49 years. 1883 1884 Mr. McNerney. --and you propose huge cuts, 35-40 percent 1885 cuts, how can that be consistent? 1886 Mr. Wheeler. We have not cut our research on PFAS/PFOA and 1887 we are moving forward on a number of regulatory fronts, plus we 1888 are already enforcing our 70 parts per trillion standard at eight 1889 different sites around the country and we have assisted states 1890 in 20, over two dozen enforcement actions around the country as 1891 So we are moving forward to clean it up where we find it. 1892 We are using groundbreaking GIS modeling to determine where the 1893 problems are. 1894 Mr. McNerney. Well, I mean, we will have to see if that 1895 is consistent with what your testimony says. 1896 Mr. Wheeler. Absolutely. 1897 Mr. McNerney. Pat Breysse, the director of the Agency for 1898 Toxic Substance Disease Registry, also recently testified of the 1899 important work his Agency is doing to identify hazards from PFAS. 1900 Will you commit to ensuring that all regulatory actions you take

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.

on PFAS are sufficient to address the hazards that that Agency has identified?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes. Their number is very different than ours. But yes, we are working closely with ATSDR.

Mr. McNerney. All right, I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. The chair recognizes the gentlelady from Michigan, Representative Dingell, for 5 minutes, please.

Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to find peace, Mr. Wheeler. The issue of fuel economy standards is one that is very complex and I know you are well-versed in its history and its intricacies just like I am. But I am at a loss and I am not trying to be hostile. I care about the auto industry, it is still the backbone of the American economy and I am at a loss when it comes to reaching a consensus between everyone.

I know there was a meeting in the Oval Office. I know the President asked EPA and NHTSA to work with all the stakeholders and try to come up with one standard. And it matters. This is an industry that is far more fragile, you probably do understand how fragile it is, than many people realize. And even as we were having a discussion, I keep saying to my colleagues, here, when those Obama standards were set there was an assumption that there

would be 30 percent electric vehicles.

And we have a lot of problems and it doesn't help when the President takes shots at EVs, EVs need to be part of that equation. And we are competing in a global marketplace where you have countries, and I think we want to be competitive in the global marketplace, China is telling everybody they have to go with those EVs. And I called Mary Nichols myself right before she left, I think she is just about back, and said, "Am I going on a Don Quixote mission or are you willing to go to the table and sit down?''

Everybody needs this. Everybody wants it, the environmentalists, the autos. You say you are working. Mary is willing to go back to the table. Can we go to the table and get one national standard that will keep a strong competitive auto industry?

Mr. Wheeler. I would love to have a one standard, 50-state solution to this. You know, when Mary Nichols gave us her counterproposal after 3 months, she said at the time that, you know, although she was the director of the California Resources Board that the board members had not signed off on it. She said that the incoming governor had not signed off on it. The outgoing governor had not signed off on it. And the attorney general who threatened to sue us at the time had not signed off on it, and

8	7

he has already sued us.

There are a lot of politics going on in California over this issue. I would love to have a 50-state solution on this.

Mrs. Dingell. So I understand those politics. But I also understand, you know, I am not old but I am seasoned and I know how tough these issues are, and if we can get everybody back at that table, we need to do it. This industry cannot afford to have two separate standards. We want to stay at the forefront of innovation and technology. That means money needs to be going into R&D, not a court battle that is going to go forever that is going to give this industry uncertainty.

So could I get a commitment from you? Can we try to go back to that table? Mary should be back right about now. Can we do that?

Mr. Wheeler. We are always open to hearing from California on this, but to be frank they did not come forward with a credible offer last fall. We were asking them for weeks, "What is it that you want?'' And I think it is important to note that when we are talking about the California waiver we are not talking about the health-based standards. We are only talking about the energy efficiency standard.

Mrs. Dingell. Well, you know, I mean the environmental advocates and the auto industry are okay with the continuation

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 the California waiver. Who do you think we are helping by taking it away?

Mr. Wheeler. If we end up having two different standards for the entire country, it is going to create problems across the board.

Mrs. Dingell. Chaos.

1970

1971

1972

1973

1974

1975

1976

1977

1978

1979

1980

1981

1982

1983

1984

1985

1986

1987

1988

1989

1990

1991

1992

Mr. Wheeler. Chaos, it will. In our proposal California only looked at energy efficiency. Our proposal looks at energy efficiency as well as public safety and under our proposal we estimate 15,000 lives saved. California is only looking at this with one goal in mind and that is energy efficiency and CO2. We are looking at it much broader than that including public safety and using real data as far as what American consumers are purchasing today.

Mrs. Dingell. So I want to continue this and I am committed because this industry and this economy and this country depends on this.

So having said that, I need to ask you one other question because I have 49 seconds left. We have had an EPA lab that started out in 1920 as part of the military, then it went to the Public Health Department, and then it has been yours since EPA was founded. It is on Grosse Ile. It is critical for many things in Michigan, the Great Lakes. A couple of years ago you

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. 89 threatened to close the Ann Arbor lab, the Administrator kept that open and environmentalists, auto industry, everybody said that was critical. Can you take another look at not closing this Grosse Ile EPA Office, which I have people in my office every day telling me how critical it is to the Great Lakes, emergency cleanups, I know you were ready for that question. Mr. Wheeler. I would certainly take another look at it, but we are trying to consolidate. The Ann Arbor facility is very I have been to Ann Arbor twice now to visit that facility. It is very important. Mrs. Dingell. It is important. Mr. Wheeler. But we have facilities in almost every state, I think 40 states, and we need to be reducing our footprint. Congress, if the appropriations isn't directed--Mr. Tonko. We need to move on to the next--Mr. Wheeler. And we are trying to consolidate. Mrs. Dingell. Can we keep talking after this? Thank you. Mr. Tonko. Okay, thank you. The gentlelady yields back. We now recognize the gentleman from California, Dr. Ruiz, for 5 minutes, please. Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Administrator Wheeler, for being here I want to talk to you about a serious threat to the

1993

1994

1995

1996

1997

1998

1999

2000

2001

2002

2003

2004

2005

2006

2007

2008

2009

2010

2011

2012

2013

2014

public's health that affects potentially millions of Southern Californians from Riverside County all the way to L.A. County and Imperial County. The Salton Sea is California's largest inland body of water and it is shrinking. The exposed playa have very fine dust, particulate matter that is contaminated with agricultural runoff and other toxins that if they get into the air it can easily penetrate the lung-blood barrier. I am a doctor so I can follow the path.

And such exposure is associated with premature death as well as asthma attacks, chronic bronchitis, decreased lung function, and respiratory disease. All of this leads to increased hospitalization, emergency room trips and doctor visits. In fact, the surrounding community already had the highest pediatric asthma hospitalization rate in the entire state of California. So this pollution, in fact, disproportionately affects the most vulnerable among us, infants, children, seniors, and low-income families. So fine particle pollution is harmful to human health even at very low concentrations.

And it makes sense. We don't want chemically contaminated dust or particles or any dust in our blood. The scientific consensus recognized by hundreds of peer review articles and by EPA administrators during both Republican and Democratic administration says that fine particle pollution is a so-called

Committee's website as soon as it is available. 91 2039 non-threshold pollutant. That means that any level of fine 2040 particle pollution exposure can cause harm. 2041 At our December 2017 hearing, then Administrator Pruitt 2042 agreed that fine particle pollution was a no-threshold pollutant. 2043 Administrator Wheeler, do you agree that fine particle pollution 2044 is a non-threshold pollutant? 2045 I believe most of the science directs us that Mr. Wheeler. 2046 way, yes--2047 So yes, good. Will the EPA officially Mr. Ruiz. 2048 acknowledge that the presence of fine particulate matter at any 2049 threshold is a public health hazard? 2050 Mr. Wheeler. We are currently in the middle of our NAAQS review for PM. 2051 It is scheduled to be completed by the end of 2052 2020. CASAC is currently reviewing the PM science that the Agency 2053 supplied and we expect to have a report back from CASAC, so I would like to defer until I--2054 2055 Well, you just said that any amount of particle 2056 matter and dust especially those with chemicals that gets into 2057 our blood is harmful to our health. 2058 I believe there is still science as far as Mr. Wheeler. 2059 what is the composition of the particles, whether or not certain 2060 compositions have a better--2061 Well, I will tell you that composition of any Mr. Ruiz.

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. 92 2062 particle that is small enough to enter the alveolar blood barrier 2063 is harmful to your health. There is no foreign body that is in 2064 our blood that is helpful to our human health. 2065 Mr. Wheeler. I will defer to you on the medicine, but it 2066 is my understanding that --2067 So, listen, when you consider this, no--Mr. Ruiz. Mr. Wheeler. --composition of the PM is important. 2068 2069 Mr. Ruiz. Yeah. Know that any foreign body in your blood 2070 regardless of the composition--2071 Mr. Wheeler. I understand that, but some is worse than 2072 others. 2073 Mr. Ruiz. --if it can get into your blood system it is bad 2074 for your health. You know that. 2075 Mr. Wheeler. Yes. 2076 Mr. Ruiz. The Clean Power Plan rule includes a policy that 2077 particulate matter is a non-threshold pollutant, yet the EPA is 2078 in the process of repealing that rule. So consider that rule 2079 when, and that part of that rule when you look at this science 2080 as well. So by--2081 Mr. Wheeler. The Supreme Court stayed that rule. 2082 Good. Excellent. By repealing the Clean Power 2083 Plan, the EPA could potentially for the first time say that any 2084 level is safe, so I am glad that the Supreme Court in fact agrees

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

with us.

So let me move on to another issue. And part of the reason that fine particulate matter from the Salton Sea lake bed is so dangerous is because the sea is partially fed by agricultural runoff and from sources like the New River, one of the dirtiest, most polluted rivers in the country. It contains toxins, wastes and parts from animal products, and chemical runoff from companies and carcinogens like DDT.

My office was recently contacted by constituents who work as CBP officers stationed at Riverside, Imperial County, who have suffered from respiratory illnesses, skin rashes, symptomatic exposure of toxins and harmful chemicals. Some have been diagnosed with chemicals. Many came concerned about their future, their health. A childhood friend of mine, Hector Acosta, also concerned about what would happen with him. Will he come down with cancer as well?

They recently wrote a letter requesting your support for an epidemiological study. Will you commit to working with CBP to study the potential hazards of exposure to the New River, including conducting an epidemiological study to ensure that our public safety officers and their families are protected?

Mr. Wheeler. We will have to look into that. I am not sure if that is in EPA or in ATSDR, but we will certainly help you

	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.
2108	with
2109	Mr. Ruiz. Great, so will you provide me an answer by June
2110	1st?
2111	Mr. Wheeler. Yes.
2112	Mr. Ruiz. Great. And before I close, I want to submit this
2113	GAO study that I recently asked GAO to do regarding EPA's
2114	meaningful consultation with tribes regarding Superfund
2115	consultation and management. They gave you a set of
2116	recommendations. I would like you to take a look at them and
2117	see if you can respond to those recommendations. I would like
2118	to submit this for the record.
2119	Mr. Tonko. Without objection.
2120	[The information follows:]
2121	

| This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within

Mr. Tonko. Okay, we will--thank you. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the vice chair of the full committee, the Representative from New York, Representative Yvette Clarke.

Ms. Clarke. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, and Administrator Wheeler.

I have some very serious concerns about the EPA's being run by former lobbyists setting the rules for former clients. Your calendars reveal that since joining the Agency you have frequently met with companies you have once represented. I want to be clear, I am concerned about the ethical and possible conflicts of interest because the mission of the EPA is so important to the health and safety of my constituents and the public nationwide.

EPA plays an essential role in safeguarding us and the Agency should not be for sale. Let me focus on just one example, the EPA's Risk Management Planning Program, the so-called or also called RPM, excuse me, RMP. The RMP program offers important protections for workers, first responders, and the communities around high-risk chemical facilities. Mr. Wheeler, it is my understanding that you are pursuing rulemaking to weaken the RMP program at the urging of industry. But so long as the requirements are on the books, will you commit to aggressively enforcing them?

Mr. Wheeler. First of all, Congresswoman, yes, absolutely. But we are not moving to weaken the RMP program at all and I don't know what you are referring to in meeting with former clients. I have not met with any of my former clients under my recusal statements and I have followed the career advice of the EPA ethics officials and I am really not sure what you are referring to on that.

Ms. Clarke. Well, let me--I am not going to get into a back-and-forth. That is something we can discuss. I have a short amount of time.

Mr. Wheeler. But that goes to my personal integrity so I want to make sure.

Ms. Clarke. I got you. We will follow up with you on that.

More than 9.1 million people live in the vulnerability zones
of RMP facilities in my home state of New York, meaning more than
half of the state's population is at risk from accidents of those
facilities. That is why the Attorney General of New York State
recently led a coalition of 12 state attorney generals opposing
EPA's proposed rollback of RMP protections.

Your proposed rulemaking would diminish requirements for prevention, consideration of safer alternatives, third-party audits, transparency, coordination with first responders, and more. These common-sense requirements should not be removed.

Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2169 In the past month, the Houston area has seen two large fires 2170 at RMP facilities, the ITC Deer Park facility and the KMCO facility 2171 in Crosby. Both fires created significant disruptions with 2172 shelter-in-place requirements and large plumes of black, toxic 2173 smoke. 2174 Mr. Wheeler, are you aware that the Deer Park facility was 2175 cited for violations of the RMP program in 2015 and some of those 2176 violations stemmed from a lack of proper prevention? 2177 Mr. Wheeler. Yes. And we have been working with the 2178 community involved. I do want to point out on the RMP program, 2179 last year we had the largest-ever settlement in the history of 2180 enforcing of the RMP program, \$150 million settlement. 2181 Ms. Clarke. Well, I think we should be doing more to prevent 2182 disasters, right. That is what that whole protocol is about. 2183 Mr. Wheeler, will you commit to strengthening the prevention requirements of the RMP program rather than weakening them? 2184 2185 Mr. Wheeler. I don't believe we are weakening them, 2186 Congresswoman. 2187 So you don't commit to strengthening them? Ms. Clarke. 2188 Mr. Wheeler. We are enforcing them more vigorously--2189 Ms. Clarke. You are enforcing them. I am asking whether 2190 you would strengthen them. 2191 Mr. Wheeler. We are in the middle of a rulemaking process

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

to reconsider certain provisions of the RMP--

Ms. Clarke. All right. Let me go on to my next question because clearly you are not interested in strengthening them.

Are you aware that the facility also has extensive violations of the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act? That is the Deer Park facility.

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, I am aware of that.

Ms. Clarke. Okay. I don't think a facility with that record of compliance should be trusted to protect surrounding communities. Will you commit to finalizing an RMP rule that preserves the third-party audit requirements?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes.

Ms. Clarke. Thank you. I just think weakening a program that protects 9.1 million people in New York because the regulated industry asks you to is not your job. As an Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, industry may have been there for you before, but you work for the people now and you should be looking out for all of us. I hope that you will reconsider the strengthening of the protections of the RMP program.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. Tonko. The gentlelady yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from the state of Georgia, Mr. Carter, for 5 minutes, please.

Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2215

2216

2217

2218

2219

2220

2221

2222

2223

2224

2225

2226

2227

2228

2229

2230

2231

2232

2233

2234

2235

2236

2237

Mr. Wheeler, thank you for being here. It is good to see We appreciate you taking time to come and talk to us. you. wanted to talk very quickly about the district I represent is the 1st congressional district of Georgia. And we have two major seaports, as you know, the Port of Savannah, the number two container port on the Eastern Seaboard, the Port of Brunswick which is the number two roll-on/roll-off port in the country. Both of these are extremely important, extremely important to the economic well-being of the Southeast United States. of Savannah and Brunswick are two of the major economic engines of the Southeast and it is very important that we keep those going.

One of the things that I have spoken to you about in the past has been the bar pilots that are so very important in escorting the ships in and out of the harbor and the requirement now that they utilize the Tier 4 engines. Now we have had EPA personnel go out to the manufacturers that make the boats that they are required, that harbor pilots are required to have, and meet with them and they have said, "Look, we cannot meet these requirements,'' and EPA has agreed. And it is my understanding that through the rulemaking process that you are going to correct this.

Can you tell me where we are at right now in the rulemaking

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.

2238 process dealing with the Tier 4 engines?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, we have submitted the rule to OMB and that should be going out for public comment shortly.

Mr. Carter. Can you give me an idea about how long the OMB process may take, because obviously this is very urgent on our part.

Mr. Wheeler. I am not sure if it is a 30- or 60-day review by OMB, but I will check into that and get back to you, sir.

Mr. Carter. Okay. Well, I appreciate that. This is a step in the right direction, changing the rules, but time is of the essence. I just hope that everyone understands that because it just simply cannot be done. And the Tier 4 engines, I might add, is impacting other areas. We have a strong ag presence in our district as well, and now the farmers are telling us that they actually cannot get the Tier 4 engines onto the tractors and use the type of wheels that they need to use in their process. So I hope that this will be something you will be looking at as well.

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir.

Mr. Carter. Thank you. If we could kind of shift gears now about the Superfund sites. In my district and particularly in one area, we have a county, Glynn County, that has four Superfund sites and it is of major concern. In fact, last year you will remember that I hand-delivered a letter to you about

	the final, official transcript will be posted on the ee's website as soon as it is available.
	101
one of	them that the Department of Justice and EPA have ruled
on, the	e Terry Creek site in Brunswick, Georgia. It is the
Hercule	es site that the Hercules plant used to be on that. And
last Se	eptember I gave you a letter as I say, asking you to work
togethe	er with the Department of Justice to address some of the
concer	ns that the local community had about the consent decree
and the	e remediation plans.
Do	you know or can you tell me what actions have been taker
n the	consent decree to alleviate some of the concerns that the
commun	ty leaders have?
Ма	. Wheeler. I believe their concerns have been addressed.
And I	am also told that that consent decree should be finalized
n the	next month or so, but I will go back and make sure that
cheir d	concerns have been addressed.
М	c. Carter. Do you work with the Department of Justice or
this?	Whose jurisdiction, who is going to be making the final
decisio	on?
Мэ	r. Wheeler. It is a collaborative process between EPA and
the Der	partment of Justice on working on the consent decrees for
	and sites.

of these sites and in Brunswick and that area, one of them has had this designation of construction complete and that

Okay.

I am very concerned also because two

This	is	a pi	relimina	ry,	uned	ited	l tr	ans	cript.	The	sta	teme	ents	with	in
may k	oe i	naco	curate,	inco	mplet	ce,	or	mis	attrib	uted	to	the	spea	aker.	Α
link	to	the	final,	offi	cial	tra	nsc	rip	t will	be r	post	ed c	on th	ne	
Commi	Ltte	e's	website	as	soon	as	it	is	availa	ble.					

designation has been on there for 20 years. Is that correct?

Am I wrong on that?

Mr. Wheeler. It might be. Part of my frustration and why we are putting such an emphasis on getting these Superfund sites cleaned up is because when they are on a national priority list for decades that means it is not a priority. As I mentioned in my opening statement, we delisted 22 sites last year, the most since 2005. We have made it a priority at the Agency to move these sites, to get them cleaned up and get them cleaned up quickly. Again, if something is on the national priority list for decades, then by definition it is not a priority.

Mr. Carter. This is, you know, of major concern to this community. I have met with the community leaders and, you know, they have big plans for some of these areas, but they can't. For instance, they are looking to build a school. We can't build a school on a site like this unless we know it has been remediated, unless we know it is safe. I mean that is just irresponsible.

So I hope that I can get your commitment that you will pay particular attention to this. I recognize that it would be unfair to ask you to speak on this specific site that you are probably not prepared for that, but at the same time, I hope that you will take that back and perhaps have your staff get in touch with me.

Mr. Wheeler. Happy to do that, sir. Thank you.

This is	; a ;	prelimina:	ry, unedi	ited to	ranscript.	The st	atements	within
may be	ina	ccurate,	incomplet	ce, or	misattrib	uted to	the spe	aker. A
link to	th:	e final,	official	trans	cript will	be pos	ted on t	he
Committ	ee'	s website	as soon	as it	is availa	ble.		

Mr. Carter. Okay. Finally, I want to talk about biobutanol. That is something that is very important to us on the Coast because as you know the impact that that particular fuel has on marine engines is less severe than some of the other fuels that are out there. And I know that the Agency has been grappling with proposal on year-around E15, but what consumer protections can we expect you to see for boaters and other small engine operators to prevent misfueling and educate them on alternatives like biobutanol?

Mr. Wheeler. Well, we do work with the gasoline stations, the oil companies to make sure that it is properly labeled and to try to make sure through education efforts, and to make sure that when you have boats that it is labeled correctly and that people are not putting the wrong fuel into their vehicles or boats.

Mr. Carter. Okay. All right, I have got just about a minute left. Just to recap, Mr. Wheeler, Tier 4 engines, Superfund sites, biobutanol, okay. And I am going to yield the remainder of my time to Ranking Member Shimkus.

Mr. Shimkus. I thank my colleague. And I will just be brief. I was going to raise a point of order, but since I am just going to get this last minute, Mr. Chairman, and I know there is the art of legal language. I just want us to be careful to use that to make accusations that we have no proven connection

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.

to, no stories, no legal actions. Administrator Wheeler has served 22 of his 30 years in the public service, in the EPA Chemical Office for 5 years, serving in the EPW and now it is on the Senate side so we could attack you for that. But 15 years, and then in private practice for 8 and then here for 2 years. So I would caution my colleagues and I will be the first when there is real things to point to it is a fair game, but innuendos I would be careful of. And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tonko. You are welcome.

Let's now move to the gentleman from Maryland,
Representative Sarbanes. You have 5 minutes, please.

Mr. Sarbanes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks for the opportunity to waive on to the committee today.

Administrator Wheeler, I wanted to talk about the Chesapeake Bay. You won't be surprised to hear that, being a Representative from Maryland and having been a champion of the Bay, really, since I was a little kid crabbing on the Nanticoke River on the Eastern Shore, but having that opportunity obviously since I came to Congress. And I am extremely distressed at this continued run that the administration is taking at the funding for the Chesapeake Bay in many different respects. I will focus primarily today on the Chesapeake Bay Program. As you know, the President in his budget 2 years ago proposed to completely

This is	; a ;	prelimina:	ry, unedi	ited to	ranscript.	The st	atements	within
may be	ina	ccurate,	incomplet	ce, or	misattrib	uted to	the spe	aker. A
link to	th:	e final,	official	trans	cript will	be pos	ted on t	he
Committ	ee'	s website	as soon	as it	is availa	ble.		

zero-out funding for the Chesapeake Bay Program. Last year, he proposed a 90 percent cut to the funding for the Chesapeake Bay Program at EPA and has done the same thing with the budget proposal this year. And obviously that would have a huge impact on our restoration efforts for the Chesapeake Bay. There are nearly 50 Members of Congress here whose districts intersect with the Chesapeake Bay watershed. There are 17 million residents of the Bay watershed, 64,000 square miles within the watershed. And the resource that that represents, not just as a national and a natural treasure, but in terms of the economic engine that it represents for Maryland and for the region, really cannot be overstated.

So the proposal to come again with this kind of cut, and I will as you know over the last 2 years in response to that there has been a bipartisan pushback on the part of Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, who understand how valuable the program is to all of the states involved, but really to our country overall.

So I wanted to ask you to comment on these cuts. I know that there were similar proposed draconian cuts made with respect to funding of the Great Lakes restoration efforts. And since the budget has come down, you and the President have now kind of reversed the position on the Great Lakes and are indicating

that the funding will be restored as you are interested in having Congress restore that funding, but we haven't had the same kind of declaration or commitment made with respect to the Chesapeake Bay.

So I would ask you to comment on that, please.

Mr. Wheeler. Certainly, Congressman. And first of all, I live in a Chesapeake Resource Protection Area. I am fully committed to the Bay and making sure that the health of the Bay continues to improve. The Geographic Program areas is just one area of funding that we use to help restore the Chesapeake Bay. We have other Clean Water Act programs as well, the source water protection programs authorized under the Safe Drinking Water Act to protect the watershed and including the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program, water quality trading and also our work involving the harmful algae blooms.

Also last month, I signed a WIFIA loan for the City of Baltimore for \$202 million that will go a long ways to helping to clean up the Bay. So we have a number of different programs aside from the geographic specific programs that we can use and we do use to not only help the Chesapeake Bay, but the Great Lakes, Puget Sound, a number of watersheds all around the country. We are not limited to our programs to the geographic programs. We have a lot of other tools at our disposal.

This is	; a ;	prelimina:	ry, unedi	ited to	ranscript.	The st	atements	within
may be	ina	ccurate,	incomplet	ce, or	misattrib	uted to	the spe	aker. A
link to	th:	e final,	official	trans	cript will	be pos	ted on t	he
Committ	ee'	s website	as soon	as it	is availa	ble.		

Mr. Sarbanes. Well, I certainly appreciate you having those other tools and maintaining commitment to them is really important. But the Bay program that the EPA funds and supports is really critical because it is a leveraging program and the amount of expertise that has been assembled in the program with respect to restoring the Chesapeake is tremendous over the last few years. You are going to, I think, encounter the same kind of response you saw from Congress over the last couple of years with respect to that proposed cut.

And I would just encourage you to do the kind of reevaluation that we have seen with respect to the Great Lakes restoration efforts as you are looking at the Chesapeake Bay, because I would think that the administration would want to be on the correct side of this issue in terms of maintaining a critical momentum with respect to the restoration that has happened and largely because of that leveraging resource that has been represented by the Chesapeake Bay Program.

So we urge you, we beseech you to take a position of restoring that funding. You can rest assured that that is the position that we are going to assemble here in Congress on a bipartisan basis. And with that, I yield back my time.

Mr. Wheeler. We will utilize all the funds that Congress gives us for the Bay.

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.

	100
2422	Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back. The chair now
2423	recognizes the gentleman from Iowa. Representative, you have
2424	5 minutes, please.
2425	Mr. Loebsack. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for
2426	allowing me to waive on to this subcommittee. And I admire the
2427	clairvoyance of my friend, Mr. Shimkus. I am indeed going to
2428	ask you about the Renewable Fuel Standard, Mr. Wheeler. I am
2429	going to get right to my questions.
2430	Mr. Wheeler, have the 39 small refinery waiver requests that
2431	were at DOE last week been sent to you folks at EPA yet?
2432	Mr. Wheeler. I don't believe the formal waiver requests
2433	have been sent. We have received a list from the Department of
2434	Energy.
2435	Mr. Loebsack. Do you expect to grant any or all of these
2436	waivers going forward?
2437	Mr. Wheeler. We will certainly take the advice of
2438	Department of Energy into account. In the past we have taken
2439	their advice in all but one instance.
2440	Mr. Loebsack. Now looking forward, do you expect that you
2441	will have to grant any small refinery waivers for 2019, or what
2442	about 2020?

and whether or not the small refineries have a hardship based

Mr. Wheeler. Well, it would depend on the data each year

2443

This	is	a pi	relimina	ry,	uned:	ited	l tr	ans	cript.	The	sta	teme	ents	with	in
may k	oe i	naco	curate,	inco	mplet	ce,	or	mis	attrib	uted	to	the	spea	aker.	Α
link	to	the	final,	offi	cial	tra	nsc	rip	t will	be r	post	ed c	on th	ne	
Commi	Ltte	e's	website	as	soon	as	it	is	availa	ble.					

upon the information in the data. You know, part of that is the price of RIN.

Mr. Loebsack. And this has been hugely controversial as you know in corn country because of the waivers. What is clear to me, unfortunately, is that this particular EPA under your predecessor, hopefully that won't be the case under you, is committed to granting small refinery waivers, and every year since 2013 we have seen these waivers. But the explosion the last few years has been prolific. And it appears to the American people that if a refinery applies for a waiver, it basically is guaranteed to get one, unfortunately.

Just to be perfectly clear, Mr. Administrator, when you and your predecessor waive over 2.6 billion gallons of biofuels and counting, you are harming the biofuels industry, an industry that as you know is an economic driver in districts like mine in Iowa and throughout the Midwest, throughout corn country, generally. The EPA has failed to do anything to reallocate the demand destruction.

Your Agency has expressly refused to take comments on a possible reallocation on the 2019-2020 RVO. You have refused to acknowledge the likelihood of waivers and rulemaking when it is clear the refiners will continue to submit applications and you all will keep granting them especially under this

may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. It link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the
Committee's website as soon as it is available.
administration, one that has prolifically, I have to say, handed
out over 54 waivers to the oil industry so far.
What is the Agency doing, if anything, to restore the 2.
billion gallons of lost biofuel demand?
Mr. Wheeler. We are looking into that. But I would poin
out that when the Agency was not issuing the waivers, we were
sued three times and we lost all three cases.
So we
Mr. Loebsack. Well, is there any statutory prohibition of
reallocating the waive volumes?
Mr. Wheeler. After we have set the RVOs for a year we can'
go back and modify the RVO numbers, and the waiver requests com-
in after the RVO numbers are set.
Mr. Loebsack. Would it be easier to reallocate the gallon
if you were able to determine the so-called hardship earlier is
the compliance year? Do you have the ability to do that?
Mr. Wheeler. Yes, we would have the ability to do that,
but again we don't receive the request for the waivers until after
the RVOs are set.
Mr. Loebsack. If you got them done earlier in the year,
could you then potentially use the RVO to account for these waivers
even as an estimate?

Mr. Wheeler. It is not a factor of us getting them done

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.

earlier because we don't receive them from the small refineries.

Mr. Loebsack. And I have just one final question, Mr. Wheeler, and it is a yes or no question. Do you acknowledge that when ethanol and biodiesel plants suffer when you grant small refinery exemptions that the farmers who grow the corn and the soybeans for ethanol and biodiesel are harmed as well?

Mr. Wheeler. Yes, they are. But that is why we are also moving forward to grant the E15 year-round to provide greater markets for the ethanol.

Mr. Loebsack. I certainly hope so too, and do appreciate that.

Mr. Wheeler. We hope to have that finished in time for the summer driving season.

Mr. Loebsack. And we are looking forward to that because I think the best way to deal with that issue is through regulation obviously.

Mr. Chairman, this EPA I believe has been egregiously undermining the biofuels industry and hurting farmers across the country. This is what I hear from farmers every time I talk to them, quite honestly. If these actions continue, they will do reparable harm to the economy in my state and other states especially in corn and soybean country. I am going to continue to exert my oversight role as I have today, and certainly I hope

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 this administration looks more favorably on our corn growers, our soybean growers, and much less favorably on big oil going forward.

So thank you, and I do yield back. Thank you.

Mr. Tonko. Representative Loebsack yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Arizona, Representative O'Halleran, for 5 minutes, please.

Mr. O'Halleran. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for allowing me to waiver in.

I want to discuss, Mr. Wheeler, my concerns about the pace of cleanup of the over 520 uranium mine sites on the Navajo Nation reservation and the available EPA resources to resolve this crisis. This crisis was created by the federal government. The Navajo Nation had nothing to do with this process. You will see a map on the screen identifying the sites and most of them are nearby waterways or washes.

While these mines are no longer operating, the lingering high levels of radiation as admitted to by the EPA, are still causing a devastating effect to the health of Navajo people in my district. Remediation of these sites to reduce toxic exposures and ensure access to safe drinking water is moving too slowly.

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.

2537 [Slide.]

Mr. O'Halleran. In fact, the monitoring systems are not even in place right now that is a USGS issue, in part, because too few resources such as staff and funding are being devoted to completing these difficult work. I cannot see how proposals for deep cuts in funding and staffing can maintain progress, let alone increase its pace. The Navajo people already have waited decades for help in cleaning up this dangerous pollution and they deserve a resolution. Administrator Wheeler, how does the EPA justify its 15 percent proposed cut, around \$115 million, to the Superfund program for hazardous site cleanups for fiscal year 2020?

Mr. Wheeler. Congressman, we are trying to balance a number of competing interests within the EPA budget to try to reduce the overall federal expenditures, but one thing we are doing on the Superfund program is going after the responsible parties at a higher level. We had more recoveries last year from PRPs than previous years which will hopefully free up more Superfund dollars to address other sites such as the Navajo Nation.

Mr. O'Halleran. In this case I believe that waiting for that time is costing people's lives and children's quality of life and their potential for life and death issues. But I also

Committee's website as soon as it is available. 114 2560 know that there is Superfund money there and you haven't been 2561 using it appropriately. After congressional pressure years ago, 2562 it seemed like progress was being made by the EPA in the creation 2563 of five-year plans for uranium mine cleanups which EPA released 2564 in '08 and 2014. Did the EPA meet the goals it set for itself 2565 in this latest five-year plan which recently ended in 2018, and 2566 was enough budgeted to fulfill these goals? 2567 Mr. Wheeler. If you don't mind, sir, I would like to respond 2568 for the record on that question. 2569 Mr. O'Halleran. Okay. Further, the EPA Inspector 2570 General's Office reported in August of last year that EPA had 2571 not finished developing in the prioritization methodology for 2572 the 54 sites included in the settlements as of June 2018. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record the 2573 2574 Inspector General's report on this issue, Report Number 18P0233. 2575 Mr. Tonko. Without objection. [The information follows:] 2576 2577

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

This is	; a ;	prelimina:	ry, unedi	ited to	ranscript.	The st	atements	within
may be	ina	ccurate,	incomplet	ce, or	misattrib	uted to	the spe	aker. A
link to	th:	e final,	official	trans	cript will	be pos	ted on t	he
Committ	ee'	s website	as soon	as it	is availa	ble.		

Mr. O'Halleran. Also in this report, EPA Regions 6 and 9 noted that they intend to follow through with their site cleanup contaminants and stay on schedule, but that the task completion dates are subject to available resources staffing and that both offices were operating with too few employees. In fact, both five-year plans there was no money requested from the EPA in addition to your regular budget and, frankly, the 10-year plan that is coming up does not request it either.

Frankly, I am disheartened that the funds currently available for mine cleanup, so few sites have been cleaned to date even where funds are available to do the work as with the settlement fund for the Tronox mines. It seems there are still too few resources at EPA to move this work forward and many other projects that have been discussed here today.

I do appreciate the EPA's process for site evaluation and tribal consultation, but the sense of urgency towards this crisis appears to be lacking, in my view. In fact, I think it is disrespectful to the people that are impacted by this and the responsibility of federal government is not being made by this administration or prior.

Mr. Chairman, with this information presented I believe that we, as a committee, ought to request the EPA come in for a thorough follow-up briefing on this matter.

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.
116
Mr. Wheeler, will you commit to an Agency briefing before
this committee on the status of the uranium mine cleanups?
Mr. Wheeler. Yes, I would.
Mr. O'Halleran. I realize this is a complex and difficult
task, but we should be able to make much better progress than
we have been. Almost 80 years is way too long to have the Navajo
Nation, the water resources of the Navajo Nation, and the Colorado
River potentially impacted because of our negligence. And, Mr.
Chairman, I yield back.
Mr. Tonko. The gentleman yields back.
Administrator Wheeler, on the fuel economy proposal I want
to note that EPA's internal analysis corrected many flaws in the
modeling underlying the proposed rule. And after doing so, EPA
career staff concluded that instead of saving lives, the proposed
rule would actually increase fatalities.
And also again we thank you for appearing before the
subcommittee today. And I know that you have made some comments
Mr. Shimkus. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Tonko. Yes, sir.

Mr. Shimkus. Can I see the cite for that analysis that you just read?

Mr. Tonko. It is in the administrative record.

Mr. Wheeler. I am not familiar with that, but I would like--

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 with	thin
may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker	r. A
link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the	
Committee's website as soon as it is available.	

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you.

Mr. Wheeler. --to respond for the record on that. I am not familiar with that information.

Mr. Tonko. So again we thank you for appearing before the subcommittee today. I know you made some commitments to respond to members' requests today and I hope we can receive those responses along with answers to questions for the record in a reasonable amount of time, including confirmation that the TSCA risk evaluation was sent to the National Academies of Science.

I would also mention a letter--I would be remiss if I didn't mention this one that we sent a letter to EPA with Representatives Dingell, Lujan, and Welch back in December on PFAS chemicals and the TSCA program. I hope we can receive that information in the near future because this committee intends to work on PFAS this year. The 70 parts per trillion health advisory level is not a standard and it is not enforceable.

So I hope EPA will provide us with the assistance necessary for us to move forward with all available information. And in regard to that December letter, might I be more specific and direct since you have had that for months, I would ask that we receive a detailed response within 7 working days.

Mr. Wheeler. We will give you a response, yes.

Mr. Tonko. Within 7 working days?

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

	link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.
	118
2648	Mr. Wheeler. I will have to check with the staff on what
2649	Mr. Shimkus. Mr. Chairman, are we going into a second round?
2650	Is that where we are headed?
2651	Mr. Tonko. No. I just wanted a response to our letter of
2652	December.
2653	Mr. Shimkus. Thank you.
2654	Mr. Tonko. And I think we are owed a response and I would
2655	appreciate a 7-day time frame, working day time frame by which
2656	to respond.
2657	Mr. Wheeler. I hear you and I need to check on the status
2658	of that response. We have responded. I believe we have received
2659	eight committee letters. We have responded to seven of them.
2660	Mr. Tonko. This is a December letter, Mr. Administrator,
2661	so I don't think we are being unfair, 7 working days?
2662	Mr. Wheeler. I will have to see where we are on the response.
2663	We will get it to you
2664	Mr. Tonko. Can you give us an update in 7 working days?
2665	Mr. Wheeler. Yes, sir. We
2666	Mr. Shimkus. Mr. Chairman, are we going to go to a second
2667	round, because Mr. Tonko. We are not going to a second
2668	round. I just want to get a commitment to get a response to a
2669	letter from December.
2670	Mr. Shimkus. Well, it is five and five, so.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A 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.

119

Mr. Tonko. Okay. We have a number of documents that we ask to be for unanimous consent to enter into the record. include a fax sheet from the Colorado Oil and Gas Association on the state's air quality advancements; an opinion letter submitted to the Gainesville Sun titled, "Attacks on science are a threat to our water''; a February 2019 report by the GAO entitled, "Superfund: EPA Should Improve the Reliability of Data on National Priorities List Sites Affecting Indian Tribes''; a letter from various public health groups entitled, "Climate Change is a Health Emergency,'' a declaration on climate change and health; an EPA Inspector General report on uranium mine sites on Navajo lands from August 2018; and finally, a map from the EPA Inspector General report. Again, request unanimous consent to enter the following into the record. Mr. Shimkus. Without objection, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Tonko. So moved.

[The information follows:]

2688

2689

2671

2672

2673

2674

2675

2676

2677

2678

2679

2680

2681

2682

2683

2684

2685

2686

2687

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.

120

Mr. Tonko. And so with that, again we thank you,

Administrator Wheeler. I remind members that pursuant to

committee rules they have 10 business days to submit additional

questions for the record to be answered by our witness.

Mr. Wheeler, I ask you to respond promptly to any such questions that you may receive. At this time, the subcommittee is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:24 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

2690

2691

2692

2693

2694

2695

2696