1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS MOLLEN
3	HIF116180
4	
5	
6	THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 ENVIRONMENTAL
7	PROTECTION AGENCY BUDGET
8	THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 2018
9	House of Representatives
10	Subcommittee on Environment
11	Committee on Energy and Commerce
12	Washington, D.C.
13	
14	
15	
16	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m.,
17	in Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Shimkus
18	[chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.
19	Members present: Representatives Shimkus, McKinley,
20	Barton, Blackburn, Harper, Olson, Johnson, Flores, Hudson,
21	Cramer, Walberg, Carter, Duncan, Walden (ex officio), Tonko,
22	Ruiz, Peters, Green, DeGette, McNerney, Cardenas, Dingell,

23	Matsui, and Pallone (ex officio).
24	Also present: Representatives Long, Costello, Bilirakis,
25	Lance, Griffith, Rush, Eshoo, Schakowsky, Butterfield,
26	Castor, Sarbanes, Welch, Lujan, Loebsack, Kennedy, and Engel.
27	Staff present: Jennifer Barblan, Chief Counsel,
28	Oversight & Investigations; Mike Bloomquist, Staff Director;
29	Samantha Bopp, Staff Assistant; Daniel Butler, Staff
30	Assistant; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Kelly Collins,
31	Legislative Clerk, Energy/Environment; Jerry Couri, Deputy
32	Chief Counsel, Environment; Jordan Davis, Senior Advisor;
33	Lamar Echols, Counsel, Oversight & Investigations; Wyatt
34	Ellertson, Professional Staff, Energy/Environment; Margaret
35	Tucker Fogarty, Staff Assistant; Adam Fromm, Director of
36	Outreach and Coalitions; Ali Fulling, Legislative Clerk,
37	Oversight & Investigations, Digital Commerce and Consumer
38	Protection; Jordan Haverly, Policy Coordinator, Environment;
39	Zach Hunter, Director of Communications; Peter Kielty, Deputy
40	General Counsel; Bijan Koohmaraie, Counsel, Digital Commerce
41	and Consumer Protection; Tim Kurth, Deputy Chief Counsel,
42	Communications & Technology; Ben Lieberman, Senior Counsel,
43	Energy; Ryan Long, Deputy Staff Director; Milly Lothian,
44	Press Assistant and Digital Coordinator; Mary Martin, Chief

45	Counsel, Energy/Environment; Drew McDowell, Executive
46	Assistant; Brandon Mooney, Deputy Chief Counsel, Energy;
47	Annelise Rickert, Counsel, Energy; Peter Spencer, Senior
48	Professional Staff Member, Energy; Jason Stanek, Senior
49	Counsel, Energy; Austin Stonebraker, Press Assistant; Hamlin
50	Wade, Special Advisor, External Affairs; Andy Zach, Senior
51	Professional Staff Member, Environment; Michelle Ash,
52	Minority Chief Counsel, Digital Commerce and Consumer
53	Protection; Priscilla Barbour, Minority Energy Fellow; Jeff
54	Carroll, Minority Staff Director; Jacqueline Cohen, Minority
55	Chief Environment Counsel; Jean Fruci, Minority Energy and
56	Environment Policy Advisor; Tiffany Guarascio, Minority
57	Deputy Staff Director and Chief Health Advisor; Caitlin
58	Haberman, Minority Professional Staff Member; Rick Kessler,
59	Minority Senior Advisor and Staff Director, Energy and
60	Environment; Jourdan Lewis, Minority Staff Assistant; John
61	Marshall, Minority Policy Coordinator; Jon Monger, Minority
62	Counsel; Kaitlyn Peel, Minority Digital Director; Alexander
63	Ratner, Minority Policy Analyst; Tim Robinson, Minority Chief
64	Counsel; Michelle Rusk, Minority FTC Detailee; Andrew
65	Souvall, Minority Director of Communications, Outreach and
66	Member Services; Tuley Wright, Minority Energy and

67	Environment Policy Advisor; C.J. Young, Minority Press
68	Secretary; and Catherine Zander, Minority Environment Fellow.
69	
70	
71	
72	
73	
74	
75	
76	Mr. Shimkus. The subcommittee will come to order.
77	Before we begin, I would like to take a moment to address the
78	guests in our audience. First of all, thank you for coming.
79	We think engaged citizens are a welcome and valuable part of
80	the political process. I only wish every hearing drew this
81	much interest.
82	The purpose of this hearing is to hear from the
83	Administrator of the EPA on important matters currently
84	before the Agency including the subcommittee's continued
85	interest in the workings of the Environmental Protection
86	Agency. It is an opportunity for the subcommittee to ask
87	questions and have a thoughtful discussion on these issues.
88	The number of people in the audience this morning

demonstrates the strong interest in these topics and we welcome that interest and your attendance today.

I do want to remind our guests in the audience that the chair is obligated under the rules of the House and the rules of the committee to maintain order and preserve decorum in the committee room. I know that we have deep feelings on these issues and that we may not agree on everything, but I ask that we abide by the rules and be respectful of our audience members, our viewers, and our witnesses.

The chair appreciates the audience's cooperation to maintaining order as we have a full discussion on these important issues. And I would like to recognize myself for 5 minutes for an opening statement.

Good morning, Administrator Pruitt, and welcome back to the Environment Subcommittee. I am glad you are here today and look forward to our discussion. From a policy perspective and from my seat outside the Agency, I am generally pleased with the direction you are taking at the EPA. As I mentioned when you were here 5 months ago, the American people don't want ideologues rewriting or reinterpreting our laws, they expect and deserve folks at agencies like the EPA who will faithfully implement what

Congress has passed.

I am especially happy with the reinvigorated Superfund program and in particular, after more than 20 years on the National Priorities List, I am very glad to see progress finally being made on the West Lake Landfill which we have talked about numerous times. Superfund sites are a tangible environmental and public health problem that may pose multiple immediate threats.

One of the bills I worked on when I joined this committee was to help make the Superfund program operate more rationally, so to see that you also care about this program is important to me. I also want to applaud your initiative to look at the EPA's workforce and identify ways to make the Agency more efficient and effective. As I mentioned back in December, this exercise, sadly, has not been undertaken in more than 20 years. I believe a lack of consistent review can lead to complacency or foster regulatory overreach and I look forward to learning more about efforts to reshape the bureaucracy.

As the author of the changes to Title I of the Toxic Substances Control Act, I also want to commend you for reducing the backlog of applications for new chemicals. I

understand the backlog has crept back up by one-third of its normal level, but I look forward to seeing what actions you take including the use of new user fees to help EPA operate its new chemicals review process more expeditiously.

Finally, I am glad to hear that the regulatory process you are running is not looking to short-circuit public comment. Past administrations have issued enforceable guidelines or employed other tricks to get their way on policy when many Americans and their representatives in Congress may have disagreed.

Now as public servants our jobs are not based solely on the things we do or the things we have done, but also the way we conduct our business. It is no secret that there have been many stories in the press about the management and operation to the Agency and your dealings with potentially regulated sectors. I consider much of this narrative to be a distraction, but one this committee cannot ignore.

I look forward to hearing your side of the story on the rumors and allegations you are facing. Before yielding back my time I want to make a couple of environmental budget and policy observations. First, even though federal law requires the President to propose a budget, the U.S. Constitution

vests the actual budget and spending authority with the Congress, particularly the House of Representatives. Second, the President's budget was released on February 12th, 2018 without full knowledge what Congress would do in the Consolidated Appropriations Act that became law 6 weeks later. Had the Administrator joined us in February or March, he would not have had to face this dynamic. But regardless of what members think of the administration's budget proposal, I hope today they will remember our own role in the budget and spending debate.

Finally, I want to say something about administrative efforts regarding transportation fuels. Recently, the White House is engaged with the EPA and Department of Agriculture to consider administrative changes to the Renewable Fuel Standard. I take these efforts quite seriously, not only as subcommittee chairman but also as a representative of a corn and soybean growing district in southern Illinois that also happens to have two oil refineries.

I believe that no matter how well intentioned any regulatory effort may be, the only way to get a lasting solution, especially one that will not spend more time in court than on the books, is by having Congress settle this

177	issue by statute. I urge you, Mr. Administrator, and the
178	other members of the executive branch to patiently work with
179	us in good faith on a legislative solution to the Renewable
180	Fuel Standard.
181	With that I have 50 seconds left. Seeing no one wishing
182	that time, I yield back the balance of my time and recognize
183	the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from
184	New York, Mr. Tonko, for 5 minutes.
185	[The prepared statement of Mr. Shimkus follows:]
186	
187	**************************************

Thank you, Mr. Chair. We are here today to

discuss EPA's budget for fiscal year 2019. The President has called for a nearly 30 percent cut at EPA which would severely impair the Agency's ability to fulfill its mission, to safeguard public health, and our environment. We know all too well the costs of failing that mission, of the pain of communities, of children and families who suffer illness resulting from pollution in their air and water. So ves, I am concerned that EPA is increasingly allowing polluters to set the agenda and threaten public health with minimal accountability. Under Administrator Pruitt, common-sense public health and environmental protections are being slated for elimination with no regard for scientific evidence and little justification beyond the wishes of regulated entities. actions include reopening clean car standards without any mention of health or pollution, continuing to repeal the Clean Power Plan and dismissing the science of climate change, implementing TSCA reform that ignores bipartisan congressional intent, and a number of attempts to undermine

I expect the courts will agree that many, if not all, of

the Clean Air Act.

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

Mr. Tonko.

these actions are unjustified. In addition, I am troubled by the dismissal of science by the Agency's political leadership. Hundreds of scientists have left EPA with no apparent plan to replace them. Expertise on the science advisory boards has been eroded and the recently proposed rule to undermine the use of science in rulemakings will severely limit the Agency's ability to safeguard public health.

I know many career employees at EPA simply want to work hard to ensure the air we breathe is clean and the water we drink is safe. To them I say thank you. But the Agency's political leadership is pursuing a different agenda and the mounting evidence of serious ethics violations, incredible investigations at the highest level cannot go unscrutinized.

Mr. Chair, I value this subcommittee's bipartisan record. There are times that we disagree, but we have worked through tough issues together and are often able to find bipartisan balance. I know there are those in the majority who support rollbacks of EPA rules, but all of us should be troubled by the numerous reports of misuse of taxpayer dollars and apparent conflicts of interest that have made the Administrator a frequent subject of investigation.

I am of course referring to the Administrator's pattern of wasteful spending on luxury travel, personal security and yes, office upgrades. To say nothing of his well-documented sweetheart rental from a lobbyist with business before EPA and huge unapproved raises for top political staff, amongst others. Perhaps most concerning have been the reports of retaliation against employees both career and political that have dared to question Administrator Pruitt's most troubling abuses and expenditures. And in almost all cases, the more we have learned the worse they get.

At this point we must ask if the Inspector General will have the resources needed to investigate the Administrator's seemingly endless misconduct. At the heart of all these issues is an apparent pattern of an administrator refusing accountability and putting personal and special interests ahead of the American people. I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to imagine, if a Democrat acted in this manner would you stand for it? I think the answer is clear you would not. My colleagues and I may disagree about many of the policy decisions coming out of this EPA, but one thing I hope we can agree on is that we cannot afford to turn a blind eye to the reports of this Administrator's fiscal

254 mismanagement and abuse of his position. 255 Mr. Administrator, the evidence is clear. You have 256 failed as a steward of American taxpayer dollars and our 257 environment. You claim to believe in the mission of the EPA, 258 but your actions including your mistreatment of EPA's 259 dedicated career staff tell a very different story. Evidence 260 from your time in state government should have made this 261 obvious, but only in recent weeks have we come to fully 262 understand the extent of your political ambitions, your 263 tendency to abuse your position of personal gain, and to advance the agendas of your political benefactors and what 264 265 appears to be a propensity for grift. 266 But, most importantly, your conduct as Administrator has 267 demonstrated a lack of respect for American taxpayers and the 268 Agency you were appointed to lead and has affirmed the 269 regrettable but inevitable conclusion that you were never fit 270 for this job and your refusal to provide any serious 271 transparency, accept any accountability, or show even the 272 slightest contrition is inexcusable. 273 Mr. Chair, no one is above the law. Congress must hold 274 this Administrator accountable on behalf of the American

people, and I hope our committee can continue to investigate

276	and bring the truth of these important issues to light in a
277	bipartisan manner. With that I yield back.
278	Mr. Shimkus. The chair thanks the gentleman. The chair
279	now recognizes the Chairman of the full committee, Greg
280	Walden from Oregon, for 5 minutes.
281	The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
282	Mr. Pruitt, welcome back to the House Energy and
283	Commerce Committee. As you know, we scheduled this hearing
284	to focus on the EPA's policy and budget priorities some time
285	ago, but you surely understand that members on both sides of
286	the aisle have some serious questions about the management
287	and operations of the Agency. We expect you to answer these
288	questions fully and truthfully.
289	I am concerned that the good progress being made on
290	policy front is being undercut by allegations about your
291	management of the Agency and use of its resources. These
292	issues are too persistent to ignore and I know many members
293	are looking forward to hear more clarity from you today. You
294	will have ample opportunity to help provide us with any
295	information that can help answer these questions.
296	Additionally, there are numerous ongoing investigations into
297	these issues and I want you to commit to the committee that

you will provide us with all the same information you provide to the EPA Inspector General and other congressional committees.

Having said that, let me also say that I appreciate your good work to focus EPA on the mission Congress has tasked it with in statute, that being clean air for Americans to breathe, safe water for our citizens to drink, and soils free from pollution. As an example, I want to commend your efforts to reinvigorate the Superfund program and specifically to accelerate the cleanup of the Willamette River at the Portland Harbor. This has gone on long enough and you stepped in and made a difference to the satisfaction of the people of Portland, Oregon. And even some of your most liberal detractors applaud your efforts on this critical cleanup and I thank you for taking the lead.

I also appreciate your desire to rebalance the power between Washington, D.C. and the states making our efforts more efficient and helping deliver tangible results to communities across the country. To truly succeed we need stronger local, state, federal, and private partnerships where we can team up and leverage all available resources to accomplish the goals of cleaner water, cleaner air, and

cleaner soils. Importantly, I appreciate your stated commitment to administer the law as Congress intended and to have the Agency concentrate on its statutory obligations under environmental and public health laws as well as the Administrative Procedures Act.

Bringing new transparency to your public processes, especially when it comes to the data and science that underpins policies, is truly a welcome change from past EPAs. Mr. Administrator, too many of your predecessors believed a clean environment was also incompatible with a healthy economy. I share your view that we can and must have both in America. We need common sense regulation that protects the public, actually cleans up the environment, and does so in a way that does not unnecessarily suffocate the economy. I believe the EPA should focus on innovative problem solving and partnership with states, the private sector, and other stakeholders that leverage their resources and expertise. I look forward to our discussion today about the Agency's budget and the EPA's direction now and in the future.

As with our hearing with you 5 months ago, I remain interested in the goals you are establishing for the programs at EPA and the metrics you intend to use to measure their

342	progress. Particularly, I noticed objective number 5 in the
343	proposed budget discusses staffing and internal management
344	issues. It is important that EPA not be bloated, but it is
345	essential that EPA have the staff with proper expertise,
346	implementing and enforcing programs that correlate with their
347	experience; finding that critical staffing balance is one of
348	the most important roles of anyone given the enormous task of
349	managing a large, taxpayer-funded enterprise.
350	Finally, I want to applaud those objectives in the
351	Agency's budget that reduce red tape result in the regulated
352	community better knowing what is expected of them and
353	promoting prompt, even, and fair enforcement of the law. I
354	look forward to learning more about all of that today. So I
355	thank you for joining us again before the Energy and Commerce
356	Committee and I look forward to your testimony.
357	With that Mr. Chairman I yield back the balance of my
358	time.
359	[The prepared statement of Mr. Walden follows:]
360	
361	**********INSERT 2******

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back the balance of

302	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back the balance of
363	his time. The chair now recognizes the ranking member of the
364	full committee, Congressman Pallone from New Jersey, for 5
365	minutes.
366	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
367	Administrator Pruitt has brought secrecy, conflicts of
368	interest, and scandal to the EPA. In any other
369	administration, Republican or Democrat, you would be long
370	gone by now. So far, 140 House Democrats have signed on to a
371	resolution introduced by Ms. Castor expressing no confidence
372	in you, Mr. Pruitt. Additionally, four Republican House
373	members have also called on you to step down.
374	And the voices are growing. Just look at the critiques
375	from former Bush EPA Administrator and New Jersey Governor
376	Christine Todd Whitman who called Administrator Pruitt's
377	tenure, and I quote, a slap in the face to fiscal
378	responsibility and responsible governance, and said also that
379	evidence is abundant of the dangerous political turn of an
380	agency that is supposed to be guided by science. Another
381	former Republican EPA Administrator William Reilly called
382	Administrator Pruitt, and I quote, a third-rate ideologue.
383	Past administrators of both parties believed in the

EPA's mission and understood that they had been given a sacred trust by the people of our country. Unfortunately, this is not the case with you, Mr. Pruitt. Clearly, you do not believe in EPA's mission and appear to have forgotten that you are here to serve all the American people, not merely a select few or just yourself. And the fact is, Administrator Pruitt has used this office as nothing more than an opportunity to either enrich himself or his corporate friends and President Trump seems to be perfectly fine with all these actions. So much for draining the swamp.

When we met in December, you pledged to be more transparent. You promised to do a better job providing technical assistance, sending witnesses to hearings, and responding to congressional requests. But you have followed through on none of these promises. What you have done is generate scandal after scandal. When confronted about them you have repeatedly failed to take responsibility for your actions and instead you have blamed your staff, your security detail, your critics, pretty much anyone but yourself, and you are accountable for your agency and all of these scandals, in my opinion. The buck stops at your desk.

There are so many outstanding questions that we need

truthful answers to today but because so far we have only gotten half-truths, misleading answers, or outright falsehoods. For instance, you rented a condo at well below market value and then emphatically claimed on Fox News that your landlord's lobbyist husband had no business before the EPA, a statement that was proven to be untrue. And it is that kind of conduct that prompted Ranking Members Tonko, DeGette, and vice Ranking Member Castor and I, to request that you be placed under oath for this hearing and that it be expanded to include the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee. The Chairman did not agree to that request, but I would remind you what Chairman Walden said to the press when he declined our request. He said, lying to Congress is a crime regardless of whether or not you are sworn in. committee Republicans have conveniently told the press that they are investigating you for some of your outrageous ethical abuses, yet I have seen no evidence from committee Republicans that that is really happening. Fortunately, committee Democrats have been demanding answers and five independent federal investigations are now

being done into your conduct at our request. Yesterday, I

406

407

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

426

428 joined with Ranking Member Cummings of the Oversight and 429 Government Reform Committee to request an additional 430 investigation by the Office of Special Counsel into your 431 troubling pattern of apparently retaliating against EPA 432 employees who question your extravagant spending and I am confident that these investigations will affirm what I have 433 434 come to believe is true that you are unfit to hold public 435 office and undeserving of the public trust. 436 And I don't say those words, you know, because I 437 particularly dislike you or, you know, hold you in ill 438 repute. I just think that every indication we have is that you really should resign and you are undeserving of the 439 440 public trust. And I yield back, Mr. Chairman. Thank you. 441 The gentleman yields back his time. Mr. Shimkus. 442 now conclude with members' opening statements. 443 would like to remind members that pursuant to committee rules, all members' opening statements will be made part of 444 445 the record. 446 We would also now like to thank and welcome our 447 distinguished witness, U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, 448 for being here today. You will have an opportunity to give 449 an opening statement followed by a round of questions by

450	members. You are joined by the Honorable Holly Greaves,
451	Chief Financial Officer. Welcome to you also, we appreciate
452	you being here.
453	And, Mr. Administrator, we now recognize you for 5
454	minutes for your opening statement.

455 STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE E. SCOTT PRUITT, ADMINISTRATOR, 456 U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY 457 458 Mr. Pruitt. Well, good morning to you, Mr. Chairman, 459 Ranking Member Pallone, members of the committee, it is good to be with you today and I appreciate the opportunity to 460 461 discuss these matters that you have raised. 462 There is consequential and important work being done at 463 the EPA since the beginning of the Trump administration both 464 in terms of improved environmental outcomes as well as substantial regulatory reform. We are stripping burdensome 465 466 costs from the American economy at an unprecedented pace and we are doing this while inspiring confidence in the American 467 468 people that it is government going to work with them as 469 opposed to against them, to achieve harmony between jobs and 470 growth and environmental stewardship. 471 In the short time of the Trump administration we have 472 made enormous progress as far as improved environmental 473 These are just a few: We have removed over three outcomes. 474 times the number of polluted sites in contaminated 475 communities across the country as compared to the previous 476 administration for 2017, and for 2018 we are on pace to

remove as many as ten times the number of polluted sites. We are working cooperatively with the states to improve air quality through the approval of 350 state improvement plans. And with regard to water we are leading a multiagency approach that has set a goal of eradicating lead from our drinking water within 10 years, largely through the utilization of a tool that you provided, WIFIA. It is my goal to prioritize applications for critical water infrastructure over the 10 years to hopefully see four billion a year dedicated to the replacement of lead service lines in order to reduce lead in our drinking water. President Trump has set an ambitious goal for the EPA under his administration and our measurable achievements are 490 a testament to the effectiveness which a results-driven EPA can achieve. President Trump did not only task us with accomplishing the core mission of the EPA acting more efficiently and more effectively than ever before, he also demanded comprehensive regulatory reform. That 495 transformational change is happening. In just 1 year, the Trump administration has saved the American people almost \$8 billion in regulatory savings. And the EPA alone is responsible for nearly two dozen regulatory actions, saving

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485

486

487

488

489

491

492

493

494

496

497

Americans one billion of that eight billion in regulatory cost.

These actions are providing America's job creators with the regulatory clarity they deserve. By repealing and replacing the so-called Clean Power Plan we are ending a one-size-fits-all regulation on energy providers and restoring rule of law. By rescinding and rewriting the 2015 Waters of the United States rule we are ending Washington's power grab over land use decisions across the country. It is indisputable that we have made enormous progress in advancing President Trump's reform agenda and pruning back decades of regulatory overreach that was unnecessary, burdensome, and ultimately harmful to hardworking Americans across the country.

When the President nominated me to this position I believed the work was going to be impactful and it has been and tremendous progress has been made. But I did not expect the work to be easy and I knew there would be meaningful opposition. However, as I sit before you today, I recognize there have been very troubling media reports over the past few weeks. I promise you that I, more than anyone, want to establish the hard facts and provide answers to questions

surrounding these reports.

521

522

523

524

525

526

527

528

529

530

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

Let me very clear. I have nothing to hide as it relates to how I have run the Agency for the past 16 months. not afraid to admit that there has been a learning process and when Congress or independent bodies of oversight find fault in our decision-making I want to correct that and ensure that it does not happen again. Ultimately, as the Administrator of the EPA, the responsibility for identifying and making changes necessary rests with me and no one else. With that being said, facts are facts and fiction is fiction and a lie doesn't become truth just because it appears on the front page of a newspaper. Much of what has been targeted towards me and my team has been half-truths or at best stories that have been so twisted they do not resemble reality. And I am here and I welcome the chance to be here to set the record straight in these areas.

But let's have no illusions about what is really going on here. Those who have attacked the EPA and attacked me are doing so because they want to attack and derail the President's agenda and undermine this administration's priorities. I am simply not going to let that happen. I look forward to your questions today and thank you, Mr.

543	Chairman.
544	[The prepared statement of Mr. Pruitt follows:]
545	
546	*********INSERT 3******

547	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
548	chair thanks the Administrator. I will start the series of
549	questioning and I will recognize myself for 5 minutes for the
550	first round.
551	We have obviously a lot of media presence here. I have
552	been asked the last couple days what am I going to do, what
553	am I going to say, and I said, well, I am going to talk
554	policy and stewardship. So half my 5 minutes is going to be
555	on a policy issue, and hopefully that will save some time for
556	us to talk about some stewardship issues.
557	Since you last testified before the subcommittee, the
558	White House has hosted a number of meetings, some of which
559	have included you and other Cabinet officials, senators, and
560	various stakeholders, to discuss changes in the Renewable
561	Fuel Standard. As I alluded to in my opening statement,
562	those potential administrative actions hang like the sword of
563	Damocles over efforts on Capitol Hill to reach an enduring,
564	legislative solution to the problems of that program.
565	Are any of these administrative changes imminent, or
566	will you commit to allowing Congress time to work on a
567	legislative solution?
568	Mr. Pruitt. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think both are

important and I do think there are some regulatory options that we can pursue. Many have talked about transparency as an example with respect to the trading platform and the RFS trading platform, how long you can hold a RIN as an example, who can buy, who can sell RINs. There are those kinds of, I think, evaluations that we can engage from a regulatory perspective. And as you know there is also consideration about the RVP waiver and the E15 being allowed year around.

I think that is something, it is a legal determination.

I think that is something, it is a legal determination. It is not a policy determination. And we have been earnest the last several months evaluating that in hopes that we can get to a conclusion on our ability to take those kinds of actions. But I really believe that Congress's role in this is terribly important because as you look at the issues that we are facing with respect to the Renewable Fuel Standard and the viability of the RINs platform we need both Congress and our regulatory responses to be working together.

Mr. Shimkus. Well, let me just tell you from my perspective what happens as we are trying to get our disparate groups together is that every time someone gets hauled down to the White House the other side goes crazy.

And then, you probably get to see the same thing, the other

591 side gets hauled down and the other side goes crazy. And we are trying to get everybody in the room and that is the 592 593 perspective that I come from. 594 The follow-up on this is what actions, if any, are you 595 taking now to prepare for the Renewable Fuel Standard post 596 2022? 597 Mr. Pruitt. Well, as you know under the statute we have 598 an ability to reset those volume obligations and we are 599 evaluating that. There is a cap of 15 billion for 600 conventional presently. But another area Mr. Chairman that I 601 know you have been interested in is high octane. And with 602 respect to it was mentioned in some other comments about the CAFÉ standards, there needs to be a serious consideration of 603 604 use pursuing as a country fuel choices and options to meet 605 those CAFÉ standards and provide high octane as an option to 606 the American people. I think there is a potential that will 607 serve both the ag sector as well at the auto sector and 608 consumers across this country that we could pursue together. 609 Well, thank you. Now I want to move to Mr. Shimkus. 610 the administrative portion of my two questions. Obviously 611 you have already alluded to and some of my colleagues have 612 alluded to all the recent stories and issues and your

613	willingness to set the record straight. So in my minute and
614	45 seconds left I want to give you the time to address those
615	as you will.
616	Mr. Pruitt. Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated
617	in my opening comment, I want to address each of these
618	respective issues and provide information and we will work
619	with Congress both with Oversight as well as this committee
620	to provide any and all information that helps answer those
621	questions. Those have been a distraction to our agenda, I
622	think the congressman mentioned that earlier, and that
623	troubles me. Ultimately, as Administrator of the EPA, I have
624	to take responsibility to make changes internal to the Agency
625	to get accountability in our processes to ensure that in each
626	of these areas we get better results and that we show the
627	American people that we are committed to being good stewards
628	of taxpayer resources, staying true to our mission at the
629	Agency, which I believe that we are and have, and I am
630	committed to doing that. That is why I am here to talk to
631	you about it today.
632	Mr. Shimkus. I thank the Administrator and I yield back
633	my time and now turn to the ranking member of the
634	subcommittee, Mr. Tonko, for 5 minutes.

635	Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Recently it came out
636	that two EPA employees who came with you to Washington from
637	Oklahoma were given significant raises over the White House's
638	objection. When you were interviewed by Ed Henry on Fox News
639	you claimed to have been unaware of those raises. At the
640	time, Ed Henry asked you whether you intentionally went
641	around the White House or whether you simply had no idea what
642	your staff was up to.
643	The EPA Inspector General is looking into those raises
644	and last week the IG released preliminary information showing
645	that the forms to grant the raises were signed by your chief
646	of staff, Mr. Ryan Jackson, who wrote that he was signing on
647	your behalf. This is your opportunity to set the record
648	straight. Did you, Administrator, authorize Mr. Jackson to
649	sign those documents for you?
650	Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, those were delegated to Mr.
651	Jackson and the Inspector General did reference that in his
652	management alert and he recognized the authority.
653	Mr. Tonko. So you did authorize him then to sign them?
654	Mr. Pruitt. Those decisions, that decision was made by
655	my chief of staff.
656	Mr. Tonko. Yes or no, did you authorize him?

657	Mr. Pruitt. There are delegations giving him that
658	authority.
659	Mr. Tonko. So that is a yes.
660	Mr. Pruitt. The Inspector General recognized that,
661	Congressman.
662	Mr. Tonko. So you authorized Mr. Jackson to sign those
663	documents for you. In internal emails, Sarah Greenwalt, one
664	of the aides who received a substantial raise, stated that
665	you were aware of and supported the raises. Was that true?
666	Mr. Pruitt. I think with respect to the raises what is
667	important
668	Mr. Tonko. Was that true?
669	Mr. Pruitt. Congressman.
670	Mr. Tonko. I have 5 minutes so I have to move along.
671	Mr. Pruitt. I was not aware of the amount nor was I
672	made aware
673	Mr. Tonko. Not the amount, were you aware of the
674	raises?
675	Mr. Pruitt. I was not aware of the amount nor was I
676	aware of the bypassing or the PPO process not being
677	respected.
678	Mr. Tonko. Well, then I am concerned that you have no

679 idea of what is going on in your name at your agency especially on an issue already under IG investigation. You 680 have spent this week claiming to champion transparency, but 681 682 on Tuesday you blocked the press from attending an event where you announced a new proposal that will severely limit 683 the Agency's use of public health studies in policymaking. 684 685 When internal emails came out about this new policy last 686 week, they revealed that it had been developed entirely by 687 political staff, seemingly without a robust outside 688 stakeholder process, and once the press started covering 689 those emails they were removed from the Agency's public FOIA I do not know if you were personally involved in the 690 691 decision to remove those emails, but it certainly was not 692 transparent. 693 Mr. Administrator, you like to claim that you support the rule of law and acknowledge the limits of EPA's 694 695 authority. Many of our environmental statutes are clear. EPA must use the best available science as a foundation of 696 697 policymaking. This proposal would prevent that. 698 aware, yes or no, that Nancy Beck raised concerns that such a 699 policy could also impact data that would be important to 700 industry such as confidential business information? Yes or

701	no.
702	Mr. Pruitt. This effort
703	Mr. Tonko. Yes or no.
704	Mr. Pruitt. This effort, Congressman, was about
705	ensuring that
706	Mr. Tonko. Were you aware that
707	Mr. Pruitt at the Agency
708	Mr. Tonko. Were you aware that Nancy Beck raised the
709	concern? Were you aware?
710	Mr. Pruitt. As I indicated, Congressman, this effort is
711	actually a reflection of Congress's commitment to
712	transparency at the Agency.
713	Mr. Tonko. Sir, I need to move on. I take that as a
714	yes. To mitigate that concern it appears that the proposal
715	has been crafted so that you, the Administrator, has the
716	discretion to grant exemptions as you see fit without any
717	transparency or accountability for your decisions. For
718	example, if EPA was assessing the safety of a chemical, you
719	alone would have the power to selectively block public health
720	studies that do not support your political priorities and
721	allow ones that favor your friends in industry. Not only
722	does this open the door to special treatment for industry

723	over the public health, but you could also pit winners and
724	losers amongst the industry types.
725	Do you think it would be hypocritical to exempt industry
726	data containing confidential business information from
727	disclosure but not personal health information from public
728	health researchers? Yes or no? Would it be hypocritical?
729	Mr. Pruitt. I think that is a misstatement.
730	Congressman, I believe that what needs to be clear is that
731	what actions we took this week were to ensure that data and
732	methodology were also available to those that they are
733	concerned about our rulemaking.
734	Mr. Tonko. You know, I believe it is hypocritical. So
735	moving on, given your track record how can the public trust
736	your discretion to make fair decisions when it comes to those
737	biases?
738	Mr. Pruitt. You know, Congressman, this was an effort
739	to ensure transparency. Because as we do rulemaking at the
740	Agency what is important
741	Mr. Tonko. Based on your record should the public trust
742	your decision-making here with the hypocrisies that would
743	exist in the system you defined?
744	Mr. Pruitt. This is actually a support of transparency

745	for all rulemaking at the Agency. This is not an individual
746	decision that is made by the Administrator. This is
747	programmatic offices making decisions on rules
748	Mr. Tonko. Sir.
749	Mr. Pruitt that are based upon transparent
750	Mr. Tonko. Sir, I think this boils down to an issue of
751	trust and you have developed a system where you are picking
752	winners and losers. We pit the public against the industry
753	or you are picking favorites within the industry and I think
754	there is a hypocritical outcome to it all.
755	And with that Mr. Chair, I yield back.
756	Mr. Shimkus. I thank my colleague for staying within
757	time. And the chair recognizes the Chairman of the full
758	committee, Congressman Walden, for 5 minutes.
759	The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned
760	in my opening statement there are many reviews currently
761	going on at the EPA, in the Inspector General's Office,
762	Government Accountability Office, and other congressional
763	committees, about some of these concerns you are hearing
764	about today, Mr. Administrator, and that have been raised in
765	the media. So my question is pretty easy. Will you commit
766	the EPA will provide this committee with all the documents

767	and information EPA produces for those inquiries?
768	Mr. Pruitt. Absolutely.
769	The Chairman. Thank you. As I told you the last time
770	you were here, this committee is charged by the House of
771	Representatives with legislative and oversight responsibility
772	for the bulk of the statutes that the EPA implements and we
773	decide where the Agency's money can best be spent. Can you
774	help me understand your guiding principles for determining
775	legitimate uses of federal money by the EPA including whether
776	you are using any kind of previous spending guidance to make
777	these decisions?
778	Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, I believe that as we are
779	making decisions we have policy and guidelines at the Agency
780	that drive those decisions. Some of them are attributable to
781	programmatic offices, some of them are attributable to, you
782	know, the science part of our office. But yes, those
783	guidelines govern our decisions each and every day.
784	The Chairman. And are they similar to the guidelines
785	that governed your predecessor's decisions?
786	Mr. Pruitt. Yes.
787	The Chairman. In what ways?
788	Mr. Pruitt. Well, these are policies that predated our

789	time there at the Agency and so they have governed our, you
790	know, from travel to internal decision-making on allocation
791	of dollars to serve programmatic offices. So these are
792	predated policies that govern our actions every single day.
793	The Chairman. Let me ask you about the issue of science
794	and transparency. I have had a lot of constituents over the
795	years who have been very concerned about decisions in various
796	agencies that get made by administrators or the bureaucracy
797	and in some cases they can't get access to the underlying
798	data that underpins the decisions. The proposal that you put
799	forward this last week or so, how does that address that
800	issue, are we going to get science that everybody gets a
801	chance to see that can be replicated that maybe is peer-
802	reviewed so we, all working off facts?
803	Mr. Pruitt. And actually this has been an interest of
804	Congress. As you know there has been proposed legislation to
805	address this very issue.
806	The Chairman. Yes, it has been.
807	Mr. Pruitt. And this was a regulatory action that was
808	taken this week, a proposed rule that actually goes to the
809	heart of transparency as I was trying to share earlier.
810	Because it requires that and when we do rulemaking at the

811	Agency we can't just simply publish the conclusions, the
812	summaries of studies, because what has happened historically
813	is third parties have provided studies or summaries, we have
814	taken those conclusions, used those as a basis of rulemaking
815	but not published the data, not published the methodology
816	that actually supported the conclusion. And so, those that
817	are commenting on rules were ill-equipped to be able to
818	understand whether the conclusions were rightly concluded or
819	not.
820	So this is an effort on our part to ensure that as we do
821	science at the Agency whether it is internal at the EPA or
822	whether we use third parties as far as their findings, data,
823	methodology, and conclusion should all be a part of the
824	package.
825	The Chairman. So is what you are trying to do is make
826	more information available or less information available?
827	Mr. Pruitt. Yes, absolutely more information available.
828	The Chairman. To the public. So you are going to
829	require that every one of these decisions or whatever they
830	are based on, the data and the methodology as well as the
831	conclusions are transparent and available to the public. Is
832	that going to be on your website? How are we going to know

833	this?
834	Mr. Pruitt. Well, it is actually a proposed rule,
835	Congressman. It is actually something that we are taking
836	comment on and I am sure there will be a wide array of
837	comment on that very proposal. But the objective once again
838	is to ensure transparency, reproducibility, with respect to
839	the science that we rely upon in making our decisions in
840	rulemaking.
841	The Chairman. As you know, Mr. Administrator, last
842	year, and then I think we actually passed it into law this
843	year, this committee unanimously, I believe, here and in the
844	House, rewrote America's Brownfields Legislation and we are
845	working together to rewrite the Safe Drinking Water, clean
846	Drinking Water Act as well and make additional grants
847	available. What are you doing to help clean up these
848	brownfields sites that litter our neighborhoods and our
849	country?
850	Mr. Pruitt. You know, we just issued a series of grants
851	across the country this week with respect to the Brownfields
852	Program, and you are right. It has been a tremendous success
853	reclaiming polluted areas across this country to allow
854	communities to once again enjoy those areas. And so with the

855 partnership of Congress, the increased omnibus, you know, 856 provided additional monies there for us to enhance that 857 program, we are administering those grants and seeking to 858 partner with communities all over the country to ensure that 859 these areas are cleaned up and re-purposed and able to be enjoyed again by those communities. 860 861 The Chairman. And I just have a few seconds left. 862 want to follow up on what the chairman of the subcommittee 863 talked about regarding the RFS and new fuel standards. 864 want you to know that Mr. Flores and Mr. Shimkus and others 865 on this committee have put a lot of time in because it is a 866 priority of mine and theirs to figure out going forward how 867 we have a standard that works for those who grow corn, those 868 who refine fuels, the auto industry, and the environment. 869 And I would hope this administration would look to our 870 leadership in this effort as well as any independent actions 871 or the fact that we are actually a co-equal branch and the 872 House has some authority in this area as well as the Senate. 873 Will you commit to that? 874 Mr. Pruitt. I think it is essential, as I shared with 875 the chairman earlier, because at the end of the day certainty 876 is very important in this area. And I think you see

877	tremendous investment over the last
878	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. We will
879	make sure and I apologize. I just want to make sure that
880	we have a lot of people lined up. We will have more time
881	to talk about that.
882	The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
883	Mr. Shimkus. The chair thanks the Chairman and the
884	chair now recognizes the ranking member of the subcommittee,
885	Mr. Pallone, for 5 minutes.
886	Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
887	You know, I listened, Mr. Administrator, to your reasons
888	why you haven't resigned and basically you said that you are
889	staying because only you can carry out the President's
890	mission. And I strongly disagree with that. I think your
891	actions are an embarrassment to President Trump and distract
892	from the EPA's ability to effectively carry out the
893	President's mission and if I were the President I wouldn't
894	want your help, I would just get rid of you. But I am not
895	the President so let me move on.
896	It has been reported that you have even gone so far as
897	to retaliate against EPA's employees, punishing those who
898	questioned your spending and management, and sidelining those

899	who attempted to advance important public health protections.
900	So I wanted to ask again, yes or no, because we don't have a
901	lot of time, it has been reported that at least five EPA
902	employees were recently reassigned, demoted, or otherwise
903	retaliated against after they raised concerns about your
904	spending. Is that correct, yes or no?
905	Mr. Pruitt. I don't ever recall a conversation to that
906	end.
907	Mr. Pallone. Well, I will take that as a yes. I was
908	further alarmed
909	Mr. Pruitt. It shouldn't be taken as a yes.
910	Mr. Pallone that you removed the head of the EPA
911	office that found that you did not face direct death threats.
912	Has it always been your practice to fire people who disagree
913	with you?
914	Mr. Pruitt. I mean, Congressman, the Inspector General
915	himself has noted that the threats against me are
916	unprecedented
917	Mr. Pallone. Well, you are not answering yes or no. So
918	again
919	Mr. Pruitt with respect to the quantity and the
920	type of threats and is on the record saying so.

921	Mr. Pallone. Okay. Look, six staffers is a pattern, I
922	think you need to start taking responsibility. But you say
923	you are going to take responsibility but you don't. I am
924	very concerned by this troubling pattern of retaliation which
925	is not only potentially illegal but is also creating a
926	hostile environment that is expediting the exodus of valuable
927	expertise from the EPA. In place of those dedicated public
928	servants you are installing industry lobbyists.
929	Let's look at the case of Wendy Cleland-Hamnett, an
930	expert who fought to finalize a ban on methylene chloride, a
931	deadly chemical used in paint strippers. The New York Times
932	and other media have reported that her efforts were opposed
933	by Nancy Beck, the chemical industry lobbyist you put in
934	charge of regulating chemicals. Just last year, Nancy Beck
935	was being paid by the chemical industry to lobby against
936	chemical regulations. Now that she is retired, Nancy Beck is
937	running the chemical program and the proposal to ban
938	methylene chloride has been abandoned.
939	Yes or no, were you involved in the decision to abandon
940	that rulemaking or was that decision made by Nancy Beck?
941	Mr. Pruitt. The rulemaking has not been abandoned.
942	Actually there is a proposed rule

943	Mr. Pallone. Well, you say that but that is not
944	accurate. Do you know that manufacturers of methylene
945	chloride paint strippers have been aware of deaths linked to
946	this use for more than 28 years but continue to produce it?
947	Yes or no.
948	Mr. Pruitt. That is actually a solvent that we are
949	considering under the
950	Mr. Pallone. Okay. Obviously you don't want to admit
951	what it does. Despite all your scandals, the White House
952	says you have the President's support because you are
953	implementing his deregulatory agenda, but I think that agenda
954	has real costs. In October 2017, right before EPA abandoned
955	the rulemaking, Drew Wynne, a 31 year old small business
956	owner in South Carolina, died while using methylene chloride.
957	Drew's brother is here today and I want to thank him for
958	traveling here from South Carolina and continuing to advocate
959	for a ban of this deadly chemical.
960	Were you or others at EPA aware of Drew Wynne's death
961	when the Agency abandoned the ban of this deadly chemical?
962	Yes or no, were you aware of his death?
963	Mr. Pruitt. I think it is important, Congressman, to
964	know that we have a proposed ban in place that is being

965	considered and we are taking comments on and we haven't
966	finished that process.
967	Mr. Pallone. Well, obviously you are not going to admit
968	whether you know about Drew's death. Unfortunately, in
969	February another 31 year old man, Joshua Atkins, died using a
970	methylene chloride paint stripper to refinish his bike. I
971	learned about Joshua from his mother Lauren who sent me a
972	deeply touching letter.
973	And I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to put
974	that letter into the record, in which she states her hope
975	that her son will be the last to die from this chemical.
976	Mr. Shimkus. Can we make sure we see the letter?
977	Mr. Pallone. Yes. I will give it to you right now, Mr.
978	Chairman.
979	Again, Mr. Pruitt, your deregulatory agenda costs lives,
980	real people with names, with brothers, with mothers. You
981	have the power to finalize the ban of methylene chloride now
982	and prevent more deaths but you haven't done it. Do you have
983	anything to say to these families at this point?
984	Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, as I was trying to indicate
985	earlier there is a proposed ban in place that we took comment
986	on that we are reviewing presently. There has been no

987	decision at this time to not
988	Mr. Pallone. All right. Well, obviously you have
989	nothing to say to these families. Look, you say you are
990	going to do something but these chemicals are still on the
991	shelves and they make a mockery of Lautenberg's TSCA reform
992	legislation that this committee worked so hard on, including
993	our chairman Mr. Shimkus, and it makes a mockery of the EPA.
994	You have the power immediately to get this chemical off the
995	shelves and you are not doing it and you should do it.
996	And again, Mr. Shimkus, I appreciate your help with
997	TSCA, but he is not implementing TSCA so I am wondering if
998	our efforts were totally in vain. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
999	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
1000	chair thanks the gentleman. The chair now recognizes
1001	Chairman Emeritus Congressman Barton from Texas for 5
1002	minutes.
1003	Mr. Barton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I am honored
1004	to have the EPA Administrator back before the committee.
1005	Mr. Administrator, you are not the first person to be
1006	the victim of, for lack of a better term, Washington
1007	politics. You got picked to be the EPA Administrator because
1008	of the service you provided for the great state of Oklahoma

1009	in fighting some of the Obama administration radical clean
1010	air policies. You recommended and I support the
1011	recommendation that you made to the President that we
1012	withdraw from the Paris climate change agreement. That is a
1013	decision that most of the stakeholders at EPA violently
1014	oppose.
1015	If you can't debate the policies in Washington, you
1016	attack the personality and that is what is happening to you.
1017	Republicans do it when it is a Democratic President. The
1018	Democrats do it when it is a Republican President. And in my
1019	opinion, and it is just my opinion, that is what is happening
1020	to you.
1021	On your housing costs, were those approved, the
1022	contract, before it was signed? Didn't you get an ethics
1023	review and didn't that individual say it was acceptable?
1024	Mr. Pruitt. There have been two ethics reviews,
1025	Congressman.
1026	Mr. Barton. I need quick answers because I want to ask
1027	you
1028	Mr. Pruitt. There have been two ethics reviews speaking
1029	to the lease itself saying that it met market rates.
1030	Mr. Barton. Okay. You have been attacked for flying

1031	first class. Is that illegal?
1032	Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, that was approved by the
1033	travel office and the security team at the EPA. I have since
1034	made changes to that. But that was
1035	Mr. Barton. But it is not illegal.
1036	Mr. Pruitt. It is not.
1037	Mr. Barton. It may look bad but it is not illegal.
1038	There was an Energy secretary named Hazel O'Leary under the
1039	Clinton administration. She leased party jets that were used
1040	by rock stars. Party jets, not one time but several times.
1041	Have you ever rented a party jet?
1042	Mr. Pruitt. No, Congressman.
1042	Mr. Pruitt. No, Congressman. Mr. Barton. You have not rented a party jet. Okay,
1043	Mr. Barton. You have not rented a party jet. Okay,
1043	Mr. Barton. You have not rented a party jet. Okay, that is good. Let's talk about this transparency issue. As
1043 1044 1045	Mr. Barton. You have not rented a party jet. Okay, that is good. Let's talk about this transparency issue. As I understand it, your transparency proposal is that if they
1043 1044 1045 1046	Mr. Barton. You have not rented a party jet. Okay, that is good. Let's talk about this transparency issue. As I understand it, your transparency proposal is that if they are going to use the science to make a recommendation on an
1043 1044 1045 1046 1047	Mr. Barton. You have not rented a party jet. Okay, that is good. Let's talk about this transparency issue. As I understand it, your transparency proposal is that if they are going to use the science to make a recommendation on an EPA regulation they have to actually report what the science
1043 1044 1045 1046 1047 1048	Mr. Barton. You have not rented a party jet. Okay, that is good. Let's talk about this transparency issue. As I understand it, your transparency proposal is that if they are going to use the science to make a recommendation on an EPA regulation they have to actually report what the science is. They have to release the documents and the data sets and
1043 1044 1045 1046 1047 1048 1049	Mr. Barton. You have not rented a party jet. Okay, that is good. Let's talk about this transparency issue. As I understand it, your transparency proposal is that if they are going to use the science to make a recommendation on an EPA regulation they have to actually report what the science is. They have to release the documents and the data sets and all of that. Is that correct?

1053	confidence of the American people as we do rulemaking.
1054	Mr. Barton. I think it is an excellent idea and it is
1055	long overdue. In your budget
1056	Mr. Shimkus. Will the gentleman suspend for a minute?
1057	We have guests in the gallery. You are our guests. I
1058	have some magic words that will then cause you to have to
1059	leave. I do not want to say that. So if you would respect -
1060	- we were asked for decorum. That is not being decorous,
1061	whatever the word is. So let's just continue on with the
1062	testimony and we will move forward.
1063	The chair recognizes the Chairman Emeritus.
1064	Mr. Barton. Okay, thank you. On your transparency
1065	proposal if it is actually accepted, we will actually get to
1066	see what the science is behind the support for the
1067	regulation. Is that not correct?
1068	Mr. Pruitt. It is. And I think what has been of note
1069	to me as I have been serving at the Agency is that there is a
1070	reliance at the Agency on many third-party studies. And as
1071	those studies are the support of our rulemaking, it is
1072	important to make sure that the methodology and data
1073	accompany those conclusions so that the American people can
1074	make informed decision about the rules and whether they

1075	actually are based upon sound science.
1076	Mr. Barton. This is to get a little bit to the budget
1077	we are actually here to discuss, there is a program in your
1078	agency called Leaking Underground Storage Tanks, short in
1079	acronym is LUST. The money that goes into that fund is
1080	supposed to be used to clean up or prevent leaks from
1081	underground storage tanks. To your knowledge, is there
1082	anything under current law that prevents a state from using
1083	it for other purposes? In other words, the money is supposed
1084	to be used to clean up these underground storage tanks, but
1085	my understanding is very few states use it for that purpose.
1086	Mr. Pruitt. You know, Congressman, I am not aware of
1087	that happening but it is something that we would investigate
1088	and look into if you have some information about that
1089	happening in your state and elsewhere.
1090	Mr. Barton. Would you do that and
1091	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. The
1092	chair recognizes the gentleman from California, Dr. Ruiz, for
1093	5 minutes.
1094	Mr. Barton. Thank you for your service.
1095	Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1096	Administrator Pruitt's ethical violations as the head of

an agency with a mission to protect the public's health demonstrate a concerning lack of integrity and a pattern of the rich and powerful putting their rich and powerful friends and their own self-interest above the interest of the public's health and at the expense of the common good. Clean air to breathe and safe water to drink is not a privilege only for the rich and powerful but a right for everyone, and the role of a public servant is to serve and protect the public, in particular the public's health.

However, the gross elimination of many public health protections are kickbacks to the rich lobbyists and corporation friends that have a real impact and I want to highlight one example. This week the EPA announced that it intends to limit the kind of scientific studies it will use in issuing new protections to only studies that make public the private, personal, confidential information of the people who participate in those studies.

Revealing that info is a clear ethical violation of any reputable research institutional review board in the United States. The type of studies you want to exclude are the same kind of scientific studies that were used to prove that lead in pipes and paints harm children and that secondhand smoke

1119	is a dangerous carcinogen. We are talking about landmark
1120	studies such as the Harvard School of Public Health's six-
1121	city study which proved a connection between air pollution
1122	and early death back in 1993. That just by living in a city
1123	with poor air quality your average life expectancy was lower
1124	than those who didn't. This study later became the basis of
1125	fine particulate matter regulations in the Clean Air Act.
1126	When you were here in December, you and I spoke about
1127	fine particle matter which, thanks to studies based on
1128	confidential patient health information, we now know is
1129	associated with premature death, asthma attacks, chronic
1130	bronchitis, decreased lung function, and respiratory
1131	diseases. You acknowledge these risks and agree that there
1132	is no safe level of fine particle pollution, but your new
1133	policy would block EPA from considering the studies that have
1134	shown these dangerous health implications.
1135	So do you deny now that fine particle pollution has
1136	these health impacts and will these new regulations cause
1137	your agency to disregard these sentinel studies?
1138	Mr. Pruitt. If they provide the data and methodology to
1139	the Agency and the findings it will be used.
1140	Mr. Ruiz. Well, that is a clear violation of ethical

1141	rules protecting patient confidentiality.
1142	Mr. Pruitt. Those can be redacted, Congressman.
1143	Mr. Ruiz. Who is protecting the subjects in those
1144	studies? So you have promised us a replacement rule for the
1145	Clean Power Plan. Will that replacement rule acknowledge the
1146	health impacts of fine particle pollution?
1147	Mr. Pruitt. We actually have been as you know a
1148	proposed rule in the marketplace on just that issue.
1149	Mr. Ruiz. Well, you know, I mentioned the risks of lead
1150	in drinking water. So with this new rule those risks were
1151	shown by epidemiological studies that protected the patient
1152	confidentiality and all the other intricacies of confidential
1153	information. Now your rule would lead to the idea that if it
1154	doesn't suit the manufacturers' intent that now those studies
1155	could be disregarded.
1156	So do you believe that mesothelioma can, or that
1157	asbestos causes mesothelioma?
1158	Mr. Pruitt. I do. But the confidential business
1159	information to which you refer along with personal
1160	information can be redacted.
1161	Mr. Ruiz. So that information so you have been in
1162	office, you know, you have dismantled protections for the

1163	public's health and there is, and protections for children
1164	who suffer asthma, seniors with respiratory illnesses, and
1165	you demonstrated a disregard for true scientific study, the
1166	scientific process, and the confidentiality of people who
1167	want to participate and help further our collective knowledge
1168	to protect the public good.
1169	You have done this to allow your rich and powerful
1170	corporate friends to create more pollution in order to
1171	increase profit at the expense of the common good. Again if
1172	children with asthma and seniors with COPD and I am an
1173	emergency physician. I participated in IRB boards. I know
1174	the importance of protecting the information in order to get
1175	more participants, and I have also treated children with
1176	asthma gasping for air or seniors at their last wits' end.
1177	When you remove these protections under the guise of a false
1178	transparency notion, then you are making life more difficult
1179	for everyday American families and this is disgraceful and
1180	the American people deserve better.
1181	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. The
1182	chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia for 5
1183	minutes.

Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you,

1184

1185 Administrator, for coming before us. I think that was the first policy question you got from the other side of the 1186 aisle, observation. 1187 1188 And to the public, I think this has been a lot of a 1189 classic display of innuendo and McCarthyism that we are seeing too often here in Washington that unfortunately I 1190 1191 think works against civility and respect for people in public 1192 office. I am hoping we would be able to stay on policy today 1193 as much as we could, but I can see some just can't resist the limelight, the opportunity to grandstand. 1194 1195 So having said all that I thank you for what you have You have been able to stay disciplined on these 1196 1197 I know in West Virginia the impact that it has had policies. 1198 on Brownfields Legislation of what you are doing on that I 1199 see the rollback of some of the regulatory reform that there 1200 is hope now. A lot of the people in the fossil fuel industry 1201 that they could see that deterioration in the past 8 years 1202 prior to that. There is some hope. We are seeing the 1203 economy start to rebound thanks to you and the administration 1204 of taking this fight on. 1205 So I know that if I could, I know just as an example,

here was an example that despite what has been said to the

1206

1207 achievements that you have made that the EPA just awarded \$1.9 million to research in drinking water having to do with 1208 1209 Flint, that research in Flint. People are ignoring the 1210 progress that we are making and they are trying to make this 1211 another attack on President Trump, and unfortunately there 1212 are a lot of people that are going to go along with that. 1213 So if we could, if I could get back to one of the things 1214 that has disturbed me some with some of the events over the 1215 last numbers of years was we had a good friend in Leslie 1216 Lampton who passed away last week. Lampton has Ergon 1217 Refinery located in Mississippi but they have the only refinery in West Virginia. It is a small, kind of a boutique 1218 operation at 23,000 barrels. I know the definition of a 1219 1220 small refinery is 75,000 barrels, so they are a third of the 1221 But yet, so they are struggling meeting all of the 1222 qualifications, all the requirements of a major refinery. 1223 Is there something that we could work together or 1224 something to help out these small refineries so that they can 1225 compete? Because they can't handle the RINs, they don't have a market for that with them. So is there something that we 1226 1227 could be doing to help out these boutique refineries? 1228 Mr. Pruitt. Congress has been very helpful in providing

a small refinery exemption under the statute. It is objectively determined. It is 75,000 barrels, as you indicated, production and we have received I think 24 applications in 2017, a little bit over 30 in 2018. And I would say to you that the volatility of the RIN trading platform is creating instability across the entire RFS discussion.

So it is really in everyone's best interest to get more clarity and confidence in how this RIN trading platform and relief needs to occur. It is going to benefit the ethanol industry, benefit the ag sector, and I think benefit those that are suffering with the RIN obligations. And so it is our hope that we can chart a path forward with Congress to achieve those kinds of outcomes.

Mr. McKinley. Okay. Mr. Administrator, for numbers of years we were working to try to get resolved something for it was sitting out here for 30 to 40 years was the coal ash issue and we got that taken care of 2 years ago. But my question then back to you as the Administrator is are there states that have opted not to put together their own program and turn it over to the EPA, or can you help us, like give me an update on where we are with some of the state

1251	implementation?
1252	Mr. Pruitt. We have provided guidance to the states
1253	with respect to developing their own programs and very few
1254	states have actually done that to your question. And we are
1255	working with those state partners to equip and educate them
1256	on the option by providing the guidance. I think it is
1257	important that they pursue it and I think it is important
1258	they pursue it in a timely way, and it hasn't taken place
1259	yet.
1260	Mr. McKinley. Have any states chosen not to put
1261	together their own program?
1262	Mr. Pruitt. I just think it is early. It is nascent in
1263	the process and I think it is just very few early adopter
1264	states so far and that is the reason we are working hard to
1265	educate and inform those states.
1266	Mr. McKinley. Mr. Administrator, thank you for handling
1267	all these issues and I hope that we can stay on policy and
1268	talk about some of the progress that has been made because I
1269	think it has been good for the environment. Thank you. I
1270	yield back.
1271	Mr. Pruitt. Thank you.
1272	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The

1273 chair recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. Peters, 1274 for 5 minutes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do want to ask 1275 Mr. Peters. 1276 a couple questions about the Superfund program, particularly 1277 about your friend Mr. Albert Kelly who you put in charge of the program despite his past. He was scheduled to appear 1278 1279 before the committee in January but he backed out at the last 1280 minute citing travel obligations. I know my colleagues on 1281 both sides of the aisle were disappointed in that, but Mr. 1282 Kelly sent a letter for the record that he would be willing 1283 to answer any and all of our questions regarding his lifetime ban from the banking industry and the illegal activities that 1284 1285 led up to that. It is now more than 3 months later, we have gotten no 1286 1287 information from Mr. Kelly. We are told that political 1288 leadership has been preventing him from speaking with us and if that is true that is certainly disappointing. 2 weeks ago 1289 1290 you were interviewed on Fox News by Ed Henry and he asked you 1291 several questions about Mr. Kelly. In the interview you said 1292 that the details of the settlement with the FDIC were private 1293 and that none of us really know what happened. 1294 So my question is, if Mr. Kelly is happy to share the

1295	details of his lifetime banking ban as a matter of
1296	transparency is he not telling us the truth or are you
1297	stopping him from doing that?
1298	Mr. Pruitt. I think Mr. Kelly if he is willing to share
1299	that with you he should do that.
1300	Mr. Peters. Terrific.
1301	Mr. Pruitt. And I would encourage him to do so.
1302	Mr. Peters. And because we do think that it is an
1303	important issue of transparency I am glad to hear that.
1304	The FDIC ban is not the only concern about Mr. Kelly.
1305	It has been widely reported that his family abuts a Superfund
1306	National Priorities List site. He is the head of the
1307	Superfund program, creating at least a perception of a
1308	conflict of interest in that he might be favoring the site
1309	that is next to his property. You have mentioned that one of
1310	your goals, one of your values is that you are committed to
1311	good stewardship of taxpayer resources.
1312	Has this financial conflict been reviewed by EPA ethics
1313	officials and, if so, were they provided with all the
1314	necessary information to conduct that review?
1315	Mr. Pruitt. I don't have knowledge about that,
1316	Congressman, if that has happened or not.

1317	Mr. Peters. All right. I certainly would ask that that
1318	be done. When you came to testify before this subcommittee
1319	in December you claimed that you had to remove scientists
1320	from EPA's Science Advisory Board because of, quote, the
1321	appearance of a lack of independence. John Konkus, your
1322	deputy associate administrator for the Office of Public
1323	Affairs who is tasked with reviewing millions of dollars of
1324	grants for EPA, was approved to provide media consulting
1325	advice to unnamed clients, likely including his prior clients
1326	from his Republican-affiliated consulting firm. Were you
1327	aware that Mr. Konkus was continuing to work as a media
1328	consultant for outside clients?
1329	Mr. Pruitt. I am aware that the ethics officials at the
1330	Agency approved that. That is what I am aware of.
1331	Mr. Peters. Don't you think this creates an appearance
1332	of a lack of independence?
1333	Mr. Pruitt. The ethics officials didn't believe that.
1334	Mr. Peters. Do you have an opinion personally about
1335	that?
1336	Mr. Pruitt. I don't know anything about the contract.
1337	I just know that the ethics officials approved that
1338	transaction.

1339	Mr. Peters. It just seems to me that if he is working
1340	for people outside the Agency with his fingers inside the
1341	Agency that that could be a lack of independence, and I will
1342	just offer that as my own observation then.
1343	You brought in Jeff Sands directly from Syngenta which
1344	was facing a very large fine from EPA for failing to protect
1345	its workers from a dangerous pesticide, chlorpyrifos. During
1346	his brief tenure at EPA this fine was reduced from \$4.9
1347	million to \$400,000. Were you personally involved in this
1348	decision to reduce this fine?
1349	Mr. Pruitt. It is my understanding that Mr. Sands'
1350	involvement at the Agency occurred after the decision in
1351	March of last year with respect to chlorpyrifos
1352	Mr. Peters. Okay. Without respect to the timing then,
1353	were you personally involved then in the decision to reduce
1354	this fine?
1355	Mr. Pruitt. I was not.
1356	Mr. Peters. And I guess, I think I would suggest it
1357	also creates at least the appearance of bias and
1358	independence.
1359	And now it has come out that your head of security, who
1360	was promoted to that role after you fired his predecessor for

1361	questioning your security spending, did outside investigative
1362	work during the 2016 presidential election for America Media
1363	Incorporated, the publisher of National Enquirer. That
1364	includes the period when AMI purchased and killed a story
1365	about President Trump having an affair with a Playboy
1366	playmate. Do you think that that outside work at least
1367	creates the appearance of a lack of bias?
1368	Mr. Pruitt. It is my understanding that is being
1369	reviewed. And I was not aware of that outside contract and
1370	it is being reviewed.
1371	Mr. Peters. Okay. I guess again I would say you are
1372	not answering the question, I think it creates at least the
1373	appearance of bias and we would like to see attention to
1374	that.
1375	Finally, I guess, just to follow up on the first
1376	question, are you willing to produce Mr. Kelly to answer the
1377	questions before this committee?
1378	Mr. Pruitt. I am not standing in the way of Mr. Kelly
1379	providing information to this committee or any other
1380	committee and that is a decision that he can make and provide
1381	that information.
1382	Mr. Peters. In the interest of transparency would you

1383	be willing to direct him to come and answer those questions?
1384	Mr. Pruitt. I don't think I have that authority. I
1385	would encourage him to do so.
1386	Mr. Peters. If you have that authority would you be
1387	willing to exercise it?
1388	Mr. Pruitt. I would encourage him to do so.
1389	Mr. Peters. I will take that as a no.
1390	I will yield back.
1391	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
1392	chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Tennessee for 5
1393	minutes, Congresswoman Blackburn.
1394	Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1395	And Mr. Administrator, thank you for being here. We do
1396	have questions about the budget. And we are always
1397	interested in ways that we can stop federal overreach and
1398	that is something that is so important to my constituents in
1399	Tennessee and something that we hear about a good bit and
1400	they want the EPA to kind of get off their back many times
1401	when they are manufacturers and when they are farmers.
1402	And as a matter of fact, talking with some of my farmers
1403	at Mule Day in Columbia, Tennessee, they were talking about
1404	the WOTUS rule and I want to ask you about that because they

say that they have to move heaven before they can move earth and so they want to get the EPA off their farms. And they are very grateful that we have had the delay in the WOTUS rule and it is important to them, it is important to manufacturers. They feel like they can move forward and do something and they are not fighting with this rule.

So I want you to talk a little bit quickly because I have one other question for you about where we are with the repeal and the rewrite on WOTUS and then the cost of implementing that rule and what you all have ascertained through your cost-benefit analysis of what the cost of compliance of that rule would have been.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I will address a couple things,
Congresswoman, in response to your question. First, the
decision on repeal as well as the replacement to the 2015
rule will all occur in 2018. We will be done with that
process this year. As you know and you made reference to
that, the compliance dates have been extended but we actually
have two other rules in the marketplace. One is to rescind
the 2015 rule and then a proposal will be coming out next
month with respect to the replacement that will be inspired
by Justice Scalia and I believe the intent of the Clean Water

1427 Act with respect to the definition of the Water of the United 1428 States. 1429 Mrs. Blackburn. Okay, thank you. Let's talk about fuel 1430 economy standards. We have auto manufacturers in Tennessee 1431 and in Franklin and we have Nissan, the plants over in 1432 Smyrna. We have GM, which is in my district down in Spring 1433 Hill, you have Volkswagen over in Chattanooga. One of the 1434 things they talk a lot about are the fuel economy standards 1435 and the cost per car that trying to go to these new economy 1436 standards would do, and you have talked about adjusting the 1437 standards. 1438 So there again I want you to talk a little bit about 1439 where we are when it comes to adjusting those standards and 1440 then what you see as the cost of implementing and then the 1441 cost of compliance. 1442 Mr. Pruitt. Well, Congresswoman, as you indicate we 1443 recently issued a midterm evaluation that occurred in April 1444 of this year and we determined that the standards that have 1445 been set were too ambitious and didn't meet the facts and 1446 data that we currently have at present. So we started or 1447 will be starting very soon a rulemaking process along with 1448 DOT to reevaluate those standards.

1449	I think what is important about the CAFÉ standards is we
1450	ought to endeavor as a country to set standards for lower
1451	emissions on cars that people actually want to buy, you know,
1452	and I think what has happened for a number of years is that
1453	we have created these arbitrary levels that has put a certain
1454	sector of the cars in the marketplace that no one is
1455	purchasing which means they stay in older vehicles which
1456	actually defeats the purpose of the very act.
1457	So we are working with DOT in collaboration interagency
1458	to address that and that proposed rule will be coming out
1459	very, very soon with DOT.
1460	Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. That sounds great. I think you
1461	are exactly right on that. And we hear that not only from
1462	manufacturers but from the dealers that the economy standards
1463	have pushed forward vehicles that people don't want to
1464	purchase many times and so they are staying in the car longer
1465	or they buy a bigger car that is heavier that they feel like
1466	is going to be a safer vehicle for them.
1467	So I appreciate you being here today and I will yield
1468	back my 30 seconds.
1469	Mr. Shimkus. The chairman thanks the gentlelady. The
1470	chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Green, for

1471	5 minutes.
1472	Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1473	And I want to, Mr. Administrator, I want to thank the
1474	EPA for a recent announcement of an agreement was brokered
1475	between International Paper and the McGinnis Industrial
1476	Maintenance Corporation which are the responsible parties for
1477	the site cleanup at San Jacinto docks and waste pits in East
1478	Harris County in Texas. Over the past 10 years, Congressman
1479	Poe and I have shared that area, although now it is in
1480	Congressman Babin's district. Our district lines change
1481	pretty often in Texas, anytime a federal court decides it.
1482	So we have been working on it for 10 years and I want to
1483	thank you for that. The reporting on the agreement stated
1484	that right now the remediation process is expected to take
1485	about 29 months. Do you know or can you say how certain is
1486	that timeline? Because having watched other Superfund
1487	cleanup sites, once you get into it you always find other
1488	problems. So.
1489	Mr. Pruitt. Well, I feel very confident at the timing
1490	on that, Congressman. Region 6 there in Texas and
1491	headquarters, the partnership that existed there working with
1492	the local community is exactly how this should work. There

1493 was a temporary solution that had been put in place at San 1494 Jacinto and it threatened the health of citizens in that area and this is a permanent solution that will be provided within 1495 1496 the time period you described and at a cost of \$115 million. 1497 Well, and I know that is expensive. Mr. Green. 1498 again this area is developing and for years we have had signs 1499 up at the San Jacinto River and the Upper Galveston Bay about 1500 expectant mothers and children shouldn't eat the crabs or the 1501 fish, but when I go out there I don't see anybody that is not 1502 crabbing or fishing. So it is really important to get it 1503 completely cleaned up so it can be restored. 1504 It is also an area where we park a lot of our barges in 1505 the Houston Ship Channel and recently those barges break 1506 loose when there is a storm or a flood and they will break 1507 that cap, that temporary cap that they have. And EPA has 1508 been really good on the job, the regional office in Dallas, to make sure they, you know, they keep that pollution at the 1509 1510 docks and from continuing to come out. 1511 Let me go to our --1512 Mr. Pruitt. If I may, Congressman, I think with the 1513 hurricanes that came through last year there was significant 1514 concern about those temporary measures being displaced which

was really what hastened a solution with respect to a permanent solution.

Mr. Green. Yes. Hurricane Ike actually broke the temporary dike but that was coming from the Gulf. Our problem last year was the flooding coming downstream that hurt that and also, like I said, barges came loose from their mooring and ran into it.

Let me talk about the Renewable Fuel Standard, because if you know the area that I represent at one time I had five refineries, now I only have three of them. But the American Petroleum Institute and ethanol industry agree on — there is not much they agree on. A number of waivers the Agency has granted under the small refinery exemption under your watch has managed to get everyone's attention. API wrote you a letter in February and stated their belief that EPA should not grant small refineries exemptions.

The law provides flexibility when it comes to small refineries, however, the press reports that EPA has been given as many as 25 waivers including some that refineries are not experiencing hardship and some may not be that small. The smallest I have in my area is a hundred thousand barrels a day. The other ones have two quarter of a million every

1537 There is lack of transparency in the small refinery 1538 waiver process and we understand and respect confidential business information, but the EPA is a federal government 1539 1540 agency and secrecy is not something that I think the EPA 1541 ought to be worried about and it gives appearance of 1542 partiality and unfairness. 1543 Do you know how many applications for waivers did the 1544 Agency receive in 2016 and '17 compliance years for these 1545 waivers? 1546 Mr. Pruitt. Well, it runs about a year behind, 1547 Congressman. The applications we got in '17 relate to the 2016 obligations and as I recall they were somewhere in the 1548 mid-20s that we received. We received more than that this 1549 1550 year for the 2017. But what is really driving this in a lot 1551 of respects, I mentioned this earlier, is just the RIN 1552 prices, you know, dropping to 40 cents, up to 85 cents, and the rest. And so you just see a lot of pressure on those 1553 1554 small refineries particularly because of these escalating RIN 1555 prices and the instability of the market. 1556 Well, I have said it many times in this 1557 committee over the last 10 years, the chair and I have a 1558 difference from southern Illinois to East Houston on the RIN

1559	issue. Has the Agency granted any waivers to facilities that
1560	output exceeds 75,000 barrels a day?
1561	Mr. Pruitt. We look at it on a facility by facility
1562	basis and the statute says that it is 75,000 barrels or less.
1563	So it is objectively determined in that regard.
1564	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. The
1565	chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas again, another
1566	one, for 5 minutes, Mr. Olson.
1567	Mr. Olson. I thank the chairman and Mr. Pruitt,
1568	welcome. I wish your second appearance before this committee
1569	was under much different circumstances. As you know there
1570	has been many press reports about problems at the EPA under
1571	your watch. These problems can't be solved by Congress and
1572	this committee. That is not our role. The solution is
1573	between you and President Donald Trump. You work at his
1574	pleasure and that is pure and simple.
1575	But today, right now, you are America's EPA
1576	Administrator and my home district of Texas 22 needs you to
1577	work hard for our district. We are still trying to recover
1578	from Hurricane Harvey. We also have a Clean Air Act that
1579	actually works with local officials, local governments, to
1580	make our air cleaner instead of pursuing goals that can be

1581 never be achieved with technology that doesn't exist. On Harvey I have to publicly thank you for two things. 1582 First of all, your EPA helped my home county of Fort Bend 1583 1584 break through this whole log jam of regulations to allow us 1585 to start dredging our flooded bayous, our flooded waterways, quickly, and get that stuff taken care of. You did that sir. 1586 1587 Thank you so much for letting my home county get moving 1588 forward. 1589 Also, I want to echo my comments from Senator Green, and 1590 by the way this may be the only bipartisan thing you hear in 1591 this committee today, but it is true. I want to thank you for all the hard work you did to fast track efforts to use 1592 1593 the Superfund to clean up the San Jacinto Waste Pits. As vou 1594 know, Hurricane Harvey displaced the protective caps. 1595 don't know how much dioxin, cancer-causing dioxin exploded 1596 out of there. You stepped up like that with a plan to fix 1597 that and that will be fixed sometime as you mentioned within 1598 the next year or so at the latest. So thank you, thank you, 1599 thank you for that. 1600 My first question is about ozone and air quality. 1601 committee has heard over and over about how the impacts of

ozone and pollution some of this happens outside of our

1602

1603 control, yet for some reason we have to regulate that. This 1604 ozone comes from as far away as China or maybe as close in 1605 Texas as forest fires in Bastrop County a couple years ago. 1606 These uncontrolled sources, which EPA calls them, can create 1607 chaos for compliance with their rules by local governments. 1608 They are just frustrated, frustrated, frustrated. 1609 Our President recently asked you to respond faster to 1610 states' petitions for relief under exceptional events and international emissions provisions of the Clean Air Act. For 1611 1612 8 years those were never used before. Now you have a great 1613 weapon to help us out. How do you comply with this new 1614 request from the President? Can you give this committee 1615 progress through efforts to make sure that actually 1616 exceptional events and international emissions are complied 1617 with and taken into account with the Clean Air Act issues? 1618 Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, thanks for the question. 1619 is a very important question. And I think with exceptional 1620 events I think there is probably more latitude we have, but 1621 you mentioned something else that I think is extremely 1622 important and that is the international transport, air 1623 transport of pollution and ozone. We have nonattainment 1624 areas all over this country that are being caused by what is

1625 occurring in Asia. There has been much effort, much work 1626 done by industry and states and citizens across the country 1627 to lower emissions with ozone and we have made tremendous 1628 success. 1629 But some of the problems we have are caused by others as you have indicated, particularly in the international arena. 1630 1631 So we need to find answers there. It may be something we 1632 need to come back to Congress and ask for your assistance to 1633 address on that particular front. Exceptional events, I 1634 think, are a little bit different. I think it is more 1635 factually driven than the other issue, but nonetheless it is 1636 a very important issue that we need to address. 1637 Mr. Olson. One final question, very briefly. 1638 heard over and over about burdens placed on states from 1639 regulation after regulation after regulation. 1640 administration would save the same life three times with 1641 three different laws, different regulations. That puts a 1642 huge bite into some local governments and local people trying 1643 to comply with the federal laws. 1644 Do you have the resources you need in the Office of Air 1645 and Radiation to issue guidance to make sure working with 1646 states that we count one life and make these things actually

1647	viable?
1648	Mr. Pruitt. Well, I mean as we came in to this, as I
1649	came in to this position we had 700 state implementation
1650	plans, SIPs, where states have invested money and resources
1651	to actually provide a plan on how to improve air quality and
1652	they were sitting on a shelf. We have moved on 350 of those.
1653	I mentioned that in my opening statement. But we need to
1654	focus on those priorities partnering with states and the
1655	first place to start is to work with them on those state
1656	implementation plans.
1657	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. The
1658	chair recognizes the gentlelady from Colorado, Ms. DeGette,
1659	for 5 minutes.
1660	Ms. DeGette. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
1661	Administrator Pruitt, when you were in front of this
1662	committee in December we discussed the installation of a
1663	soundproof privacy booth in the Administrator's office, or
1664	the SCIF, at a cost of over \$40,000. At that time you told
1665	me that your view was that the expenditure was appropriate
1666	despite the fact there were two other SCIFs at the EPA. Is
1667	that correct?
1668	Mr. Pruitt. This is actually not a SCIF.

1669	Ms. DeGette. Okay. Well, whatever it is, the
1670	soundproof booth, you expressed your view that it was
1671	appropriate, correct? Yes or no.
1672	Mr. Pruitt. I didn't express that \$43,000 was
1673	appropriate.
1674	Ms. DeGette. Yes or no. Okay, you are not going to
1675	answer my question. Did you know at that time that this
1676	expenditure violated Section 710 of the Financial Services
1677	and General Government Appropriations Act and the
1678	Antideficiency Act? Yes or no, sir.
1679	Mr. Pruitt. It is actually the opinion of the Office of
1680	General Counsel at the Agency that that is not the case.
1681	Ms. DeGette. So you are not going to answer that
1682	question either. Do you know whether any one of your staff
1683	knew that that expenditure violated these two laws? Yes or
1684	no, sir.
1685	Mr. Pruitt. The OGC again has indicated that their
1686	opinion is it is not a violation.
1687	Ms. DeGette. So you are not going to answer that
1688	question.
1689	If we can, please give the witness a copy of the April
1690	16th, 2018 letter. Are you familiar with that letter from

1691	the GAO, Mr. Administrator? Yes or no.
1692	Mr. Pruitt. I am familiar with the GAO's decision, yes.
1693	Ms. DeGette. Thank you. And in that decision
1694	Mr. Shimkus. Will the gentlelady suspend for a minute?
1695	Can we see a copy of that?
1696	Ms. DeGette. Certainly. I would be happy to present
1697	what is asked unanimous consent that it be placed in the
1698	record.
1699	Mr. Shimkus. After we look at it we probably will. And
1700	while we are waiting we are going to I think we are ready
1701	to accept that other letter that you asked to be submitted.
1702	Without objection, so ordered.
1703	[The information follows:]
1704	
1705	**************************************

1706	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady may continue.
1707	Ms. DeGette. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
1708	Now the conclusion of this was that these two laws were
1709	violated. Is that correct?
1710	Mr. Pruitt. Their conclusion is that those statutory
1711	requirements were not followed by the Agency.
1712	Ms. DeGette. Yes. Now did you know about that at the
1713	time?
1714	Mr. Pruitt. I did not.
1715	Ms. DeGette. Did your staff know about that at the
1716	time?
1717	Mr. Pruitt. About what, Congresswoman?
1718	Ms. DeGette. About these two laws that were supposed to
1719	be complied with before the expenditure happened, yes or no.
1720	Mr. Pruitt. As I indicated, the Office of General
1721	Counsel, career individuals at the Agency advised
1722	Ms. DeGette. No, I am sorry. You can't filibuster,
1723	sir. Did you know or did your staff know?
1724	Mr. Pruitt. I am not filibustering, Congresswoman. I
1725	am trying to answer your question.
1726	Ms. DeGette. Okay. Well, let me ask you this. The EPA
1727	has the ability to impose penalties for this illegal

1728	activity. Will you or your staff be subject to these
1729	penalties, yes or no?
1730	Mr. Pruitt. We are investigating this internally with
1731	appropriate individuals both here as well as the Inspector
1732	General.
1733	Ms. DeGette. Well, you don't know. All right, my next
1734	question, sir, is would you agree that public officials
1735	should be held to the highest standards of ethical conduct?
1736	Mr. Pruitt. I believe that, yes.
1737	Ms. DeGette. Yes. Now in that vein I want to ask you
1738	about two troubling financial housing transactions that you
1739	have been involved with as a state then a federal elected
1740	official. In 2003, you were an Oklahoma state senator with a
1741	state salary of \$38,400, correct?
1742	Mr. Pruitt. And also an attorney with a law practice.
1743	Ms. DeGette. Yes, correct?
1744	Mr. Pruitt. And also an attorney with a law practice.
1745	Ms. DeGette. Okay. Now you lived in a second home near
1746	the state capital purchased by a shell company, Capital House
1747	LLC, from a lobbyist, Marsha Lindsey, correct?
1748	Mr. Pruitt. It was not a shell company.
1749	Ms. DeGette. Okay. But it was an LLC, Capital House,

1750	correct?
1751	Mr. Pruitt. Which is normally how you buy real estate
1752	in Oklahoma.
1753	Ms. DeGette. You know, yes or no would work.
1754	Mr. Pruitt. I am seeking to answer your question,
1755	Congresswoman.
1756	Ms. DeGette. Okay. Now what was your financial
1757	investment in Capital House, LLC?
1758	Mr. Pruitt. It was one-sixth of the purchase price as I
1759	recall.
1760	Ms. DeGette. And so what, do you remember the amount?
1761	Mr. Pruitt. I do not. I did not negotiate the purchase
1762	price.
1763	Ms. DeGette. So you actually put that amount into the
1764	LLC. Is that right?
1765	Mr. Pruitt. That was the portion that I was responsible
1766	for, yes.
1767	Ms. DeGette. And did you actually pay that amount into
1768	the LLC?
1769	Mr. Pruitt. I did. I did.
1770	Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Now it has been reported that
1771	another lawmaker rented a room in that home and paid rent to

1772	you although you never listed your share in the shell company
1773	or that rent on your financial disclosures; is that correct?
1774	Mr. Pruitt. I don't ever recall that. No.
1775	Ms. DeGette. Okay. Was that rental income distributed
1776	among the owners of the shell company in the proportion that
1777	you contributed to the company?
1778	Mr. Pruitt. K1s were issued to each of the individual
1779	members. Those were reported as income through our tax
1780	filings and so all income was reported.
1781	Ms. DeGette. Did you pay taxes on that income?
1782	Mr. Pruitt. We did.
1783	Ms. DeGette. Can we get that information, sir?
1784	Mr. Pruitt. I can provide you K1
1785	Ms. DeGette. Did you personally pay taxes on your
1786	income from that rental?
1787	Mr. Pruitt. I can provide you the K1.
1788	Ms. DeGette. That would be great. Did you pay taxes on
1789	that income?
1790	Mr. Pruitt. As I indicated, I received a K1
1791	Ms. DeGette. I know you received a K1. Did you pay
1792	taxes on that income?
1793	Mr. Pruitt. That was provided to my accountant in our

1794	filing.
1795	Ms. DeGette. So you are not going to answer that
1796	question either.
1797	Mr. Pruitt. I am answering the question, Congresswoman.
1798	Ms. DeGette. Yes, okay. Did you pay taxes on the
1799	income that you got for your share?
1800	Mr. Pruitt. Congresswoman, as you know, you provide
1801	information to your accountant, they determine what you pay.
1802	Ms. DeGette. So you are not going to answer that
1803	question. Now I have some other questions about your D.C.
1804	condo but I am out of time. And I just want to say to my
1805	colleagues on the other side of the aisle and also to you, I
1806	am not doing this to hassle you. I am doing this because as
1807	elected officials and appointed officials we have the public
1808	trust. Everything we do has to be to the highest ethical
1809	standard as you just agreed with me. And when we have these
1810	transactions it brings disrespect on us as public officials -
1811	_
1812	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time
1813	Ms. DeGette and as the job we do.
1814	Mr. Shimkus has expired.
1815	Ms. DeGette. So I am just going to continue this and I

1816	would hope you would be forthcoming with this committee.
1817	Thank you.
1818	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired. Your
1819	unanimous consent request will be respected and we will put
1820	your letter, the GAO letter, into the record.
1821	[The information follows:]
1822	
1823	**************************************

1824	Mr. Shimkus. The chair now recognizes the gentleman
1825	from Ohio, Mr. Johnson, for 5 minutes.
1826	Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman, you know, I served for 26-
1827	1/2 years in the United States Air Force, and I do believe
1828	that public officials have a standard of conduct that should
1829	be beyond reproach, but so should Members of Congress. And,
1830	you know, I think it is shameful today that this hearing has
1831	turned into a personal attack hearing and a shameful attempt
1832	to denigrate the work that is being done at the EPA and with
1833	this administration and make this a personal attack rather
1834	than focus on what we are here to talk about which is the
1835	budget and the functioning and the policy work being done at
1836	the EPA.
1837	So I am going to redirect my questioning to you, Mr.
1838	Pruitt. Under the provision, under the previous
1839	administration the EPA put severe squeezes on job
1840	opportunities and businesses in Eastern and Southeastern Ohio
1841	which, by the way, we didn't make personal attacks when that
1842	happened, we talked about policy at the time. And this has
1843	had, you know, our district has an abundance of fossil energy
1844	resources and energy opportunities.
1845	Today we have an EPA that recognizes the importance of

those jobs and is willing to work with the states like Ohio to provide a healthy balance between jobs and environmental regulations. That approach has made a real difference in my state and in my district and I applaud those efforts at restoring sensibility. Along those lines I would like to talk a bit about New Source Review and the Agency's work to date on some of the issues surrounding New Source Review. In February, this committee held a hearing exploring the challenges that New Source Review standards pose for our energy and infrastructure investments and opportunities. We learned that many companies avoid carrying out projects to improve existing facilities because they are afraid of being targeted by an EPA enforcement action for having incorrectly interpreted New Source Review requirements. I have been encouraged to see the EPA's recently released guidance memos clarifying certain NSR program requirements and policy. So, Mr. Pruitt, from your perspective what is the goal of these NSR guidance memos and what impact are they having? Mr. Pruitt. Well, it is one of the greatest issues that I think we are dealing with at the Agency to address that which companies want to do across the country which is

invest, invest in capital infrastructure to improve the

1846

1847

1848

1849

1850

1851

1852

1853

1854

1855

1856

1857

1858

1859

1860

1861

1862

1863

1864

1865

1866

1867

1868	reduction of emissions. And so what we want to do is provide
1869	clarity. You mentioned a couple of memo guidances we
1870	provided. One is a once in, always in approach that we took
1871	to this issue along with the project netting approach that
1872	was a second step.
1873	So we are engaged in those kinds of initial steps, but
1874	overall we are looking at a comprehensive rule that will
1875	address New Source Review in order to provide certainty and
1876	clarity to those across the country that as they make
1877	investments to improve outcomes as far as emission reductions
1878	that they are not going to face new permitting requirements
1879	under the Clean Air Act.
1880	Mr. Johnson. Yes. Do you think the NSR program can be
1881	further reformed so that we continue to protect air quality
1882	while removing unnecessary burdens placed on industry?
1883	Mr. Pruitt. I mean I do. I think, you know, the Clean
1884	Air Act was last amended in 1990, 28 years ago, and so I
1885	think there are provisions of the Clean Air Act that should
1886	be looked at and that is one.
1887	Mr. Johnson. In regards to the Clean Air Act, how is
1888	the EPA striving to provide more flexibility and deference to
1889	state agencies?

1890 Mr. Pruitt. Well, as mentioned earlier, we are 1891 providing guidance in certain and many programs encouraging 1892 states to be active partners there. But one of the things 1893 that I think is most essential with respect to air quality is 1894 just the utilization of state improvement plans and us being responsive, responding to those Departments of Environmental 1895 1896 Quality, Departments of Natural Resources, whatever the 1897 agency may be, to really work with them in close partnership 1898 to adopt those plans and approve those plans in a timely way. It really sends a bad message when states take those steps, 1899 1900 invest, and then don't get a response from the agency for years and air quality suffers as well. 1901 1902 Mr. Johnson. Well, I have some other questions, but I 1903 am running out of time. 1904 Lastly, I know that EPA has expressed interest in 1905 finding a resolution to some of the concerns regarding EPA's 1906 current brick MACT rule which was issued in 2015. Would you 1907 commit to working with me and this committee in providing 1908 further information on this work and any potential 1909 possibilities? Compliance dates are right around the corner 1910 and it is important to provide this industry with some 1911 common-sense regulatory certainty.

1912	Mr. Pruitt. Yes, Congressman, absolutely.
1913	Mr. Johnson. Okay, thank you.
1914	And Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
1915	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. The
1916	chair now recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr.
1917	McNerney, for 5 minutes.
1918	Mr. McNerney. I thank the chairman.
1919	Administrator Pruitt, since becoming EPA Administrator
1920	your public calendar is filled with meetings with oil and gas
1921	companies, trade associations and lobbyists, but not with
1922	environmental groups or public health groups. It seems that
1923	deep pockets are a prerequisite to getting a spot on your
1924	calendar. Mr. Pruitt, isn't it true that you and your
1925	affiliated political organizations received nearly \$4 million
1926	in campaign contributions from fossil fuel interests?
1927	Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, I haven't looked at those
1928	numbers in some time, so I am not sure.
1929	Mr. McNerney. Well, I can assure you that it is. And
1930	as an example of pay-to-play, on June 5th, 2017, you
1931	announced that the EPA halted implementation of the methane
1932	rule. This was an attempt to retroactively delay the rule's
1933	requirements on oil and gas industry for 90 days. A few

1934	weeks prior to that on May 24th, 2017, you spoke to the
1935	American Exploration and Production Council.
1936	Mr. Pruitt, was your June 5th actions made in response
1937	to a request by the American Exploration and Production
1938	Council or any of its individual members?
1939	Mr. Pruitt. Methane is something that we take very
1940	seriously and will regulate. In fact, we have proposals that
1941	we are considering now to regulate methane going forward as
1942	part of the VOC approach. And so methane is
1943	Mr. McNerney. So you aren't answering my question. You
1944	had a meeting
1945	Mr. Pruitt. The actions that were taken then were
1946	unrelated to any meetings or events. It was actions to
1947	provide certainty to those in the marketplace with respect to
1948	how we were going to approach methane.
1949	Mr. McNerney. Okay. Well, I ask this because Concho
1950	Resources, an oil and gas exploration and production company
1951	is a member of the American Exploration and Production
1952	Council. Concho Resources also happens to be represented by
1953	the Washington, D.C. lobbying firm Williams & Jensen. You
1954	made these decisions on the methane rule that would directly
1955	benefit Williams & Jensen's client while living in a Capitol

1956	Hill condo owned by the wife of a then Williams & Jensen
1957	lobbyist with a rent of \$50 a night.
1958	I wonder what the owners got or tried to get in return
1959	for their generosity. This is another example of pay-to-
1960	play. Arbitrarily delaying a rule is illegal and the DC
1961	Circuit Court found your actions to be in excess of statutory
1962	authority.
1963	Mr. Chairman, I have a statement from the American
1964	Association for the Advancement of Science on the EPA
1965	Administrator's plan to disallow the use of scientific
1966	evidence in decision-making, and I would like to submit this
1967	for the record.
1968	Mr. Shimkus. If the gentleman would pass it over to the
1969	chair so I can look at it.
1970	Mr. McNerney. Mr. Administrator, do you have confidence
1971	in the AAAS and the Union of Concerned Scientists in deciding
1972	what would be best practices for transparency and good
1973	science?
1974	Mr. Pruitt. I am sure their opinion is credible.
1975	Mr. McNerney. Thank you. Then how can you justify the
1976	proposed rule disallowing science that was supported by these
1977	agencies?

1978	Mr. Pruitt. Well, the actions that we take at the
1979	Agency are different than their responsibilities. We
1980	actually issue rules of general applicability that apply to
1981	people all over the country and we need to ensure that the
1982	science that we use that underpins those rules actually show
1983	methodology, data, and conclusions.
1984	Mr. McNerney. Science which disagrees with professional
1985	scientists that are practicing professional scientists.
1986	Mr. Pruitt, by reducing the CAFÉ standards you will both
1987	allow more pollution on American streets and make U.S. cars
1988	less competitive with overseas manufacturers. Yes or no, did
1989	the \$4 million that you received from the oil and gas
1990	industry influence your decision?
1991	Mr. Pruitt. The decision we made on midterm evaluation
1992	was a decision based upon the record.
1993	Mr. McNerney. Administrator Pruitt, I find it very
1994	disturbing that you appear to personally benefit from many of
1995	your decisions and actions that will ultimately harm the
1996	people of this country, especially people who have little or
1997	no ability to defend themselves.
1998	Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
1999	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The

chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Flores -- we

got a lot of Texans here -- for 5 minutes. 2001 2002 Mr. Flores. That is right. 2003 Administrator Pruitt, thank you for joining us today. 2004 Let me start by echoing Chairman Shimkus' comments regarding 2005 the Renewable Fuel Standard. While I am pleased that the 2006 Agency is beginning to look at its authorities after 2022, I 2007 would like to respectfully remind the EPA that administrative actions prior to that time are limited by statute. 2008 2009 Accordingly, I request that the Agency work with Congress, 2010 particularly Chairman Shimkus, Mr. Welch, and me as we try to 2011 develop interim and long-term solutions, fuel solutions that 2012 are good for the environment and good for auto mileage, good 2013 for the American consumers, good for the agricultural and 2014 ethanol interest, and really good for all impacted 2015 stakeholders. 2016 A few minutes ago, Mr. Ruiz was trying to defend the 2017 EPA's practice under the prior administration of using hidden 2018 science to develop policy solutions and you weren't given a 2019 chance in regard to your efforts to open that process up and 2020 become more transparent with scientific studies. Can you 2021 spend about 30 seconds describing what you are trying to do

2000

2022	to make science inside the EPA more transparent, especially
2023	because it is paid for by the American taxpayer?
2024	Mr. Pruitt. It seems to me that it is common sense that
2025	as we do rulemaking at the Agency, when we base it upon a
2026	record, scientific conclusions that we should be able to see
2027	the data and methodology that actually caused those
2028	conclusions. That just makes common sense to me. That is
2029	the only change we are making. So any third-party study, and
2030	third-party study we are agnostic about who actually adopts
2031	the study, we are just simply saying to all third-party
2032	science they need to have methodology, data, and findings
2033	packaged together so that we can make an informed decision
2034	about the efficacy of their scientific findings.
2035	Mr. Flores. Okay. So I think you and I both agree that
2036	the American people deserve to see that science. It
2037	shouldn't be hidden as it was hidden in the prior
2038	administration. So I thank you for your efforts to make that
2039	science more transparent.
2040	Now to my questions, as the American people are well
2041	aware the EPA under the Obama administration abused
2042	environmental regulatory process by ignoring congressional
2043	statutes and by circumventing the U.S. Constitution.

2044	Fortunately, the federal court system stepped in to protect
2045	American families from this abuse of the rule of law. In
2046	this regard I have the following questions, one, I will go
2047	through the questions first and you all can respond
2048	supplementally if you would like to.
2049	Can you provide this committee with a list of those
2050	overreaching and overturned regulations that were overturned
2051	by the court systems? Can you provide this committee with
2052	the economic cost of those overturned regulations, and can
2053	you also inform the committee about EPA's actions, if any, to
2054	modify those regulations so those overreaching regulations to
2055	conform with the rule of law?
2056	Mr. Pruitt. Yes, on all fronts.
2057	Mr. Flores. Okay. And I would ask you to do that
2058	supplementally in the interest of time.
2059	Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back the balance of my
2060	time.
2061	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
2062	chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Michigan, Mrs.
2063	Dingell, for 5 minutes.
2064	Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2065	Administrator Pruitt, yesterday I sent you a letter on

EPA's January 25th, 2018 guidance to reverse the longstanding once in, always in policy for major sources of hazardous air pollutants. This document rolls back one of the bedrock safeguards to limit toxic air pollution from factories and industrial operations. The Clean Air Act requires EPA to control hazardous air pollutants to protect public health. These pollutants are the worst of the worst and they include many that cause cancer in children like mercury, arsenic, and lead. The law focuses on limiting these pollutions from industrial sources by requiring them to control their emissions using the maximum achievable control technology, or MACT.

The once in, always in policy ensured that polluters continued to clean up their act and didn't backslide on their progress, but in the January 25th guidance you punched a huge giant loophole in these critical public health protections essentially allowing sources to increase their toxic air emissions with no consequences. At a Senate hearing in January, you were asked about the new once in, always in guidance and indicated that, quote, it was a decision made outside of the Air Program office. It was a policy office decision, unquote.

2088	At the time, you didn't seem aware of the details and
2089	that happens when things are, you have a lot of stuff, but I
2090	am hoping now that you have had more time to familiarize
2091	yourself and I would like to ask you some questions. It is
2092	not clear whether EPA has any idea how many sources might
2093	increase their emissions of hazardous air pollutants as a
2094	result of this policy change and I would like to ask you some
2095	yes or no questions.
2096	Yes or no, did EPA determine which sources and how many
2097	would be covered by this policy change before releasing the
2098	January 25th guidance?
2099	Mr. Pruitt. Yes. There was a review of those issues,
2100	Congresswoman.
2101	Mrs. Dingell. Yes or no, thank you.
2102	Mr. Pruitt. And I would say to you that this was an
2103	incentive to companies to actually invest in emissions.
2104	Mrs. Dingell. Okay, did you, yes or no, did EPA
2105	determine the location of these sources?
2106	Mr. Pruitt. That is something that I would have to I
2107	don't know about the locations.
2108	Mrs. Dingell. Please, for the record yes or no, did
2109	EPA provide that. Yes or no, did EPA assess the magnitude

2110	of hazardous air pollution that could increase as a result of
2111	the January 25th guidance?
2112	Mr. Pruitt. It is actually a benefit with respect to
2113	providing incentive as I indicated to those major emitters to
2114	get into another category.
2115	Mrs. Dingell. Yes or no. So
2116	Mr. Pruitt. I understand that they looked at that, yes.
2117	Mrs. Dingell. Has EPA initiated or completed any of the
2118	previously mentioned analyses since the release of January
2119	25th guidance?
2120	Mr. Pruitt. The work that was done was in support of
2121	the guidance that was issued.
2122	Mrs. Dingell. It is also not clear whether EPA has
2123	looked at the potential health effects of this decision. Yes
2124	or no, did EPA conduct an analysis of the health effects
2125	including the potential increased risk of cancer of this
2126	decision before releasing the January 25th guidance memo?
2127	Mr. Pruitt. That is something we will have to provide
2128	and verify.
2129	Mrs. Dingell. Yes or no, did EPA conduct an analysis of
2130	the potential health effects of this policy on children,
2131	babies, or pregnant women before releasing the January 25th?

2132	Mr. Pruitt. That is something we will have to assess
2133	and provide.
2134	Mrs. Dingell. Yes or no, did EPA conduct an analysis of
2135	the potential health effects of this policy on older
2136	Americans for those with chronic health problems before
2137	releasing the January 25th guidance?
2138	Mr. Pruitt. I hate to be redundant, but that is
2139	something we will have to assess and provide.
2140	Mrs. Dingell. Yes or no, did EPA conduct an analysis of
2141	the potential health effects of this policy on minority and
2142	low-income communities before releasing the January 25th?
2143	Mr. Pruitt. I would answer the same way.
2144	Mrs. Dingell. In the absence of information from EPA, a
2145	number of independent groups have taken it upon themselves to
2146	analyze the potential toxic impacts this policy would have on
2147	communities near and downwind from major sources. They found
2148	that the chemical industry stands to benefit substantially
2149	from this loophole. Have you met with any industry
0150	
2150	representatives who requested the repeal of this once in,
2150	representatives who requested the repeal of this once in, always in policy?

2154	Mrs. Dingell. There is no incentives for pollution. I
2155	am going to conclude with one different subject because this
2156	is very important to me. You recently concluded the midterm
2157	evaluation of fuel economy standards for model years 2022 to
2158	'25. It is my deep belief that the auto companies, their
2159	workers, and the consumer have benefited from having one
2160	national program for fuel economy and that it is critical to
2161	preserve that moving forward. The importance of these
2162	standards besides saving energy, reducing emissions, is the
2163	certainty that businesses need. I am deeply worried about
2164	reports that California doesn't matter to you.
2165	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time is expiring.
2166	Mrs. Dingell. All right. I just want to say it is my
2167	hope that we can have one national program moving forward.
2168	If you do, we work on it together, everybody wins.
2169	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time is expired.
2170	We are going to accept for submission into the record
2171	the statement from the American Association for Advancement
2172	of Sciences.
2173	[The information follows:]
2174	**************************************

Mr. Shimkus. Just for our colleagues' note, the chief 2175 2176 executive officer is a guy named Rush Holt who you will all 2177 remember. 2178 The chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Hudson, for 5 minutes. 2179 2180 Mr. Hudson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. 2181 Pruitt, for being here today. I have two areas of questions 2182 I want to jump into with you. The first relates to the 2183 chemical GenX and the Cape Fear River back home in North 2184 Carolina. In your testimony you highlighted the importance 2185 of safe drinking water and the EPA's efforts to proactively 2186 protect source water as well as address contamination 2187 concerns. As I am sure you are aware, my state of North 2188 Carolina is facing growing concerns over the emerging 2189 contaminant GenX. I have been engaged with you on this issue 2190 several times in the past. 2191 My concern is that we have a chemical that is spreading 2192 that we simply do not know enough about. I am worried that 2193 on the EPA's website you state that a management plan for 2194 PFOS, the related family of chemicals, won't be developed 2195 until the fall of 2018. 2 days ago I received a letter from 2196 the Office of Water addressing some but not all of our

2197	questions that I have asked about GenX. I understand the EPA
2198	has posted comprehensive scientific literature related to
2199	GenX on its website, but EPA is also developing human health
2200	toxicity information on GenX to aid states and localities in
2201	setting or refining public health goals.
2202	I would just ask, sir, what information is EPA seeking
2203	that the literature has, does not already provide, and when
2204	will the results of the EPA's information development be
2205	available to the public?
2206	Mr. Pruitt. Yes, a very important issue and I have
2207	talked to the Governor there in North Carolina and it is
2208	something that I am aware of the issues in North Carolina.
2209	We will have a toxicity review by the summer.
2210	Mr. Hudson. By the summer.
2211	Mr. Pruitt. With respect to GenX. And as you know this
2212	is an iteration beyond PFOA and PFOS. GenX was a successive,
2213	you know, chemical. I am very concerned about its impact and
2214	we are accelerating that tox review and then we will look at
2215	further steps in the fall. But we have been in
2216	communications with North Carolina and the Governor
2217	particularly about that.
2218	Mr. Hudson. Great. Well, I appreciate the attention

2219	you put on this. What were the updates to EPA's risk
2220	management of GenX based upon independent laboratory analysis
2221	of compounds found in the Cape Fear River water samples and
2222	what about those findings can you discuss now?
2223	Mr. Pruitt. With respect to the toxicity review or
2224	other studies, Congressman?
2225	Mr. Hudson. Well, there were independent laboratory
2226	analyses of the compounds that was done.
2227	Mr. Pruitt. Yes. That is part of the work that is
2228	being done to support the tox review that will occur this
2229	summer and then there will be additional standards set in the
2230	future. But what we are trying to do is work with those
2231	states like North Carolina that have an imminent concern and
2232	trying to provide them guidance as they adopt state responses
2233	as well.
2234	Mr. Hudson. Okay. Well, then I don't know if you are
2235	able to make a conclusion yet, but was GenX used in a manner
2236	that was incompatible with the consent agreement under the
2237	Toxic Substances Control Act or are you in a position to
2238	determine that?
2239	Mr. Pruitt. That is something I am not able to speak to
2240	at this point, but we can get you the information,

2241	Congressman.
2242	Mr. Hudson. Great. Well, I appreciate the seriousness
2243	with which you have taken this and the work you are doing
2244	with our governor and also on this. So thank you for that.
2245	Mr. Pruitt. Governor Cooper has been very, very
2246	concerned about it and very focused upon it and it is
2247	important that we address it with him and the state.
2248	Mr. Hudson. Great, thank you. I would like to pivot
2249	now and discuss another area that you have highlighted as a
2250	priority for the Agency which is clean air. In the 47 years
2251	since the enactment of the Clean Air Act, the EPA has never
2252	taken an enforcement action against amateur racers who make
2253	modifications to vehicles used exclusively on tracks for
2254	racing. Do you support this policy?
2255	Mr. Pruitt. The policy of taking no enforcement?
2256	Mr. Hudson. Yes, sir.
2257	Mr. Pruitt. I think it is wise, yes.
2258	Mr. Hudson. I appreciate that. In 2015 under the
2259	previous administration, the EPA slipped a few sentences into
2260	a 600-page unrelated rule that proposed to repeal this
2261	policy. And after a public outcry and a number of us raised
2262	concerns they backed off, but they sort of left some

2263	ambiguity there about the legality of this. Would you
2264	support legislation clarifying that vehicles can be modified
2265	for racing and that doing so does not violate the anti-
2266	tampering provisions in the Clean Air Act as long as those
2267	vehicles are not used on public roads or used exclusively for
2268	competition?
2269	Mr. Pruitt. It is always helpful to us to get
2270	congressional clarity on these issues, so absolutely.
2271	Mr. Hudson. Great. Well, I appreciate that. I
2272	appreciate the time you have given us here today and thank
2273	you for your focus on clean air and clean water, goals we all
2274	share.
2275	Mr. Pruitt. Thank you.
2276	Mr. Hudson. Thank you.
2277	With that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back.
2278	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
2279	chair now recognizes the gentlelady from California, Ms.
2279 2280	chair now recognizes the gentlelady from California, Ms. Matsui, for 5 minutes.
2280	Matsui, for 5 minutes.
2280 2281	Matsui, for 5 minutes. Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

withdrawn, delayed, or weakened, rules on coal ash disposal, water pollution from coal-fired utilities, methane gas emissions from oil and gas operations, air pollution from glider trucks, formaldehyde emission standards, all translate into additional profits for those industries but negatively impact public health.

So it doesn't come much as a surprise that you have determined in the midterm evaluation that the stronger vehicle fuel efficiency standards are too stringent. I strongly disagree with this determination. There is a very robust record to support the need for stronger standards and the availability of technology to achieve them highlighted by the 1,200-page Technical Assessment Report issued by the EPA.

Administrator Pruitt, you have stated many times that you intended to operate at the EPA on the basis of cooperative federalism and the rule of law. But when it comes to California and vehicle emission standards all of a sudden neither of these concepts seem to apply. You have made it clear that you do not favor California's waiver under which the state sets greenhouse gas emission standards for vehicles and you have stated that California should not have, quote, an outsized influence on vehicle standards. But this

2307	position is inconsistent with your preference for states'
2308	rights, and more importantly it is inconsistent with the law.
2309	California's special status with respect to vehicle
2310	emission regulation has been enshrined in federal law for
2311	over 50 years. Section 209(b) of the Clean Air Act states
2312	the Administrator shall, not may, shall grant a waiver to any
2313	state if the state, not the Agency, determines the state
2314	standards will be at least as protective of public health and
2315	welfare as the federal standards.
2316	The auto manufacturers have repeatedly said that they do
2317	not want the protracted legal fight that would inevitably
2318	occur if EPA moved to revoke California's waiver. But many
2319	of your public statements allude to the Agency moving in that
2320	direction. So I would ask you, does the Agency intend to
2321	initiate proceedings to revoke California's waiver, yes or
2322	no?
2323	Mr. Pruitt. Not at present. In fact, we work very
2324	closely with California officials on that issue. I have sent
2325	EPA representatives to California
2326	Ms. Matsui. So that is a no?
2327	Mr. Pruitt to meet with CARB and Ms. Nichols. It
2328	is important that we work together to achieve, as was

2329	indicated earlier, a national standard.
2330	Ms. Matsui. Okay. So it is really not a yes or no. It
2331	is a
2332	Mr. Pruitt. Congresswoman, we are working very
2333	diligently and diplomatically with California
2334	Ms. Matsui. All right, okay. Okay.
2335	Mr. Pruitt to find answers on this issue.
2336	Ms. Matsui. Okay. Okay. Well, I believe the answer
2337	should be a no because you said you have said you want a
2338	national program and you won't get this without California's
2339	agreement. The law requires you to set standards that
2340	protect public health and welfare. California standards'
2341	does just that. California agreed to a national program to
2342	enter into an agreement to accomplish that goal. If you
2343	challenge the waiver or significantly weaken the standards
2344	you are not following the rule of law.
2345	If you are, in fact, doing what you were appointed to
2346	do, what you said you were going to do, you must uphold the
2347	law and set protective standards. So far you have
2348	demonstrated little intention to do that. That is why the
2349	entire country needs California waiver to ensure that public
2350	health and the environment are protected even in the face of

2351	an Administrator who cares maybe more about repaying special
2352	interests than about safeguarding the public's interests.
2353	Now, Administrator Pruitt, I believe, to a question that
2354	you answered from Mrs. Blackburn earlier, you said the EPA
2355	has data supporting your decision to revise emission
2356	standards for light duty vehicles. Will you commit to
2357	providing that data to both sides of the committee by the end
2358	of the day? And that is a yes or no.
2359	Mr. Pruitt. We actually have two responsibilities under
2360	this process. One is a midterm evaluation and then proposed
2361	rulemaking that will occur. And so we will provide the data
2362	to you that gave rise to the midterm evaluation.
2363	Ms. Matsui. Will you provide it at the end of the day,
2364	the day that you have
2365	Mr. Pruitt. I will instruct our team to get that
2366	together and get that to you as soon as possible.
2367	Ms. Matsui. End of the day, yes.
2368	Mr. Pruitt. I will instruct my team to get that and get
2369	that to you as soon as possible.
2370	Ms. Matsui. As soon as possible, hopefully within a
2371	week then?
2372	Mr. Pruitt. Well, we will get it to you as soon as

2373	possible, Congresswoman.
2374	Ms. Matsui. Okay. I will hold you to that, okay.
2375	Mr. Pruitt. It is my intent to do so, yes.
2376	Ms. Matsui. I will hold you to that. Okay, thank you,
2377	and I yield back.
2378	Mr. Pruitt. Thank you.
2379	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady yields back her time. The
2380	chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota, Mr.
2381	Cramer, for 5 minutes.
2382	Mr. Cramer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you,
2383	Mr. Administrator, for lots of things, first of all, for
2384	being here.
2385	And once again I never cease to be impressed with the
2386	incredible depth of knowledge you have on the details of so
2387	many things. It seems to me, however, the more details you
2388	know, the more some people demand and they expect you to know
2389	everything. And I have to say in my years both on this
2390	committee and on previous committees I have never had a
2391	Cabinet official that knew as much about the policies that
2392	your Agency is implementing as you have with yours. So thank
2393	you for that.
2394	I also want to thank you for your incredible, not just

2395 an understanding of, but commitment to, cooperative 2396 federalism. It is something that has been lost in previous administrations, including by some of your critics that were 2397 2398 predecessors to you, and the restoration of it is no small 2399 matter. And I want you to know on behalf of the people of 2400 North Dakota how very much we appreciate your approval of our 2401 state's application for primacy over class IV wells, which is 2402 our CO2 wells, so I think it was a clear demonstration of the 2403 policy. 2404 I am also, I have to say I am somewhat struck by some of 2405 the accusations that have come at you today. For example, 2406 you were accused of picking winners and losers with your 2407 policies. And I just have to ask, isn't the Clean Power Plan 2408 at its very core the picking of winners and losers by trying to regulate electric generation outside of the fence line? I 2409 mean isn't that a picking of winners and losers? 2410 2411 Mr. Pruitt. Well, I mean the Agency, in response to 2412 that, Congressman, actually defined a best system of emission 2413 reduction under the statute as being able to coerce decisions 2414 being made at the local level on how you generate 2415 electricity. So I think by definition that was almost 2416 picking winners and losers.

2417	Mr. Cramer. You have also been accused of hypocrisy.
2418	You have been accused of the lack of transparency by people
2419	who in the same breath are defending secret science as a
2420	means of carrying out their political philosophy, all the
2421	while accusing you of being the ideologue in the room. The
2422	irony is rich beyond rich with me.
2423	Mr. Pruitt. And I think what, if I may for a second.
2424	Mr. Cramer. Please.
2425	Mr. Pruitt. I think what is important with respect to
2426	the scientific transparency it doesn't apply to only certain
2427	studies. It applies to all third-party studies of every
2428	type. I mean many members on this committee, I am sure,
2429	would be very concerned that if API went out and did a study,
2430	didn't provide the methodology, didn't provide the data,
2431	provided conclusions to the EPA and then the EPA acted on
2432	rulemaking with respect to methane or other issues, there
2433	would be tremendous concerns about that.
2434	So it applies to all third-party science irrespective of
2435	the source. It just simply says data, methodology,
2436	conclusions matter and the American people need to be able to
2437	consume that.
2438	Mr. Cramer. Well, it seems to me and I appreciated the

2439 inquiry earlier and maybe you could elaborate a little bit on 2440 how personal data can be protected and is protected. 2441 is asking for the names of every victim of every, you know, 2442 of every pollution source that has ever happened in the world 2443 or that has been sourced in any study. They are not asking 2444 for personal data, we are asking simply for the science to be 2445 revealed. I mean you can protect the personal data, right? 2446 Mr. Pruitt. Both the personal data, Congressman, as well as confidential business information, both CBI and 2447 2448 personal information can be redacted and can be addressed and 2449 still serve the purposes of the proposed rule. 2450 Mr. Cramer. I have to say I think though of all of the 2451 accusations today, it was interesting after about 4 minutes 2452 of defending the swamp one of their leaders said so much for 2453 draining the swamp. 2454 Mr. Administrator, I think the greatest sin that you 2455 have committed, if any, is that you have actually done what 2456 President Trump ran on, what he won on, and what he has 2457 commissioned you to do in finding some balance in both 2458 carrying out the mission of environmental protection while at 2459 the same time looking out for the economy and jobs creation. 2460 And I just again for the people in North Dakota I appreciate

that so much.

In my remaining minute if you would take some time to just elaborate even a little bit more on the New Source Review issue, because, you know, in North Dakota we have a number of existing plants that are finding it very difficult to even meet the spirit of the intent, if you will, of New Source Review and I think it just seems to be working against itself.

Mr. Pruitt. I mean I think for the American people as we talk about, I mean what New Source Review is, is when you have a company that wants to invest sometimes hundreds and millions of dollars in their facilities to reduce pollution they refuse to do so because if they invest too much it is considered a major modification to the facility which then requires what, additional permitting responsibilities which they may not get. So dealing with New Source Review is something that is very, very important to actually incentivize companies and reward companies who want to invest in better outcomes.

It was talked about earlier with respect to once in, always in. That effectively is what that is because under the category of major emitters and minor emitters in what we

2483	said is that as you are a major emitter and you invest and
2484	you actually reduce your pollution down to minor levels you
2485	can actually be rewarded for that and actually, I think,
2486	incentivized to do that.
2487	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The
2488	chair recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. Cardenas,
2489	for 5 minutes.
2490	Mr. Cardenas. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for
2491	calling this hearing and also I marked your words that you
2492	said that today hopefully we are going to be talking about
2493	policy and stewardship. So I hope that we can get that on
2494	the record as well on both of those fronts.
2495	Mr. Pruitt, welcome to the people's House. The list of
2496	your failures is long and your wasteful spending is an
2497	embarrassment to government and very offensive to the
2498	taxpayers who pay all of our salaries. This administration
2499	is so packed with unethical behavior, but yet at the same
2500	time you have to understand that your power directly impacts
2501	health and well-being of vulnerable populations in this
2502	country seniors, our sick, and our disabled.
2503	It is tempting to ask why you spent nearly 68,000 on
2504	hotels and travel from August through February, just in 5

2505	months, and 50,000 on modifications to your office including
2506	a privacy booth that cost over \$43,000, and an oversized desk
2507	with ornate woodworking that cost over \$2,000, but we already
2508	know that some of these purchases were made in violation of
2509	federal laws.
2510	When you appeared before the subcommittee in December,
2511	this subcommittee, you said that your phone booth is used for
2512	classified conversations and sensitive conversations with the
2513	White House. Has this \$43,000 phone booth, has it been
2514	certified as a SCIF, and also so are you using it for
2515	classified conversations, is that appropriate?
2516	Mr. Pruitt. It has not been certified as a SCIF and it
2517	does provide protection on confidential communications. And
2518	I think it is important, Congressman, to know where this
2518 2519	I think it is important, Congressman, to know where this originated. I did have a phone call that came in of a
2519	originated. I did have a phone call that came in of a
2519 2520	originated. I did have a phone call that came in of a sensitive nature and I did not have access to secure
2519 2520 2521	originated. I did have a phone call that came in of a sensitive nature and I did not have access to secure communications. I gave direction to my staff to address that
2519 2520 2521 2522	originated. I did have a phone call that came in of a sensitive nature and I did not have access to secure communications. I gave direction to my staff to address that and out of that came a \$43,000 expenditure that I did not
2519 2520 2521 2522 2523	originated. I did have a phone call that came in of a sensitive nature and I did not have access to secure communications. I gave direction to my staff to address that and out of that came a \$43,000 expenditure that I did not approve. That is something that should not occur in the

2527	you are saying that staff did it without your knowledge?
2528	Mr. Pruitt. Career individuals at the Agency took that
2529	process through and signed off on it all the way through.
2530	Mr. Cardenas. Okay. So you were not involved in that
2531	is what you are saying?
2532	Mr. Pruitt. I was not in involved in the approval of
2533	the \$43,000 and if I had known about it, Congressman, I would
2534	have refused it.
2535	Mr. Cardenas. Okay. That seems a bit odd. If
2536	something happens in my office, especially to the degree of
2537	\$43,000, I know about it before, during, and after. But
2538	anyway let me get on to my next points. I am sure you can
2539	see the irony of this \$43,000 expenditure even though you are
2540	saying before the public that you are not taking
2541	responsibility for it.
2542	EPA's budget is far from unlimited. When you commandeer
2543	public resources for your personal use other lifesaving
2544	agency activities do suffer. In another troubling example,
2545	Millan Hupp, an EPA appointee who came with you from Oklahoma
2546	and was recently awarded with a large raise over the White
2547	House's objections, reportedly went out to open houses in
2548	search for a condo for you. Mr. Pruitt, I hope you

2549	understand that using public employees for your private
2550	business is illegal. Turning now to your highly questionable
2551	condo lease from Vicki Hart, I find it highly concerning that
2552	you apparently never had an EPA ethics attorney review the
2553	lease before you signed it. Did you have an EPA ethics
2554	attorney look at that lease before you signed it?
2555	Mr. Pruitt. On the other issue, Congressman, I want to
2556	address that I am not aware of any government time being used
2557	by Millan Hupp. She is a friend of both my wife and myself
2558	and has been for a number of years and she is a friend. And
2559	the activities
2560	Mr. Cardenas. Okay. You stated for the record that you
2561	are not aware that she used her official time. Thank you
2562	very much. But did any of the attorneys at the EPA look at
2563	your lease before you signed it?
2564	Mr. Pruitt. The review that took place took place
2565	afterwards.
2566	Mr. Cardenas. Afterwards, okay. And what did they say
2567	about that lease afterwards when they reviewed it?
2568	Mr. Pruitt. They said that the rate paid was comparable
2569	to other, what I leased actually was comparable to other
2570	arrangements.

2571	Mr. Cardenas. Did they state that in writing or
2572	verbally?
2573	Mr. Pruitt. Actually in writing, in writing twice.
2574	Mr. Cardenas. In writing, okay, can you get a copy of
2575	that to the committee?
2576	Mr. Pruitt. I can get the ethics opinions to you, yes.
2577	Mr. Cardenas. Okay, thank you. It was also recently
2578	reported that as Attorney General of Oklahoma you reassigned
2579	an investigative staff of the office to be your personal
2580	driver and security team. Are those reports accurate?
2581	Mr. Pruitt. I am not aware of what you are referring
2582	to, Congressman.
2583	Mr. Cardenas. Okay. All right, to my next question, in
2584	an apparent attempt to rebut reports, your Agency published
2585	data in February claiming a large increase in penalties
2586	against polluters, but that data included the penalties
2587	assessed by the Obama administration. In fact, 90 percent of
2588	those numbers that you reported were actually assessed by the
2589	previous administration. Did you intentionally claim credit
2590	for the enforcement actions taken by the Obama administration
2591	to obscure your weak record on enforcement, yes or no?
2592	Mr. Pruitt. In fact, the Obama administration cut into

2593	agents at that office. We have increased the number of
2594	agents in that office.
2595	Mr. Cardenas. Thank you. On my time
2596	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired.
2597	Mr. Cardenas. I just want to show you a picture of the
2598	Mr. Shimkus. The chair recognizes the gentleman from
2599	Michigan. The gentleman
2600	Mr. Cardenas that I grew up in and that is the new
2601	picture here.
2602	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman will suspend. His time is
2603	expired. The chair will recognize the gentleman from
2604	Michigan for 5 minutes.
2605	Mr. Walberg. I thank the chairman.
2606	Mr. Cardenas. I yield.
2607	Mr. Walberg. And I would thank the Administrator for
2608	being here. I appreciate you taking the time to do
2609	this. It is important for us as we work in our relationship,
2610	the constitutional relationship that we have time with you.
2611	So thank you for being here and thank you for your policy
2612	efforts as you perform your functions.
2613	Administrator Pruitt, the last time you were before this
2614	committee you told me then, I quote, the Great Lakes

2615	Restoration Initiative is something that we should work
2616	together to make sure is achieving good outcomes and I think
2617	it has and we will continue that discussion as we head into
2618	2018. I appreciate those words, but we have seen a lack of
2619	support for the GLRI.
2620	Again in this fiscal year 2019 budget request, the GLRI
2621	was funded at 30 million by this administration. Obviously I
2622	was and am not okay with that level of funding and worked
2623	with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the Great
2624	Lakes Caucus in an effort to restore full funding, which we
2625	did, for that. And I certainly would love to stand on the
2626	banks of one of the Great Lakes in my district, Lake Erie,
2627	with you, and just have an opportunity to discuss further
2628	what is so important about 20 percent of the world's fresh
2629	water resources being there in the Great Lakes and what a job
2630	we have attempted to do as Great Lakes states to make that
2631	work for us.
2632	Do you believe that 30 million is adequate funding for
2633	such a critical program?
2634	Mr. Pruitt. Well, I commend what Congress has done to
2635	address that. I think Congress restored that level to 300
2636	million, I think, in the omnibus.

2637	Mr. Walberg. 300 million.
2638	Mr. Pruitt. And I remain personally and as
2639	Administrator of the EPA committed to you to work
2640	Mr. Walberg. Will you make a request to the
2641	administration to work with us on that?
2642	Mr. Pruitt. I will continue to do that Congressman.
2643	Mr. Walberg. I would appreciate that because it is
2644	important and I think again it is something that we want to
2645	in the Great Lakes Region take care of that resource as good
2646	stewards and I believe you do as well.
2647	Mr. Pruitt. Well, the challenges there, the invasive
2648	species we know is an issue. We want to do all that we can.
2649	I was actually in Region 5 earlier this week and obviously
2650	they are very focused on those efforts as well. I am hopeful
2651	that we can find better outcomes as we go forward on the
2652	funding levels.
2653	Mr. Walberg. Well, with that, with invasive species and
2654	with algae bloom, which has been significant, touching my
2655	district, across the line in Ohio as well, when we discussed
2656	last time you mentioned that there would be an interest
2657	and let me find you said it is something that we ought to
2658	do going forward and ensure that there is a partnership like

2659	that and specifically referring to Agriculture and Interior.
2660	Have you had an opportunity to talk with Sonny Perdue or
2661	Ryan Zinke about this issue of algae bloom and how to address
2662	it in the Great Lakes?
2663	Mr. Pruitt. The Secretary, Secretary Perdue and I have
2664	actually talked about issues with respect to geographical
2665	focal areas, but Ryan and I have not. And I think it is
2666	important, you know, as I indicated, for states like the
2667	Great Lakes Initiative you have states that have joined
2668	together partnering and collaborating with the federal
2669	government to achieve better outcomes and I think that is an
2670	example of true federalism.
2671	Mr. Walberg. Is there anything I can do to assist in
2672	bringing that coalition together? I would be delighted to
2673	stand on the banks of Lake Erie with you and Secretary Zinke.
2674	Mr. Pruitt. Well, yes. We ought to do that together
2675	with the other two individuals as well.
2676	Mr. Walberg. Okay, next topic is the constant threat of
2677	invasive species. I believe we have an administration right
2678	now that isn't committed to some of the shipping interests in
2679	Illinois and Indiana that there were before and I don't
2680	discredit that. But we have a water resource that could be

2681	impacted in many different ways recreationally, commercially
2682	as well, if Asian carp, one of those species were to get into
2683	the Great Lakes.
2684	Can you please provide an update on what your efforts
2685	have been with the Army Corps of Engineers that have been
2686	dragging their oars in the water for too long on this issue?
2687	Have you had any significant contact with them in moving this
2688	issue forward?
2689	Mr. Pruitt. I have had contact with Secretary Esper as
2690	well as R.D. James there at the Corps on a multitude of
2691	issues. I don't recall speaking about this particular issue,
2692	but I appreciate you making me aware of it and we will talk
2693	to them about their involvement.
2694	Mr. Walberg. Yes, if you could get on that. That is
2695	just so significant. And it is amazing right now though we
2696	have seen DNA that have come from carp in the Great Lakes,
2697	thus far we are not seeing the impact of the fish themselves.
2698	We can't have that happen. If it happens there is no turning
2699	back, and this is an environmental protection issue. And so
2700	I hope that you will check into that further, and I certainly
2701	would like to check with your office.
2702	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. The

2703 chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia for 5 minutes. Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2704 2705 Thank you, Mr. Pruitt for being here. As you know, I 2706 have the honor and privilege of representing the 1st congressional district of Georgia which includes the entire 2707 coast of Georgia and it also includes the Savannah Harbor. 2708 2709 The Savannah Harbor Expansion Project is a billion dollar 2710 project, arguably the most important economic development 2711 project in our state's history next to the Interstate System. 2712 It supports the infrastructure and economic principles that 2713 were laid out by President Trump. It is exactly that. This is what he has been talking about when he has been 2714 2715 talking investing in the infrastructure in our country. Ιt 2716 is one of the most studied projects in the history of 2717 mankind. We started this project in the late 1990s. Since that 2718 2719 time, three ports in China have been started and completed, 2720 yet this is not completed yet. Back when you were here in 2721 December, I brought to your attention the Tier 4 emission 2722 standards that are being required for the harbor pilots and 2723 for their boats and the problem that it was causing us then. 2724 You understand that unless we can get those ships in and out

2725 of port, it does us no good to invest a billion dollars into 2726 this project. We have to have those harbor pilots and their 2727 vessels in order to get these ships in and out of port. 2728 Now the Tier 4 emission standards, I spoke to you in This was after months of my staff and 2729 December about those. 2730 your staff going back and forth to discuss this. 2731 time almost 5 months ago, I have had the harbor pilots come 2732 up to Washington at their own expense and their own time to 2733 meet with your staff. Your staff was completely unprepared. 2734 It was complete waste of time for the harbor pilots to be 2735 You gave me a commitment back in December that you would look into this. I need to know where we are at with 2736 2737 This is extremely important for us. 2738 Can you give me an idea of where we are at with this? 2739 Mr. Pruitt. First, Congressman, my apologies to you and 2740 your constituents if we weren't responsive. And that is the first I have heard of that and I will check on that very 2741 2742 issue and my apologies there. 2743 Secondly, as I shared with you recently, we are actually 2744 sending representatives, I think, to California to meet with the architect on the construction of the vessels to determine 2745 2746 whether there is a way to modify --

2747	Mr. Carter. When will they be going to California?
2748	Mr. Pruitt. I think this month. I think it is actually
2749	this month.
2750	Mr. Carter. This month, April?
2751	Mr. Pruitt. May, I am sorry. It is happening in May.
2752	Mr. Carter. May, so next month.
2753	Mr. Pruitt. Yes.
2754	Mr. Carter. Can I have the commitment that we are going
2755	to get this fixed? Are you personally involved in this? Are
2756	you personally looking into this?
2757	Mr. Pruitt. I am now.
2758	Mr. Carter. You are now as of today.
2759	Mr. Pruitt. Yes.
2760	Mr. Carter. But you told me you were in December.
2761	Mr. Pruitt. Yes. My communication
2762	Mr. Carter. Now you are telling me today. I want to
2763	believe you.
2764	Mr. Pruitt. Yes. So my communications to the team in
2765	December were to take steps and apparently that has not been
2766	done.
2767	Mr. Carter. That has not been done.
2768	Mr. Pruitt. Yes. So I will be personally engaged on

2769	this going forward.
2770	Mr. Carter. I certainly hope so, because look, I want
2771	to help you, okay, because I want you to help me. This is
2772	extremely important. This is, as I said before, the largest
2773	economic development project in the state of Georgia since
2774	the Interstate System. We have got to have this done. If we
2775	don't have the bar policy, they don't have the vessels and
2776	the manufacturer is telling us that they cannot meet the Tier
2777	4 emission standards and build these vessels that they need.
2778	Mr. Pruitt. I think it is also a competitive situation
2779	with other regulations outside of our agency that are causing
2780	a certain type of vessel along with the engine. So there is
2781	work to be done.
2782	Mr. Carter. I just need a commitment. Can I have a
2783	commitment from you that this will be resolved in 30 days?
2784	Mr. Pruitt. You have the commitment from me to get
2785	engaged on this issue with our Air Office to find answers.
2786	We will have answers
2787	Mr. Carter. Can I have a commitment from you that you
2788	will get this resolved as soon as you can?
2789	Mr. Pruitt. I will find answers to this within 30 days.
2790	Mr. Carter. Okay. I can't stress to you how important

2791	this is. Also, the Tier 4 emission standards are causing
2792	problems with generators. They are not able to build the
2793	large one megawatt generators. And keep in mind now I said I
2794	was representing the entire coast of Georgia. We have
2795	hurricanes in Georgia, therefore we need generators. In
2796	fact, in one 11-month period we had two hurricanes. They
2797	cannot make these. Will you commit to reviewing the Tier 4
2798	standards to see if they are practical and if they are
2799	rational?
2800	Mr. Pruitt. Yes. I will engage in conversations around
2801	this issue with our Air Office to see what the options are.
2802	Mr. Carter. The last thing I want to ask you about is
2803	biobutanol. It is my understanding that you have
2804	Mr. Pruitt. About what, I am sorry?
2805	Mr. Carter. I am sorry?
2806	Mr. Pruitt. About what, I am sorry?
2807	Mr. Carter. Biobutanol.
2808	Mr. Pruitt. Okay.
2809	Mr. Carter. This is one of the biofuels that is an
2810	alternative fuel and it is my understanding that you have a
2811	comment period that is about to end at the end of April; is
2812	that correct?

2813	Mr. Pruitt. I can verify that.
2814	Mr. Carter. Okay. Well, please verify that because as
2815	you know the ethanol additives cause a lot of deterioration
2816	to marine engines. Biobutanol as I understand it is much
2817	better, much more compatible for marine engines and we need
2818	that to come to market. When this comment period is up I
2819	hope that you will act on it.
2820	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is
2821	Mr. Pruitt. Pathway for advanced categories under the
2822	RFS, is that what you are referring to?
2823	Mr. Carter. Yes.
2824	Mr. Pruitt. Okay.
2825	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired.
2826	Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
2827	Mr. Shimkus. The chair recognizes the gentleman from
2828	Mississippi for 5 minutes, Mr. Harper.
2829	Mr. Harper. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
2830	Administrator Pruitt, welcome. It appears that it has
2831	become a political blood sport to try to destroy anybody
2832	associated with the Trump administration, and I want to say
2833	thank you for what your Agency has done and the attention
2834	that they have given to the New Source Performance Standards

2835 for residential wood heaters. That was very helpful to some, 2836 you know, employers that were in real danger of not being 2837 able to meet a particular deadline and I appreciate the work 2838 that your Agency has done on that. 2839 And I also want to ask you a few questions and I need to 2840 ask you about a series of media reports that I found 2841 particularly concerning. According to these reports at least 2842 five EPA officials have been reassigned, demoted, or requested to switch jobs because they raised concerns about 2843 2844 your spending and management of the Agency. You know, you 2845 have already testified this morning that these actions were 2846 based on other reasons, but even the implication of 2847 retaliation can have an impact on the morale of EPA 2848 employees. Will you explain these allegations and tell us 2849 what steps EPA takes to investigate allegations brought 2850 forward by EPA employees? 2851 Mr. Pruitt. First, there is no truth to the assertion 2852 that decisions have been made about reassignment or otherwise 2853 as far as employment status based upon the things that you 2854 reference. I am not aware of that ever happening and it is

something I want to make very, very clear. The individuals,

I don't know to whom you reference across the board, but the

2855

2856

2857	folks that I am aware of two of those individuals are SES
2858	individuals that are serving in other capacities. They are
2859	actually still employees of the Agency.
2860	So I think that is important to note, but I just want to
2861	emphasize very, very clearly to you that there is no actions
2862	that we have taken that I am aware of related in any way to
2863	the issues you raise as far as reassignment or employment
2864	action based upon that.
2865	Mr. Harper. Can you assure me and the employees of EPA
2866	that all whistleblower complaints are taken seriously at EPA
2867	and that you will make your best efforts to ensure that
2868	whistleblowers are protected from any kind of retaliation?
2869	Mr. Pruitt. Absolutely, and I think that is how we get
2870	better. I think that is how we improve outcomes and
2871	processes. And this is not one of those situations,
2872	Congressman, in this situation, but absolutely, prospectively
2873	that is something that I can commit to you and will commit to
2874	you.
2875	Mr. Harper. You know, I have had some of my
2876	constituents raise an issue regarding oil spill response
2877	training and I am told that the funding for certain training
2878	courses for federal and local responders involved in inland

2879	oil spill prevention and cleanup have been eliminated and
2880	that the EPA Environmental Response Team is no longer able to
2881	consistently make these courses available. With an increase
2882	in oil production across the country there remains a need for
2883	oil spill response training for local, state, and federal
2884	responders.
2885	Would you be willing to commit to looking into whether
2886	funding can and will be made available for what we believe is
2887	a very important training?
2888	Mr. Pruitt. Yes. Yes, Congressman, I agree with that.
2889	Mr. Harper. Over the last 6 years, EPA has used its
2890	discretion to reduce and perhaps eliminate the effectiveness
2891	of the on-site technical assistance appropriated by Congress
2892	to small and rural communities in my home state of
2893	Mississippi including terminating funding for my state's two
2894	full-time EPA funded circuit rider positions. My rural and
2895	small communities have told me numerous times, however, that
2896	this is the best and most helpful assistance with EPA water
2897	standards and unfunded mandates.
2898	So to address this problem in 2015, Congress passed and
2899	the President signed a version of my bill, the Grassroots
2900	Rural and Small Community Water Systems Assistance Act,

2901 solely to stop this problem that was caused by EPA and still 2902 continues today. So this bill requires EPA to give preference to the technical assistance that small and rural 2903 2904 communities find the most beneficial and effective. 2905 So on April 11th of 2018, EPA announced the award of technical assistance grants. It was my hope that this 2906 2907 announcement would have returned the two full-time circuit 2908 rider positions funded by EPA to Mississippi and the other 2909 states, yet I am told that there is less help with EPA 2910 mandates to small and rural communities. So did EPA conduct 2911 a review of what small communities find is the most beneficial and will you look into this for possible necessary 2912 2913 correction? 2914 Mr. Pruitt. Yes. So those TAG grants are so important. 2915 And when you reference small and rural communities, some of our water infrastructure we think about the dense markets as 2916 2917 far as the age in infrastructure across the country but those rural communities also need tremendous assistance. So those 2918 2919 TAG grants are something that should be a focus in that area 2920 that you raised and I will look into the status of that for 2921 you. 2922 Mr. Harper. Thank you very much for what you are doing

2923 for the country. 2924 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. 2925 chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Rush, for 5 2926 minutes. 2927 Administrator Pruitt, I must say unlike my Mr. Rush. colleagues, no, thank you, no, thank you, to the policies of 2928 the Environmental Protection Agency under your tenure. But 2929 2930 in my home city of Chicago we are in the middle of a dire 2931 situation as reported in a recent Tribune article entitled, 2932 "Brain-damaging lead found in tap water in hundreds of homes tested across Chicago, results show," and this article is 2933 written on April the 12th, 2018. 2934 The article went on to state that in the nearly 2,800 homes tested between 2015 and 2935 to 2017, close to 70 percent were found to contain elevated 2936 2937 levels of lead. Additionally, three of every ten homes 2938 tested contained lead concentration higher than 5 parts per 2939 million, the maximum amount allowed in bottled water by the 2940 FDA. 2941 I understand that EPA is currently considering revisions 2942 to the lead and copper rule. This rule was supposed to have 2943 been issued last year, but the Agency under your leadership 2944 has repeatedly delayed any action on this. You have also

delayed action on the lead renovation, repair, and painting rule for commercial buildings. And your recent proposal on scientific data could block the EPA from considering landmark studies, what you misleadingly have termed, quote, secret science, end of quote. These important studies are critical in identifying potential risks to public health including those related to lead contamination, cancer as it related to smoking, as well as the health impacts associated with other dangerous contaminants.

And I would like to hear from you on how the Agency will move to phase out lead in drinking water such as require replacements of lead service lines as well as your justification for your attacks on established scientific data. I have also been concerned by some of your public statements expressing a belief that there might be a safe level of lead and suggesting that lead contamination of drinking water is caused by Superfund sites as opposed to lead piping.

Mr. Administrator, as you well know, even your own

Agency has declared that there are no safe levels of lead for

consumption. According to the Center for Disease Control and

Prevention, even consuming tiny amounts of lead can

2967	permanently damage the developing brain of children and
2968	contribute to kidney failure, heart disease, and other severe
2969	health problems. I also understand that this issue of
2970	replacing lead piping will require billions of dollars to
2971	remediate this problem on a national level. So I am curious
2972	to hear from you on ways that the EPA might provide financing
2973	and other mechanisms to help address this issue.
2974	As you know, the administration's fiscal year 2019
2975	budget proposed \$863 million on Drinking Water State
2976	Revolving Funds which is an \$81.2 million decrease from the
2977	fiscal year 2017 enacted levels. However, the most recent
2978	EPA Needs Survey estimates that it will cost over some \$472
2979	billion for capital improvements between the years 2015 and
2980	2034. I will be meeting, Mr. Administrator, with senior
2981	state officials in the near future to discuss these and other
2982	issues, but I would like to hear from you on what steps the
2983	EPA will be intending to address these critical issues which
2984	have of course
2985	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired.
2986	Mr. Pruitt. If I may, Mr. Chairman?
2987	Mr. Shimkus. Just for a short minute.
2988	Mr. Pruitt. There is no safe level of lead in our

drinking water. It is something we need to act aggressively

2990	upon as an Agency and as a country. We have estimated it is
2991	about \$45 billion to replace the lead service lines across
2992	the country, and with WIFIA and the authority this Congress
2993	has given the EPA, I really believe that we can prioritize
2994	funding in the WIFIA program up to four billion a year in
2995	over a 10-year process, or thereabouts, achieve tremendous
2996	results.
2997	Mr. Shimkus. Okay, the gentleman's time is expired.
2998	The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia, Mr.
2999	Griffith, for 5 minutes.
3000	Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
3001	Continuing along these lines, thank you, Administrator
3002	Pruitt. And, Mr. Chairman, if we could submit for the record
3003	the article from the Roanoke Times from today, the article
3004	came out yesterday but it is in today's electronic clips,
3005	"Virginia Tech team gets EPA grant to engineer citizen-
3006	science water quality project."
3007	As you will recall, in the previous administration there
3008	was a regional EPA administrator who looked the other way.
3009	The Flint, Michigan problem became a problem but it was
3010	exposed by Marc Edwards, the professor at Virginia Tech,

2989

3011	because he went out there on his own dime with his own monies
3012	and started doing the studies that needed to be done. Now
3013	your EPA has granted his group \$1.9 million to have folks
3014	test their water and send it in so we can find out exactly
3015	where the hot spots are whether they be in Mr. Rush's
3016	district of Chicago or elsewhere.
3017	And Professor Edwards says he calls this the largest
3018	engineering citizen-science project in American history. The
3019	3-year grant will support his team and some other
3020	universities that are involved and he said that all the work
3021	we did with consumers over the years and the students at the
3022	Virginia Tech, this bottom-up, organic science phenomena it
3023	created a tidal wave of understanding that couldn't be
3024	ignored. This is how science is supposed to work to me, Marc
3025	Edwards, Virginia Tech. If we could have that article put in
3026	the record by unanimous consent?
3027	Mr. Shimkus. The Democrats have looked at it and they
3028	have approved. Without objection, it is submitted for the
3029	record.
3030	[The information follows:]
3031	
3032	**************************************

3033	Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much. Now I am going to
3034	switch gears, but I couldn't help but think Mr. Rush's
3035	comments were so timely for that.
3036	All right, I am going to switch now to the final rule
3037	for Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards
3038	for Medium and Heavy Duty Engines and Vehicles - Phase 2 that
3039	was approved in the prior administration. You all are taking
3040	some action in regard to one part of that which I want to
3041	talk about in a minute, but I first want to talk about
3042	trailers. And I asked these questions of the prior folks at
3043	the EPA and I don't know how they have authority to regulate
3044	trailers when the Clean Air Act clearly says that the term
3045	"motor vehicle" means any self-propelled motor vehicle
3046	designed for transporting persons or property on a street or
3047	a highway and a trailer is not self-propelled, nor is it a
3048	motor vehicle, nor does it have an engine. It might have a
3049	compressor if it is a refrigerator truck.
3050	You would agree with me that this needs attention and
3051	that we need to make sure that trailers are not being
3052	declared by the EPA to be self-propelled motor vehicles, yes
3053	or no?
3054	Mr. Pruitt. Yes. We are in process

Mr. Griffith. Thank you. I have to move on to the next one because I have a more complicated one. You are also in the process of looking at the situation in that same regulation related to gliders and to big trucks. And I have a problem because my district has the Volvo North America truck manufacturing site, thousands of jobs, billions of dollars were spent to meet the new requirements. Now I would agree with you in that, that the law does not say the EPA can do what they did because they went after gliders and they didn't, they went after it and just said you basically can't do it, which they don't have authority to do because it is not a new motor vehicle engine which is defined in the code in similar sections to what I just read on the trailers, utility trailers in my district as well.

And, but what is interesting is, I do believe that there ought to be something because, you know, Volvo and other truck manufacturers spent billions upgrading. And what the code says is, is that you really don't have any authority over used motor vehicles during the useful life of that motor vehicle, but that is 11 years and 120,000 miles. So what is happening is in some cases the gliders are not being used just on wrecked trucks or other trucks that might be, you

3077	know, within that time frame, but they are being used on
3078	trucks outside of their useful life.
3079	Don't you think that it would be appropriate to take a
3080	look at and all that is in the law, you have that
3081	authority. Take a look at it and see what can be worked out
3082	so that we don't have trucks that are just being overhauled
3083	by the glider companies that are decades old and nowhere near
3084	meeting the emission standards of the United States, but at
3085	the same recognizing they have a right to do that if the
3086	truck has not used up its useful life as defined already as
3087	11 years and 120,000 miles.
3088	Mr. Pruitt. So that alternative is something that we
3089	haven't reviewed yet, but I appreciate you bringing it to my
3090	attention. We have been focused upon the statutory analysis
3091	both for gliders and trailers, but this is something we need
3092	to add to the evaluation.
3093	Mr. Griffith. And I just have to say what is
3094	interesting is, is I think about 80 to 85 percent of what the
3095	previous administration wanted to accomplish could have been
3096	accomplished if they hadn't done sloppy legal work. I yield
3097	back.
3098	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The

3099 chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Duncan, for 5 minutes. 3100 3101 Mr. Duncan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3102 Administrator Pruitt, thank you for being here today and 3103 I apologize for the abrasiveness of some of my colleagues who would rather tarnish your character than really try to delve 3104 3105 into the issues facing this great nation. 3106 I would like to spend a few minutes discussing the Obama administration's Waters of the U.S. rule, otherwise known as 3107 3108 WOTUS. And I know Congresswoman Blackburn brought it up 3109 earlier, but I want to go into a little more detail. As you know, this flawed regulation sought to expand federal control 3110 3111 over 60 percent of our country's streams, millions of acres 3112 of wetlands that were previously non-jurisdictional. 3113 allowed the EPA and the Army Corps to regulate almost every 3114 water from manmade conveyances to large rivers. 3115 The rule has created an unnecessary confusion and 3116 suffering for farmers, ranchers, job creators, and private 3117 property owners, and in reality the regulations have done 3118 very little to benefit environmental stewardship. WOTUS is 3119 by far the largest issue for agriculture in South Carolina, 3120 and I know on your multistate action tour this past summer

hosted by, I think, Super-Sod there in Anderson, you saw the 3122 real negative impact that WOTUS regulations had on farmers 3123 and local businesses. 3124 These regulations are emblematic of the aggressive and 3125 unconstitutional overreach by the federal government under 3126 the Obama administration and the habitual undermining of 3127 state and local authority regarding environmental matters. 3128 It is our responsibility in Congress to use our lawmaking 3129 power to enact legislative and permanent fix. 3130 Mr. Administrator, I appreciate your attention and 3131 efforts to curtail the WOTUS rules. We talked about that the last time you were in front of this committee about the 3132 3133 President's executive order, and I just want to ask this 3134 question. I saw earlier this month that you issued a memo 3135 taking control of decision-making from the EPA's regional 3136 administrators on important matters to streams and wetland 3137 jurisdictions. Can you elaborate on the intentions of this

document and why you issued that memo?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. There has been many decisions made at the regional level through delegation, as I was talking about earlier, utilizing that definition historically, you know, that 2015 decision and then even prior to that in 1986 and

3121

3138

3139

3140

3141

3143 the 2008 guidance. And so we had inconsistency across the country with respect to what jurisdiction we had, and this 3144 was an effort to draw that back to make sure we had 3145 3146 uniformity and how we review our responsibility on the Clean 3147 Water Act and make sure that every region is implementing 3148 that the way that they should. 3149 Mr. Duncan. So why is this important to Waters of the 3150 U.S.? 3151 Mr. Pruitt. Well, certainty is, certainty and clarity 3152 around the Waters of the United States rule is terribly 3153 important because, you know, if you have landowners across 3154 this country quessing about whether the EPA or the Corps of 3155 Engineers or any other agency at the federal government has 3156 jurisdiction over their decision, meaning that they have to 3157 seek a permit, then they don't want to find out years later 3158 that they should have got that permit and then face fines 3159 each day for those number of years. So clarity and certainty 3160 around where federal jurisdiction begins and ends really is 3161 at the heart of our efforts this year with respect to the Waters of the United States rule. 3162 3163 Mr. Duncan. All right. Is there any effort by the 3164 Agency to go back and look at these maps that were drawn?

Because when I look at the Waters of the U.S. ruling and I look at streams or doggone ditches in my district that were falling under the jurisdiction, these are ditches that only hold water in an increment rain event that aren't navigable waterways in anybody's opinion. And if you came out there and looked at some of these areas you would go, why in the world is that covered? Is there any attempt by the Agency to go back and review these maps and really pull some of those designated areas back in?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, that is part of our objective and effort with the rewrite of the Waters of the United States rule. It is not just that there was rescission, repeal in the marketplace. It is also what is coming next? Where is the clarity? Where does jurisdiction begin and end? Because these jurisdictional determinations you are referring to, you are right, they have been so inconsistent, so different in certain parts of the country that ephemeral drainage ditches, dry creek beds, puddles, prairie potholes in North Dakota, you know, considered Waters of the United States, which I believe looking at the text of the Clean Water Act clearly was not within the intent of Congress.

So that is something that we are going through that

3187	process, providing that clarity, and then those
3188	jurisdictional determinations will take effect or maybe
3189	change after that.
3190	Mr. Duncan. Just the last question, during my time as a
3191	state legislator we had instances where areas were considered
3192	isolated wetlands and these were areas where logging loading
3193	decks were loaded, were situated, and they sat there for a
3194	while. Water settled, no wetland, no streams, but bulrushes
3195	popped up because water settled in there from where the
3196	equipment had set and all of a sudden this area was
3197	designated an isolated wetland and wasn't able to be
3198	replanted, wasn't able to be developed.
3199	Is there anything the EPA is doing to look at those
3200	isolated wetland issues like that?
3201	Mr. Pruitt. Yes, and also prior converted crop lands.
3202	I mean there are similar issues around that issue, so
3203	absolutely we are.
3204	Mr. Duncan. Okay, thank you.
3205	Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
3206	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
3207	chair recognizes the gentlelady from California, Ms. Eshoo,
3208	for 5 minutes.

Ms. Eshoo. I thank the chairman for holding today's hearing and for extending the legislative courtesy for me to participate at your subcommittee which I am not a member of. I am very glad to be here.

Administrator Pruitt, public officials and public office have a public trust to live up to. We are called to hold ourselves to the highest ethical standards so that the people that we serve have the confidence that we work for them. Not for ourselves, not for special interests, but for them. In front of your title Administrator, is U.S. EPA, an agency that Richard Nixon founded. And I think if a public official loses the trust of people and his or her ability is then becomes crippled because of the trust factor.

Now you have a solid record of breaking ethics rules from the state level right up to the federal government. It is a long list and it includes wasteful spending. I think it is an embarrassment to our country and I think it is offensive to constituents. My constituents raise a lot of questions about and say how can he be doing this? So the question that I want to ask you might be a little unusual one, do you have any remorse for the excessive spending on behalf of yourself, the expensive air tickets, stopping in

3231	Paris, the amounts of dollars that you have expended at the
3232	Agency for an expensive telephone booth? I know you said it
3233	is for a SCIF, but there is a SCIF at the EPA. Do you have
3234	any remorse about this? Do you
3235	Mr. Pruitt. Let me say to you, Congresswoman.
3236	Ms. Eshoo. Well, you can answer it yes or no. Do you
3237	have any remorse?
3238	Mr. Pruitt. I echo your comments. I think that what
3239	you said is absolutely true about the importance of public
3240	trust
3241	Ms. Eshoo. No, I want you to answer me. I have sir,
3242	I have 2 minutes and 38 seconds.
3243	Mr. Pruitt and I endeavor to achieve to live in a
3244	way that respects that.
3245	Ms. Eshoo. Do you have any remorse?
3246	Mr. Pruitt. I think there are changes I have made
3247	already, the change from first class to coach travel. That
3248	is a change I have made. I learned about the pay raises.
3249	Ms. Eshoo. All right. Well, sir, you are not going to
3250	out-talk me. You are not going to out-talk me. You claim
3251	that Steven Hart, the lobbyist who owned the condominium
3252	where you paid below-market rent, never lobbied you.

3253	However, we now know this isn't true. Mr. Hart's firm
3254	disclosed that he met with you regarding cleanup of the
3255	Chesapeake Bay. Did you have any other official meetings
3256	with Mr. Hart, yes or no?
3257	Mr. Pruitt. The meeting that you referred to was not a
3258	meeting
3259	Ms. Eshoo. Did you have any other meetings with him?
3260	Mr. Pruitt it was with respect to an individual
3261	Ms. Eshoo. All right, I am moving on. Did you ever
3262	discuss Mr. Hart's clients or EPA business with him outside
3263	of official settings?
3264	Mr. Pruitt. There was no other meeting with Mr. Hart
3265	except for nonprofit.
3266	Ms. Eshoo. Do you have any other lobbyists or
3267	representatives of industries with business before the EPA
3268	provided you with similar personal favors that you haven't
3269	previously disclosed?
3270	Mr. Pruitt. Congresswoman, as I have indicated with
3271	respect to this situation with Mr. Hart and Mrs. Hart, the
3272	only event that took place was a meeting with a nonprofit
3273	Chesapeake Bay
3274	Ms. Eshoo. Are there any other instances in which you

3275	granted
3276	Mr. Pruitt and I am not aware of any other
3277	instances.
3278	Ms. Eshoo. Are there any other instances in which you
3279	granted access to donors or lobbyists to whom you owed
3280	personal favors?
3281	Mr. Pruitt. I am not aware of any instances.
3282	Ms. Eshoo. Your travel including regular upgrades to
3283	first class at the taxpayers' expense has cost over \$200,000
3284	since you became Administrator. Are you reimbursing the
3285	taxpayer for any of that?
3286	Mr. Pruitt. We can provide you the analysis that
3287	occurred in June of last year with respect to what caused the
3288	change to first class.
3289	Ms. Eshoo. I don't need any analysis. I know what
3290	airline tickets cost. I fly across the country every week.
3291	Mr. Pruitt. And I have changed that recently.
3292	Ms. Eshoo. No, so what are you going to you didn't
3293	answer my question. I asked you if you were going to
3294	reimburse the taxpayers for the overage and this includes ten
3295	trips to Oklahoma as well. So are you going to reimburse or
3296	what are you going to do about it?

3297	Mr. Pruitt. The travel office and the security team
3298	determine where I sit on a plane and all trips that I have
3299	taken with respect to EPA dollars have been for official
3300	trips.
3301	Ms. Eshoo. Well, you know what. With all due respect I
3302	may be elected, but I am not a fool. That is really a lousy
3303	answer from someone that has a high position in the federal
3304	government. I mean this is not a dodge-question day. We ask
3305	these questions on behalf of our constituents and I don't
3306	really find you forthcoming.
3307	So the last few questions that I would like to ask with
3308	5 seconds left is when you traveled to your home state
3309	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired.
3310	Ms. Eshoo did you attend political fundraisers
3311	during any of these visits?
3312	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time is expired.
3313	Ms. Eshoo. I would like an answer.
3314	Mr. Shimkus. The chair recognizes the gentleman from
3315	Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania?
3316	Mr. Costello. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
3317	Mr. Pruitt, I have, I think the opprobrium that you
3318	generated on some of these spending decisions is actually

3319 warranted and I have reviewed your answers and I find some of 3320 them lacking or insufficient. And I believe you have 3321 demonstrated, or you have not demonstrated the requisite 3322 degree of good judgment required of an appointed executive 3323 branch official on some of these spending items and I would 3324 like to follow up on a couple of specific instances. It has been reported that EPA officials who have 3325 3326 challenged your spending decisions and who have been 3327 reassigned or demoted were not reassigned or demoted over the 3328 challenging of your spending decisions but they all had 3329 performance issues. Have in each of those instances, those performance issues, been documented prior to them being 3330 3331 reassigned or demoted? 3332 Mr. Pruitt. I am not sure to what you are referring as 3333 far as a conclusion that they had been performance related. I talked about this earlier. I am aware of two individuals 3334 3335 being reassigned because they were in the SES category and 3336 that routinely happens in that category. I know of no 3337 instance where there were decisions made at the Agency based 3338 upon counts or otherwise on spending with respect to employment related decisions. I said that earlier and I say 3339 3340 it again to you.

3341	Mr. Costello. Are there instances where current EPA
3342	officials have objected to spending decisions that you have
3343	made who still remain in their present positions?
3344	Mr. Pruitt. I am not aware of any employment action
3345	taken with respect to anyone and spending related counsel.
3346	These individuals to whom you refer, I had limited
3347	interaction with them. They did not spend meaningful time
3348	with me with respect to spending and recommendations around
3349	spending. One of the individuals was the head of Advance.
3350	The most of the time I spent with him was in the field and
3351	not at headquarters. So there is really no factual
3352	connection whatsoever in employment status with those
3353	individuals and any counsel regarding spending.
3354	Mr. Costello. Now the issues of the two close aides who
3355	used to work for you in Oklahoma and their pay raises, are
3356	you saying that you were not aware that those pay raises were
3357	provided to them until after the fact?
3358	Mr. Pruitt. I was not aware of one of those individuals
3359	even seeking a pay raise. I was aware of another person
3360	going through the process, but I was not aware of the amount
3361	that was provided or the process that was utilized to
3362	evaluate that. And that is what I have spoken to

3363	historically.
3364	Mr. Costello. The other issue that has received a lot
3365	of attention is the \$43,000 phone booth. And you are saying
3366	that at no time from the point between when you learned that
3367	it was \$13,000 to the time that it became \$43,000, you were
3368	never apprised of the additional cost related to that?
3369	Mr. Pruitt. I was not aware if it, 13,000, 8,000, or
3370	43,000. I gave a simple instruction to my leadership team to
3371	address secure communications in the office and then a
3372	process began and we have documentation we can provide you on
3373	that, Congressman. Career individuals were involved in that
3374	process from beginning to end and made the decision that you
3375	see in that with the \$43,000 allocation.
3376	Mr. Costello. Now I tend to be very conscientious of
3377	those who have personal security related concerns. And I
3378	don't know who has said what to you or when, but I do think
3379	that there is a lot more to that than some people may realize
3380	in the general public.
3381	Having said that, it has been reported that, I believe
3382	the IG has indicated or at least someone in the IG's Office
3383	has not found some of the personal security concerns that you
3384	have proffered in relation to the enhanced security that you

3385	have received to be either warranted or credible. Would you
3386	kindly provide a little bit more detail on why you think you
3387	need and I am just going to be very honest with you. When
3388	folks read about trips to Disneyland, professional basketball
3389	games, Rose Bowl, and the additional security detail related
3390	to that, that doesn't sit well with a lot of people.
3391	Mr. Pruitt. So I can, Congressman, I can read directly
3392	from an Inspector General threat investigation and I can
3393	provide this to you. There are several on here listed with
3394	respect to threats and I will just read you two. "The
3395	threats were directed toward her father. The threat stated,
3396	I hope your father dies soon, suffering as your mother
3397	watches in horror for hours on end."
3398	There is another entry, correspondence between the
3399	subject and individuals. "Pruitt, I am going to find you and
3400	put a bullet between your eyes. Don't think I am joking. I
3401	am planning this."
3402	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired.
3403	Mr. Pruitt. So these are threats that the IG has
3404	documented. We can provide this to you. The IG has said
3405	that the threats against me as Administrator
3406	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman

3407	Mr. Pruitt are unprecedented
3408	Mr. Shimkus. If the Administrator, if you will suspend,
3409	I think the point has been made. The gentleman's time has
3410	expired. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from New
3411	York.
3412	Mr. Engel. Thank you, Chairman Shimkus and Ranking
3413	Member Tonko.
3414	Mr. Pruitt, the person appointed to run the EPA needs to
3415	be someone who cares about protecting the health and safety
3416	of people all across the country, and until now both sides,
3417	both Presidents on both parties, we have had a pretty good
3418	track record with our EPA Administrators. But your time in
3419	office really has been different. Your tenure has been
3420	stained by repeated abuses of public trust and violations of
3421	ethical guidelines, guidelines that are designed to ensure
3422	that the government's business is conducted with impartiality
3423	and integrity.
3424	But what really bothers me perhaps even more on top of
3425	that your agency is willfully ignoring sound science and
3426	stripping the protections that keep millions of Americans
3427	safe. You are making our water less safe to drink and our
3428	air less safe to breathe. You are increasing our exposure to

more dangerous chemicals and you are making our planet less healthy for our children and our grandchildren.

And that is not just hyperbole. Under your leadership, Mr. Administrator, the EPA has weakened standards for ozone pollution, proposed a repeal of the Clean Power Plan, announced a repeal of the Waters of the United States rule, abandoned the once in, always in policy that aimed to lock in reductions of hazardous air pollution from industrial sources, withdrew the mercury effluent rule, delayed the implementation of safety procedures at chemical plants to prevent explosions and spills, withdrew a proposal to track emissions of methane and volatile organic compounds from oil and natural gas facilities, proposed eliminating the Lead Risk Reduction Program, announced a reconsideration of a rule regarding coal ash, announced a reconsideration of vehicle emission standards for model years 2022 to 2025 -- and we did a lot of work in this committee on these vehicle emission standards.

You proposed repeal of emission standards for heavy duty vehicles. You announced a plan to weaken emission standards for brick and tile manufacturers. You proposed a rule reducing air pollutants at sewage treatment plants. You have

3429

3430

3431

3432

3433

3434

3435

3436

3437

3438

3439

3440

3441

3442

3443

3444

3445

3446

3447

3448

3449

scrubbed the content of your website including the page devoted to explaining climate change. You have removed the word "science" from the mission statement of your Office of Science and Technology. You have dismissed 12 of the 18 members of the Board of Scientific Counselors.

You stayed silent when counties failed to meet new ozone standards by an October 2017 deadline. Your EPA has collected far fewer fines from polluters than any of the last three Administrators during the same time, and more staff and funding cuts are looming which means even fewer toxic chemicals and other environmental hazards will be measured and the statutes that protect all Americans will not be enforced.

There is so much here, Mr. Administrator, that I wish I had more time. But instead I will focus on an issue that is in the headlines now and has profound implications for our future, the Paris Agreement. By announcing that we will abandon our commitment to the Paris Agreement, and we heard this from Mr. Macron yesterday being critical of it, this administration is setting the clock back on U.S. climate action and forfeiting our nation's position as the global leader in developing the clean energy economy of the future.

The move will only open the door for others to take our place.

This decision is bad for the planet and bad for public health. Scientists at the EPA and the U.S. Global Change Research Program have found that climate change is a significant threat to the health of the American people, increasing exposure to disease, increasing the risk of illness and death from extreme heat and poor air quality, and increasing dangerous extreme weather events. The Paris Agreement was and still is our best chance to address these risks for all Americans but we can't do it alone. Mr. Pruitt, you have supported the President's decision to announce a withdrawal from the Paris Agreement.

President Trump and you have said that the deal unfairly puts constraints on the U.S. coal industry and that it somehow is a threat to our sovereignty. It doesn't make any sense because the Paris Agreement is voluntary. It imposes absolutely no constraints on U.S. trade policy or U.S. domestic energy policy, but there is an historic economic opportunity for American companies and workers to lead the world in creating and providing newer, cleaner forms of energy.

3495	Again, yesterday French President Macron reminded us
3496	that there is no planet B that is a quote but turn to
3497	our future. And he said, quote, I am sure one day the United
3498	States will come back and join the Paris Agreement and I am
3499	sure we can work together to fulfill with you the ambitions
3500	of the global compact on the environment. I certainly hope
3501	he is right for the sake of our children and our
3502	grandchildren.
3503	To me, an Administrator should be someone who cares
3504	about these things, not someone who is going to ruin these
3505	things. Not someone who is going to make our future more
3506	dangerous for our families. And that is what bothers me,
3507	because you are not doing
3508	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired.
3509	Mr. Engel. You are instead I am finishing, Mr.
3510	Chairman. You are instead
3511	Mr. Shimkus. Finish quickly.
3512	Mr. Engel you are going against the tenets of what
3513	your job is supposed to do and that makes me very, very
3514	angry.
3515	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The
3516	chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey for 5 minutes,

3517	Mr. Lance.
3518	Mr. Lance. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, my thanks to you
3519	and the ranking member for allowing me to participate. I am
3520	a member of the committee, but not of this subcommittee.
3521	Administrator Pruitt, the EPA has a long and
3522	distinguished history established by President Nixon as you
3523	know better than anybody. I represent a district in northern
3524	New Jersey outside New York and we are concerned about some
3525	of the allegations regarding the overspending, and in
3526	particular the \$43,000 for the security of the phone booth.
3527	As you know, this has been criticized by the Government
3528	Accountability Office. The general counsel, Mr. Armstrong,
3529	said that you had a responsibility to notify lawmakers. You
3530	have indicated that you believe this is not part of
3531	renovations.
3532	Having said that, isn't there other secure locations
3533	within your Agency and why did we need to spend taxpayer
3534	funds to build a new secure place for making of telephone
3535	calls?
3536	Mr. Pruitt. First, on the GAO matter, we have in fact
3537	notified the GAO with respect to those issues and rightfully
3538	so based upon their determination. And I do want to say that

3539	the Office of General Counsel at the Agency, career
3540	individuals, interpreted the expenditure as not being within
3541	the guidelines of the statute and that is the reason the
3542	Agency acted as they did. And those were all individuals,
3543	career individuals, that were part of that process.
3544	Mr. Lance. The GAO disagrees with you, the General
3545	Counsel disagrees with you?
3546	Mr. Pruitt. That is right. But steps were taken to
3547	notify irrespective of that.
3548	Mr. Lance. I tend to agree with the GAO General
3549	Counsel. I want that on the record. Why did we need another
3550	SCIF or SCIF-like facility when there was already one at your
3551	Agency?
3552	Mr. Pruitt. So it is not a SCIF and it was not intended
3553	to be. As I shared earlier, Congressman, in an earlier
3554	question, I simply requested for a secure communication, a
3555	secure line in my office based upon phone calls that occur
3556	that are confidential in nature. And so, based upon that
3557	instruction a process ensued where this investment took
3558	place. And that is
3559	Mr. Lance. Did any of your predecessors suggest that
3560	this be needed, Republican or Democratic?

3561	Mr. Pruitt. I am not sure, Congressman.
3562	Mr. Lance. Well, I think the answer is no. It is
3563	either a yes or a no. And I don't demand just a yes or no,
3564	you are willing to elaborate. But did any of your
3565	predecessors suggest this?
3566	Mr. Pruitt. I am not sure.
3567	Mr. Lance. And I am not a person here who requires a
3568	yes or no. I would like you to answer in detail, did any of
3569	your predecessors require that?
3570	Mr. Pruitt. I am just not aware of any requests of
3571	previous
3572	Mr. Lance. Well, I have the honor of representing a
3573	predecessor of yours, Christine Todd Whitman. She is a
3574	constituent of mine. She was the Administrator for the
3575	second President Bush, and she has indicated that she saw no
3576	need for such an enhanced telephone system when she was
3577	Administrator and there was secure communications then and
3578	she has indicated that she did not think this was
3579	appropriate. And respectfully, I do not think it is
3580	appropriate. And I think that there are already secure
3581	locations and I think it was a waste of funds.
3582	Regarding a completely different issue, in a March 30th

memo you stated, you signed a directive to give more authority to your office over environmental regulations for a project near regional waterways. It is my view that taking this authority may supplant the role of local representatives and experts, water quality boards. You have relied heavily and when you were Attorney General of Oklahoma on federalism and perhaps appropriately so for local and state control over suits against the EPA. Yet, it appears to me that your directive supplants local control and that it would give you as Administrator final decision-making authority over the protection of streams, ponds, and wetlands under the Clean Water Act.

I would be interested in your views. It impresses me that your views may have changed, Administrator, now that you are the Administrator, from your position as Attorney General of Oklahoma.

Mr. Pruitt. They haven't changed with respect to the collaboration with the states in that regard. I think what you are referring to is a decision to bring that delegation back from the regions. And what we have seen, Congressman, is a great variation, inconsistency from one region to another with respect to the issues that you have described.

3605	And so this is an effort at the Agency to get uniformity and
3606	to get consistency across the regions. Collaboration,
3607	consultation will continue both at the regions and with the
3608	states.
3609	Mr. Lance. Thank you. I end my questioning by saying
3610	that I am concerned about what I believe is overspending. I
3611	am particularly concerned about the secure location. It is
3612	my judgment that that was not needed and that is the judgment
3613	certainly of at least one of your predecessors, a constituent
3614	of mine, Christine Todd Whitman.
3615	Mr. Pruitt. And, Congressman, I agree with your
3616	statement. I believe that that was an amount of money that
3617	should not have been spent and was never authorized by
3618	myself.
3619	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired.
3620	Mr. Lance. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
3621	Mr. Shimkus. The chair recognizes the gentlelady from
3622	Illinois, Ms. Schakowsky, for 5 minutes.
3623	Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. I would like to thank the
3624	chair and ranking member for allowing me, a member of the
3625	committee but not this subcommittee, to be here today.
3626	There is a lot of interest, Secretary Pruitt, in your

testimony. And I also have been troubled by certain

3628	behaviors. And it has been reported that your decision to
3629	abandon the planned fuel efficiency standards was heavily
3630	influenced by Samantha, is it Dravis or Dravis, one of the
3631	employees you brought with you from Oklahoma who is now under
3632	investigation for receiving a salary from taxpayers despite
3633	not coming to work for 3 months. You personally brought Ms.
3634	Dravis on the job at EPA when you became Administrator. Is
3635	that correct?
3636	Mr. Pruitt. She is not from Oklahoma, and yes, she came
3637	in upon the start of our administration. And are you
3638	referring to the midterm evaluation, the decision reached on
3639	the midterm evaluation?
3640	Ms. Schakowsky. I am going to continue with my
3641	questions and maybe I will get to that. She was hired using
3642	the same Safe Drinking Water Act authority that was used to
3643	give unapproved raises to other staff that you did bring from
3644	Oklahoma. Is that correct?
3645	Mr. Pruitt. I am not aware if she was hired under that
3646	Safe Drinking Water Act authority. There is authority on the
3647	Safe Drinking Water Act to administratively determine certain
3648	individuals. It is legal, authorized, it has been used by

3649	previous Administrators and it could have been used in that
3650	instance. I am just not aware.
3651	Ms. Schakowsky. How much was Samantha Dravis paid for
3652	the 3 months during which she did not report to work?
3653	Mr. Pruitt. Well, I am not aware. There is a pending
3654	investigation, as you have indicated, review of that and I am
3655	not aware that she did or did not appear for work. So that
3656	is something that is being reviewed at this point.
3657	Ms. Schakowsky. Senator Carper has stated on the basis
3658	of information, I believe, from a whistleblower, has stated
3659	that he worked with you on a deal to preserve fuel efficiency
3660	standards. He has said that you abandoned that deal at the
3661	urging of Samantha Dravis. Did Samantha Dravis urge you to
3662	abandon the potential deal with Senator Carper?
3663	Mr. Pruitt. I am just not aware. I don't know if you
3664	are speaking of the midterm evaluation or another issue. I
3665	just don't, I am not sure what you are asking.
3666	Ms. Schakowsky. Well, regardless of what the source of
3667	the I mean these are pretty straightforward questions
3668	about her and the 3 months that she are you contesting
3669	that she did not work for 3 months?
3670	Mr. Pruitt. No, I am not speaking to that at all. I am

3671	not
3672	Ms. Schakowsky. So I don't know what your point is
3673	about asking where it came from. I am asking if she worked
3674	for 3 months without any she did not work for 3 months,
3675	with pay.
3676	Mr. Pruitt. But your question was about fuel efficiency
3677	and I am not entirely sure what the question was with respect
3678	to her influence in that regard. So that is what I was
3679	trying to determine, what area you were talking about. I am
3680	not aware of
3681	Ms. Schakowsky. Okay.
3682	Mr. Pruitt. I will just say it to you this way, I am
3683	not aware of any decision around fuel efficiency, CAFÉ or
3684	otherwise, was an influence in that way.
3685	Ms. Schakowsky. Are you aware that she was paid and did
3686	not work for 3 months?
3687	Mr. Pruitt. I am not aware of any, I know it is under
3688	review at this point and those facts will bear out.
3689	Ms. Schakowsky. I wanted to ask you also, I have a
3690	little time left, about your vehicles. At the same time that
3691	the EPA has moved to increase fuel costs for American
3692	households, you have reportedly asked taxpayers to cover the

3693	cost of a luxury SUV for your use. Is it true that as
3694	Administrator you upgraded from a Chevy Tahoe, which I know
3695	your predecessor used, to a Chevy Suburban with leather
3696	interior and other luxury features?
3697	Mr. Pruitt. As I understand it, the decisions to add a
3698	vehicle to the fleet was something that was in process prior
3699	and they asked for input about the vehicle, that I did not
3700	give direction to start that process or end that process,
3701	they just asked for consultation.
3702	Ms. Schakowsky. It isn't the first time in public
3703	service that you have upgraded your official vehicle. As
3704	Oklahoma Attorney General you upgraded to a big, black SUV
3705	when your predecessor used a sedan. Is that correct?
3706	Mr. Pruitt. The sedan was something that went out of
3707	service and we had to replace that with an SUV, yes.
3708	Ms. Schakowsky. You had to replace it with an SUV?
3709	Mr. Pruitt. There was a replacement that occurred
3710	because of the other one coming out of service.
3711	Ms. Schakowsky. So it is not just that it had to be
3712	replaced. It had to be replaced with a bigger, less fuel
3713	efficient and larger, more expensive car. So it just seems
3714	to me that this pattern that we have been hearing today of

3715	behavior
3716	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time
3717	Ms. Schakowsky is very concerning. And I thank
3718	you for your answers.
3719	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time is expired. The
3720	chair recognizes the gentleman from southwest Missouri, Mr.
3721	Long, for 5 minutes.
3722	Mr. Long. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you,
3723	Administrator Pruitt, for being here today. And I think that
3724	it has been well established today that you have the most
3725	famous cone of silence since Agent 86.
3726	But that is not where my questioning is going to go
3727	today. I have a 30-year career, had a 30-year career as a
3728	real estate broker before I came here and part of being a
3729	real estate broker, it was very important to people the
3730	energy efficiency of their homes. And when they were looking
3731	for a new home they looked at that Energy Star certified
3732	program, things that complied with that. In your testimony
3733	you talk about the Energy Star program and how it helps
3734	businesses and consumers save money by reducing their energy
3735	use. The Energy Star program provides consumers with
3736	accurate information about what products and systems deliver

3737 high quality energy savings, as you know.

I am wondering if you can talk about the process involved with updating the Energy Star standards to include the most innovative and up-to-date technologies such as high performance HVAC systems which can outperform current Energy Star-approved equipment.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, the program to which you refer,

Congressman, has been extremely successful from the publicprivate partnership and there is actually a rulemaking

schedule that will occur in January of next year, as I

understand, to establish fees that will, you know, support

that program. I think the concern has been just the long
term stability and viability of the program. So we are in

the process now of preparing for that and it is something we

are committed to and I think it has been very successful.

Mr. Long. Okay. I think that it is important to both the regulating community and the public that the government speak with one consistent voice. I know from experience, you talk to people, if they call an IRS office they may call 7 different days and get eight different answers and depending on which office they call. What are your plans for ensuring the EPA's policy positions are implemented consistently

3759	across government including the EPA headquarters and the EPA
3760	regional offices in litigation and enforcement? And I was
3761	just using IRS as an example because that is somewhere a lot
3762	of people get a lot of different answers, so for the EPA.
3763	Mr. Pruitt. It is a very important question because we
3764	have ten regions across the country and what we have seen
3765	from a compliance and assistance prospective, enforcement,
3766	permitting, many, many issues, a great inconsistency. And so
3767	we are in the process of going through a Lean program at the
3768	Agency evaluating metrics.
3769	Mr. Long. I am sorry, what program?
3770	Mr. Pruitt. It is a management program to ensure that
3771	we are committed to metrics.
3772	Mr. Long. What did you call it? What was the
3773	Mr. Pruitt. It is Lean.
3774	Mr. Long. Lean, okay.
3775	Mr. Pruitt. Yes. It is a private, but I have a person,
3776	a COO that is dedicated to ensuring that we are setting
3777	metrics objectives at each of the regions and that there is
3778	verticality, uniformity from headquarters to the regions and
3779	across the country to ensure on compliance, assistance,
3780	permitting, all these various issues that we don't see this

3781 dispersion and great variety. Mr. Long. On these EPA proposed rule revisions which 3782 3783 recognize the importance of the states overseeing the 3784 implementation of the program regulating coal combustion 3785 residuals, I believe that oversight is critical. agency given more thought to adjusting deadlines imposed 3786 under the existing federal rules so the states have time to 3787 3788 get their programs developed and approved by the EPA? 3789 Mr. Pruitt. There has been consideration of that yes, 3790 and I think you make a great point about the timeline that 3791 states need to develop their own programs. We provide a 3792 quidance in that regard to the states, but they need time to 3793 adopt and implement those programs. And so both are very 3794 important trying to address the impending deadlines but also 3795 work with the states to achieve the startup of their 3796 programs. 3797 Mr. Long. With Oklahoma being a neighbor to Missouri, I 3798 am sure that you know that electric power providers in 3799 Missouri rely on a balanced portfolio of energy inputs 3800 including a large amount of coal for our energy. Is it still 3801 your plan to undertake a timely repeal of the carbon

regulations for power plants?

3803	Mr. Pruitt. If you are referring to the Clean Power
3804	Plan of the previous administration, you know, that is in the
3805	marketplace today, yes.
3806	Mr. Long. Okay. And those regulations were dependent
3807	on the last EPA's official finding that carbon endangers the
3808	environment. Is EPA planning on revisiting that endangerment
3809	finding also?
3810	Mr. Pruitt. You know, our focus has been in the Clean
3811	Power Plan and addressing that from a rulemaking perspective.
3812	So that has been our focus today.
3813	Mr. Long. Okay. And Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
3814	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
3815	chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr.
3816	Butterfield, for 5 minutes.
3817	Mr. Butterfield. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
3818	Mr. Administrator, I have been listening to your
3819	testimony here in the committee room, and back in my office I
3820	have been watching it very constantly on television. And I
3821	must tell you this is very disturbing what I am hearing
3822	today. One of the most alarming aspects that I have heard
3823	concerns your expenditures. I am going to call them your
3824	outlandish expenditures on security.

3825 And what is even more alarming to me is the fact that there has been an obvious practice of retaliation against EPA 3826 3827 employees who question your spending. And you are a lawyer, 3828 I read your bio. You have been a civil servant for many 3829 years and you have done a lot of great things. 3830 certainly know that whistleblower protections are essential to ensuring fairness and good government. But according to 3831 3832 press accounts, five EPA staff members were fired or 3833 reassigned after questioning your spending or advising you 3834 that you need to notify Congress of expenditures over \$5,000. Now the nonpartisan GAO office has now validated those 3835 employees finding that you broke the law. 3836 That is not the 3837 Democrats or any other political group. That is the 3838 nonpartisan Government Accountability Office has now 3839 validated those employees, finding that you broke the law in 3840 failing to notify the Congress. Now do you intend to hold yourself or your staff accountable for this action? 3841 3842 Mr. Pruitt. First, I want to say I know of no 3843 instances, Congressman, where a decision has been made on 3844 employment status related to spending or any recommendations 3845 regarding spending. I have said that earlier and I will say 3846 it again to you now.

3847	With respect to the accountability
3848	Mr. Butterfield. But my point is notifying Congress.
3849	Mr. Pruitt. That is an issue that I have addressed
3850	already a couple of times here. Office of General Counsel,
3851	career individuals at the Agency advised those folks going
3852	through the expenditure process that they did not need to
3853	notify Congress. GAO came out recently and said otherwise.
3854	That notification has taken place. Those individuals, those
3855	career individuals that made the decision on that expenditure
3856	were following the advice in counsel and the direction of
3857	what they knew to be right at the time.
3858	Mr. Butterfield. So it is your position that you had no
3859	responsibility to notify Congress of these expenditures?
3860	Mr. Pruitt. No, I believe that the decision has been
3861	remedied and it should have been done at the beginning. But
3862	it was not done and the question is as they made those
3863	decisions who guided that and it was career individuals at
3864	the Agency.
3865	Mr. Butterfield. I was further alarmed that the pattern
3866	was extended to the head of the Office of Homeland Security
3867	at EPA who signed off on a February memo finding that you did
3868	not face direct death threats. That person was removed from

3869	his role, I am told, the day that the Senate Democrats
3870	revealed the existence of the memo. The timing of the move
3871	clearly suggests an effort to intimidate, in my opinion, and
3872	to deter staff who might share their concerns with Congress.
3873	Any truth to that?
3874	Mr. Pruitt. And I think Donna Vizian at the office who
3875	heads our Human Resources area would say the contrary to
3876	that. The reference I made earlier to a previous question
3877	about Inspector General and their actual recitations of
3878	threats I can provide to you, Congressman. The person to
3879	whom you refer does not have all the information with respect
3880	to the collection of threats.
3881	Mr. Butterfield. Let me take you to question 2, I am
3882	running out of time. Last month you moved to weaken
3883	protections from toxic coal ash which poses serious risks to
3884	human health and the environment. I had a coal ash spill in
3885	my state of North Carolina and they are still mitigating that
3886	damage. The spill that occurred in Kingston, Tennessee
3887	caused 30 premature deaths, 200 serious illnesses among
3888	workers who cleaned up the spill.
3889	Amazingly, you have proposed weakening the protections
3890	despite the hard science proving the dangers caused by the

3891	spills. This is unacceptable. Were you aware of these
3892	severe worker impacts when you proposed weakening the coal
3893	ash rule?
3894	Mr. Pruitt. The specific examples that you refer to,
3895	no, I was not aware of those specific examples.
3896	Mr. Butterfield. Last January you delayed the essential
3897	protections for farm workers from dangerous pesticides,
3898	including delaying protections for minors. That delay has
3899	now been thrown out. My staff says thrown out. You and I as
3900	lawyers, I guess we would call it something different,
3901	dismissed by the courts. Is that true or not true?
3902	Mr. Pruitt. No, it is my understanding that there is a
3903	proposal to deal with those age requirements that are being
3904	considered but there has not been any final action on that.
3905	States, as you know, have age requirements as well and we are
3906	contemplating in that process whether those age requirements
3907	should be deferred to in this process. But I am not aware of
3908	it being final at this point, Congressman.
3909	Mr. Butterfield. Well, let me thank you for your
3910	testimony. I have listened to as much as I could today and
3911	again I say I am very disappointed with your record at the
3912	Agency. It is not commensurate with your record over many,

3913 many years in other capacities and your lack of concern for 3914 workers is what concerns me most of all. You have wasted 3915 taxpayer money. You --3916 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The 3917 chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Bilirakis, for 5 minutes. 3918 3919 Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate 3920 And thank you for allowing me to sit on this 3921 subcommittee. Of course as you know I sit on the full 3922 committee. 3923 Administrator Pruitt, I want to talk about the 3924 environmental review and approval process for local projects. 3925 With the significant portion of my constituents living on 3926 Florida's west coast, I am always concerned about hurricanes 3927 as you can understand as well as flooding. However, our area 3928 only has two evacuation routes to move residents inland 3929 during an emergency. To alleviate this problem, the Pasco 3930 County government initiated the Ridge Road Extension Project 3931 to create a third evacuation route, but you know they have 3932 been working on this since 1997. Can you believe that? 3933 Since 1997, for over 20 years, the county has been treading 3934 through regulations, filling out forms, and meeting with

3935 federal officials to get this public safety project up and 3936 running. Okay, so we are talking about again a public safety project we need to save lives, God forbid we had a disaster. 3937 3938 So while they have met with some recent success, and I 3939 have been working to help them out, the project still has not received final approval. Administrator Pruitt, what has the 3940 3941 Agency done under your leadership to streamline the review of 3942 projects particularly when they involve public safety where lives could be on the line, in this case they definitely are 3943 3944 on the line, and is permitting improvements something that 3945 your EPA workforce assessment, are they addressing these issues? 3946 3947 Mr. Pruitt. It is absolutely a priority. In fact, we began an effort last year before we arrived at the Agency. 3948 3949 They didn't know how long it took to actually go through the 3950 permitting process, in fact I asked that question upon 3951 arrival to give me an idea about the length that it took for 3952 permitting and they didn't know the answer. So we have 3953 evaluated that data. And I know this won't surprise you but 3954 it takes a long time. You have already cited your example. 3955 And so by the end of 2018 we are making changes internal

The decision that we make on permits up or

to the Agency.

3956

3957	down will occur within 6 months starting in January of '19.
3958	So that is the effort that we are engaged in. But as you
3959	know this is an interagency approach as well and we are
3960	collaborating with the Corps of Engineers around some of
3961	these issues in making sure that we have consistency in
3962	working with them.
3963	Mr. Bilirakis. Okay, so you say within 6 months
3964	beginning in 2019?
3965	Mr. Pruitt. At the end of this year we will have a plan
3966	in place to execute upon as we begin January of '19.
3967	Mr. Bilirakis. Okay. On the same point, the President
3968	released an infrastructure plan, of course as you know, which
3969	included sections on permitting improvement. One of the
3970	proposals is that one agency, one decision. Is that what you
3971	are referring to, environmental review structure? Another is
3972	allowing for localities to complete a single environmental
3973	review document for a project. Are these things that you
3974	could support?
3975	Mr. Pruitt. I do support and I think these are great
3976	recommendations that have been made as part of the
3977	infrastructure package the President and something I hope
3978	Congress adopts. But whether it is adopted or not, we are

3979	advancing this 6-month review process internal to the Agency.
3980	Mr. Bilirakis. Okay. As far as, you know, there are a
3981	lot of local governments that can't afford to hire high
3982	priced consultants, as you know. So this is very, very
3983	important to them and they shouldn't be penalized because
3984	they can't afford to hire these high priced consultants. You
3985	know, in my area over the years they have spent a lot of
3986	money on this project and but I am sure that there are
3987	examples all over the country where it has taken many, many
3988	years. So I appreciate you working with me on this and
3989	hopefully we get approval soon.
3990	Mr. Pruitt. Thanks, Congressman.
3991	Mr. Bilirakis. I thank you very much and I yield back.
3992	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
3993	chair recognizes the gentlelady from Florida, Representative
3994	Castor, for 5 minutes.
3995	Ms. Castor. Well, thank you, Chairman Shimkus, for
3996	allowing me to participate in the hearing today.
3997	Mr. Pruitt, your pattern of unethical conduct and
3998	conflicts of interest are now very well known, but I am very
3999	troubled by your failure to take personal responsibility for
4000	your actions. You simply dismissed all of the ethical lapses

at the beginning of your testimony as troubling media reports so I think that is a failure in leadership.

But the point I want to make today is that those costs, your wasteful spending, those costs pale in comparison to the damage you are doing to the health of American families and the assault on our clean air and clean water protections, our protections against dangerous chemicals and pesticides. Mr. Pallone highlighted the issue of the dangerous paint stripper, methylene chloride, at the beginning, that is known to have caused over 50 deaths and yet the EPA under your administration now has, you say we are stalled, we don't have a final decision, but in essence you have turned a blind eye to those families.

There is also the case of chlorpyrifos which is a dangerous nerve agent. It is in the same chemical class as sarin. There was a recommendation by EPA scientists when you came in, in fact the last administration had said we are going to propose very significant restrictions especially to protect babies, children, young people under 18. You came in and turned that around. You said oh, well this, well it is not final.

But you have set a pattern here. America's

4023	pediatricians are outraged. Public health advocates are
4024	outraged and so am I, because we are talking about the
4025	development of brain in babies and children. We are talking
4026	about not just children that might be in farmlands, but they
4027	live and work or they live and play in those areas. There
4028	were a lot of kids in the audience today and parents who care
4029	about this a great deal. It is Take Your Child to Work Day.
4030	That was good to have them in here.
4031	So my first question is why are corporate polluter
4032	profits more important to you than the health of families and
4033	children?
4034	Mr. Pruitt. Well, on the issue that Ranking Member
4035	Pallone brought up and this issue that you have raised, I
4036	would ask you not to jump to conclusions that there is a
4037	final process there. As you know, the previous
4038	administration
4039	Ms. Castor. But there is a pattern. There is a
4040	pattern. And
4041	Mr. Pruitt. I am trying to respond.
4042	Ms. Castor. And, you know, your actions belie what you
4043	say when your EPA scientists and public health advocates and

4045 office and time and time again you are siding with 4046 the special interests and not with the public. 4047 Mr. Pruitt. Yet that solvent that you are referring to 4048 is actually one of the ten priority chemicals that we are 4049 reviewing under TSCA that you authorized. And so we are --4050 Ms. Castor. You are right. And that was a 4051 recommendation that was the action of this committee and you 4052 have set the pattern. And, really, whatever you could say 4053 today, I think people need to look at your actions rather 4054 than your rhetoric. 4055 But in addition to your failure to take any 4056 responsibility, I have to say that I am disappointed in a lot 4057 of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that have let 4058 the Administrator off the hook today by barely asking any 4059 tough questions. There were a few exceptions and my hat is 4060 off to them. Maybe they are trying to save his job because they are worried if he doesn't perform well today he could be 4061 4062 fired. 4063 Several congressional Republicans have already publicly called for your firing, but unfortunately not on this 4064 4065 committee. Either way it is embarrassing that most of the 4066 Republicans refuse to take this committee's oversight

4067	responsibility seriously and hold you accountable. They
4068	claim to have requested documents from the administration
4069	regarding Administrator Pruitt's misconduct and conflicts of
4070	interest, but there is no evidence of any investigation.
4071	Meanwhile, the Democrats on this committee, we have sent
4072	numerous inquiries to EPA, the Office of Inspector General,
4073	the GAO, the Office of Special Counsel, and some of those
4074	have borne out and you have been found in violation of the
4075	law. Unfortunately, we have yet to see any real effort from
4076	my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.
4077	So I have been keeping a list today as well, Mr.
4078	Administrator, of the unanswered questions because you often
4079	say it is not final, we are looking at this, the jury is out.
4080	But you failed to give direct responses on a number of
4081	questions.
4082	So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit this list for
4083	the record of the endless string of questions that
4084	Administrator Pruitt has not answered today.
4085	Mr. Shimkus. Let us look at that. Pass it over here,
4086	please.
4087	Ms. Castor. Will do.
4088	And finally close out by saying

4089	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired.
4090	Ms. Castor Mr. Pruitt, you violated
4091	Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired. The
4092	chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland for 5 minutes.
4093	Mr. Sarbanes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4094	Thank you for being here, Mr. Pruitt. I have been
4095	watching you during the hearing and you certainly have the
4096	bearing of a man who thinks he is untouchable. I don't know
4097	if that is true or not, but I would be careful of that
4098	because I don't think Americans go for that and in your
4099	position they just want you to protect their air. They want
4100	you to protect clean water and they want you to conserve the
4101	land.
4102	As has been said by many of my colleagues, EPA under
4103	your tenure has been cloaked in secrecy and swamped with
4104	ongoing legal and ethical failures. You have refused to
4105	release detailed information from your calendar, often
4106	provide no advanced notice of where you are going to be,
4107	agency career staff we are told have been instructed not to
4108	take notes or carry their cell phones, and this level of
4109	secrecy has forced a lot of citizens to take the avenue of
4110	filing Freedom of Information Act requests. I understand

4111	that EPA political leadership has added a new layer of so-
4112	called awareness reviews to those requests which can delay
4113	the release of information to the public and also limit the
4114	amount of information redacted in the responses.
4115	Are you aware that your political appointees are
4116	conducting these reviews before information is released to
4117	the public, yes or no?
4118	Mr. Pruitt. First, let me say that there has been no
4119	instruction not to take notes or to carry phones. That is
4120	simply fabricated. With respect to the process you are
4121	referring to, the FOIA process is governed by statute. And -
4122	_
4123	Mr. Sarbanes. But you have set up these political
4124	appointees to do reviews, are you aware of that?
4125	Mr. Pruitt. The Office of General Counsel is conducting
4126	FOIA reviews.
4127	Mr. Sarbanes. Okay, all right. You are not aware of
4128	that. I am going to move on because as you know we are
4129	limited here. But if that was done that is a pretty clever
4130	move. We wrote to you last year with concerns about Carl
4131	Icahn's role as special advisor on regulations, potential
4132	conflict of interest due to his financial holdings and

4133	outspoken positions on the Renewable Fuel Standards programs.
4134	So here we are a year later, the EPA's implementation of the
4135	RFS programs, specifically the small refinery waiver
4136	provision, is under fire from both farmers and refiners.
4137	My colleague Mr. Green raised the issue of secret
4138	waivers. I want to build on that a little bit. I want to
4139	know about CVR Energy in which Carl Icahn owns a majority
4140	stake. Administrator Pruitt, you met with representatives
4141	from Carl Icahn's company, CVR Energy, in June of 2017. Is
4142	that correct?
4143	Mr. Pruitt. If that is what the calendar represents.
4144	Mr. Sarbanes. Okay. Did Carl Icahn's company apply for
4145	a waiver from ethanol blending requirements for any of its
4146	refining facilities?
4147	Mr. Pruitt. I am unsure.
4148	Mr. Sarbanes. Okay. We will look at the record for
4149	that. And did Carl Icahn's company receive a waiver for any
4150	of its refining facilities?
4151	Mr. Pruitt. These exemptions are governed by statute as
4152	you know.
4153	Mr. Sarbanes. Okay. Well, you are going to find that
4154	out for us and we appreciate your following up because that

is important to know because it raises serious questions about conflicts of interest. I have had the privilege of chairing here in the Congress the Democracy Reform Task

Force. We have been trying to keep up with the ethical lapses of the Trump administration, which I will tell you is kind of a full-time job, and you certainly have been at the center of some of that focus. To date, five independent federal investigations have been initiated at this committee's request and more than eight independent federal reviews are currently underway with respect to your office.

Yesterday, the Democracy Reform Task Force released

Yesterday, the Democracy Reform Task Force released another report in a series that is looking at failures and ethical lapses within the Trump administration. This one was detailing your wasteful spending and favors for your friends. It put the interests of dirty polluters ahead of the American people. So this is now available for people to take a look at. It goes through the litany of ethical violations that have come to characterize and be the hallmark of your time in office.

You have really become, I mean it is sad to say it, but you have become in many respects, and you ought to take this to heart as somebody who holds an office in the public trust,

4177	you are wearing that mantle today that office of public trust
4178	as head of the EPA, something people care deeply about. If
4179	you are going to wear that mantle you have to exercise the
4180	office with attention to the public interest and not to
4181	private interest.
4182	But, unfortunately, you have become the poster child for
4183	the abuse of public trust and this goes back a long way. You
4184	brought your way of approaching these public offices to the
4185	EPA and it has undermined the credibility of that
4186	organization. But it is a hallmark of the Trump
4187	administration and we are going to continue to demand answers
4188	and we are going to continue to hold you accountable in every
4189	hearing that you choose to be up here.
4190	I give you credit for coming today, but we are going to
4191	continue to hold you accountable for the dereliction of duty
4192	that we see. With that I yield back my time.
4193	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The
4194	chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont for 5 minutes,
4195	Mr. Welch.
4196	Mr. Welch. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, you,
4197	with Mr. Flores and I have been working on ethanol.
4198	Mr. Pruitt, I have heard reports, read reports that as a

4199	result of the pressure on Midwest ag in response to the
4200	retaliatory tariffs by China that there is a move by some to
4201	increase ethanol usage. Can you comment on that very
4202	briefly?
4203	Mr. Pruitt. Well, are you referring to the RVP waiver?
4204	Mr. Welch. That is correct.
4205	Mr. Pruitt. Yes. We have been actively evaluating the
4206	legal authority under the statute to grant the RVP waiver for
4207	the last several months. And the reason it is taking some
4208	time, Congressman, is because
4209	Mr. Welch. I want to interrupt because actually what I
4210	am talking about, I appreciate the work on ethanol that my
4211	colleagues have done, but what is reported is that as a
4212	result of the tariffs that China is imposing on soybeans and
4213	grain that there is going to be a concession from the Trump
4214	administration to go to E15, so I will just leave it there.
4215	I do want to ask you some questions along the lines of
4216	how you have been running your department. Is it the case
4217	that any of your predecessors, Republican or Democrat, who
4218	have had the high responsibility as Administrator of the EPA
4219	have had a 20-person security detail?
4220	Mr. Pruitt. I am unaware of previous considerations in

1001	that magazid
4221	that regard.
4222	Mr. Welch. Is it not at all relevant to you what the
4223	precedents have been with Republican and Democratic
4224	administrators in the past?
4225	Mr. Pruitt. I am just not aware, Congressman, of
4226	processes prior to my time at the Agency on what was
4227	considered and what wasn't considered.
4228	Mr. Welch. All right. Did the taxpayers spend \$30,000
4229	for a security detail to accompany you on the trip to
4230	Disneyland?
4231	Mr. Pruitt. I am unsure about that. I mean we took
4232	Mr. Welch. That is knowable.
4233	Mr. Pruitt. Yes. The records show that.
4234	Mr. Welch. All right. So you can determine this. It
4235	is not like secret stuff.
4236	Mr. Pruitt. The detail, the law enforcement make those
4237	determinations on what type of security should be provided,
4238	whether
4239	Mr. Welch. You know, I have been listening to a lot of
4240	the answers and the answers are somebody else knows it, and
4241	it really is starting to seem like there is something on your
4242	desk with a motto that says the buck stops nowhere, and you

4243	are the guy who is in charge.
4244	Mr. Pruitt. Yet, Congressman, I have made decisions to
4245	switch and make sure, make changes from first class back to
4246	coach. I rescinded the pay raises to those individuals.
4247	Mr. Welch. No, I get it.
4248	Mr. Pruitt. In fact that has happened.
4249	Mr. Welch. Let me ask you just about this phone booth
4250	because it is a metaphor. Are you aware that at the EPA
4251	headquarters there are two secure facilities where private
4252	phone calls could be secure?
4253	Mr. Pruitt. And again I didn't request a SCIF. I
4254	requested a secure communication that was not accessible to
4255	my office and
4256	Mr. Welch. I understand that. But you are the boss.
4257	So you tell your folks that you want a secure way of
4258	communicating, reasonable request, they are going to
4259	accommodate it. The boss is the one who has to make certain
4260	that it is a reasonable imposition on taxpayers, or do you
4261	disagree with that?
4262	Mr. Pruitt. And in this instance the process failed.
4263	As I indicated in my opening statement, those processes will
4264	be changed going forward.

4265	Mr. Welch. Did you ask the question here is the
4266	question that I think a lot of people would ask, Republican
4267	or Democrat, how can I make a secure phone call, and the
4268	answer would be well, Mr. Pruitt, there happens to be two
4269	places in this building right close to your office where you
4270	can do that. Had you asked that
4271	Mr. Pruitt. They are not right close to my office.
4272	Mr. Welch. Pardon me?
4273	Mr. Pruitt. They are not right close to my office.
4274	Mr. Welch. Well, how often do you have to use your
4275	secret phone booth?
4276	Mr. Pruitt. It is for confidential communications and
4277	it is rare.
4278	Mr. Welch. Okay. So on those rare occasions is it too
4279	much to ask you to walk whatever distance it takes for you to
4280	get to that secure line?
4281	Mr. Pruitt. I guess it depends on the nature of the
4282	call and how urgent the call is.
4283	Mr. Welch. The point is that you have two locations
4284	that you can go to when you have to make those rare secure
4285	phone calls. This is taxpayer money. It is taxpayer money.
4286	Let me ask you this. Did you have installed or were there

4287	installed biometric locks on your office?
4288	Mr. Pruitt. There were problems with locks on two of
4289	the three doors and changes were made to those locks. No
4290	instruction was given for biometric locks, but that was a
4291	decision made by those individuals.
4292	Mr. Welch. So these things just happen.
4293	Mr. Pruitt. There was a process at the Agency in that
4294	regard and there was an evaluation.
4295	Mr. Welch. Well, what is a biometric lock?
4296	Mr. Pruitt. I am not entirely sure.
4297	Mr. Welch. So do you know, is it the case you don't
4298	know how to open your door?
4299	Mr. Pruitt. I just know how to put a code in. Excuse
4300	me?
4301	Mr. Welch. No, seriously. What is a biometric lock?
4302	Mr. Pruitt. I don't know. I just put a code in.
4303	Mr. Welch. A biometric lock, it responds as I
4304	understand it to like fingerprints or some other, your eyes,
4305	some physical characteristic.
4306	Mr. Pruitt. That is my understanding as well.
4307	Mr. Welch. All right, so you have them, right?
4308	Mr. Pruitt. Those are on, those have been added to the

4309	office, yes.
4310	Mr. Welch. Why?
4311	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The
4312	chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa for 5 minutes, Mr.
4313	Loebsack.
4314	Mr. Loebsack. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for
4315	allowing me to waive on to this subcommittee. I do
4316	appreciate that.
4317	Mr. Pruitt, I share a lot of the concerns my colleagues
4318	have voiced today on the ethics front, but I am actually here
4319	to talk about an issue that as you might imagine I am from
4320	Iowa so of utmost importance to my state, to my district.
4321	During your confirmation process you stated that you would
4322	work to uphold the Renewable Fuel Standard and over the last
4323	2 years President Trump has pledged on numerous occasions to
4324	support the RFS, in fact time and time again he has pledged
4325	to support it. However, over the last several weeks,
4326	information has been revealed that makes me question that
4327	commitment as you might imagine.
4328	Various reports have indicated that the EPA has granted
4329	so-called economic hardship exemptions to numerous refiners
4330	who appear to be neither small nor financially distressed.

4331	You know what the law says, it has to be 75,000 gallons or
4332	less to be granted that economic hardship waiver. I can tell
4333	you I have heard directly from my constituents, farmers and
4334	many others, and from farmers across the country who are
4335	extremely troubled by this action. And this comes at a
4336	particularly difficult time in farm country as you know when
4337	we have had low prices, we have seen farm income trending
4338	downward, and industry profits are soaring.
4339	I am extremely disappointed in the action as you might
4340	imagine and the lack of transparency and accountability in
4341	the process is also unacceptable. Under section 211 of the
4342	Clean Air Act, the EPA administrator is required to reassign
4343	gallons that are waived under the small refinery exemption to
4344	other obligated parties. Because this entire waiver process
4345	has happened, really, without any transparency whatsoever, I
4346	am disappointed, my constituents are disappointed, and we
4347	really have no idea whether those gallons have been
4348	reassigned as required by law.
4349	So my first question, Mr. Pruitt, yes or no, have you
4350	reassigned these gallons as required by law?
4351	Mr. Pruitt. It is my understanding that the process has

happened as it is supposed to under the statute.

4352

4353	Mr. Loebsack. Well, we are going to need that. And how
4354	do you plan to reassign then the gallons you waive for going
4355	forward for the 2019 RVO?
4356	Mr. Pruitt. And I do think your question is very
4357	important with respect to the volume obligation, Congressman.
4358	And when you think about the commitment of this
4359	administration to the RFS, the point of obligation was denied
4360	as you know. That was a big issue.
4361	Mr. Loebsack. But that is not my point. I am talking
4362	about the waivers.
4363	Mr. Pruitt. No, I know. I understand.
4364	Mr. Loebsack. And I would like to move on to my next
4365	question if I could. Yes or no, do you intend to inform this
4366	committee and the public about the details behind these
4367	waivers such as which refiners received a waiver?
4368	Mr. Pruitt. Subject to the confidential business
4369	information or other information that would be the only thing
4370	that would not be available.
4371	Mr. Loebsack. Well, Mr. Pruitt, we just want to know
4372	who got these waivers, not why necessarily, and I can't
4373	understand why that would be considered confidential business
4374	information. Reports have indicated that 25 refiners

4375	received waivers from their obligations. Is that number
4376	accurate?
4377	Mr. Pruitt. That was actually in 2017, I think. The
4378	applications are still pending in 2018.
4379	Mr. Loebsack. What is the number at the moment?
4380	Mr. Pruitt. It is over that number for 2018, as I
4381	understand it.
4382	Mr. Loebsack. Did you discuss these exemptions with the
4383	White House?
4384	Mr. Pruitt. There is ongoing discussions with the White
4385	House on various issues around the RFS program.
4386	Mr. Loebsack. Who at the White House specifically was
4387	involved?
4388	Mr. Pruitt. I think the NEC in consultation with the
4389	Air Office.
4390	Mr. Loebsack. Did you brief the President on these
4391	waivers?
4392	Mr. Pruitt. Well, as I indicated this was a dialogue
4393	amongst staff members, NEC and Air Office, at our shop. So.
4394	Mr. Loebsack. Has anybody explained to the President
4395	the substantial impact that these waivers have on the ethanol
4396	industry? Some have estimated a billion gallons.

4397	Mr. Pruitt. I am sure it has come up in many
4398	discussions.
4399	Mr. Loebsack. And moving on, you told me and many
4400	others that EPA is studying whether it has the legal
4401	authority to grant the RVP waiver. That was the last time
4402	that I waived on to this committee and we talked about that
4403	issue. And that seems like it is taking quite a while as you
4404	might imagine for many of us in corn country, and with the
4405	President's recent remarks which were referenced here about
4406	his interest in year-around E15, I am wondering what the
4407	holdup is on this at this point.
4408	Mr. Pruitt. It is just trying to ensure that the legal
4409	basis is solid because there will be litigation that will
4410	ensue.
4411	Mr. Loebsack. Well, do you plan to move forward and
4412	grant the RVP waiver and allow year-round sales of E15?
4413	Mr. Pruitt. I intend to finish that process very soon
4414	to make
4415	Mr. Loebsack. Yes. Hopefully, the sooner the better
4416	because this is something that obviously is very important
4417	not only to my state and my district, many folks around the
4418	country. So we are looking forward to that. And of course

4419	refinery executives have called your action on the hardship
4420	waivers, to go back to that, quote, giving out trick or treat
4421	candy, unquote, to their industry. And I am here to tell you
4422	that farmers are very disappointed by this. They have been
4423	waiting for years for the E15 waiver year-around.
4424	And, Mr. Chairman, I think this program is in need of
4425	substantial oversight, the waiver program and certainly the
4426	E15 as well. And these actions I don't think can happen in
4427	secret. I know that was addressed earlier in this hearing.
4428	We need to make sure that these waivers are not abused as a
4429	financial windfall for special interests and I look forward
4430	to working with you, Mr. Chairman, on this further. And I
4431	yield back. Thank you very much.
4432	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The
4433	chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. Lujan,
4434	for 5 minutes.
4435	Mr. Lujan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
4436	Administrator Pruitt, you seem to view the EPA budget as
4437	a personal slush fund, redirecting resources to your personal
4438	travel that should go to environmental protection. During
4439	your tenure you have spent more than \$160,000 on travel in
4440	first class, on private jets, and on military craft. Public

4441	office is a public trust and I think flying coach is the
4442	least we can do to deserve that trust.
4443	My question for you is this. When you are paying for
4444	your own airfare with personal funds do you fly coach?
4445	Mr. Pruitt. I follow the security recommendations of my
4446	team when I pay for it personally as well.
4447	Mr. Lujan. Will you commit to reimbursing taxpayers for
4448	your luxury travel?
4449	Mr. Pruitt. You refer to it as luxury travel and the
4450	\$160,000 that you refer to pales in comparison to the
4451	previous administrations. I think you are referring to
4452	international travel. I took two international trips.
4453	Previous administrations took multiple trips and spent far
4454	more than that. These decisions about security detail, who
4455	attends and what they do to provide protection happened
4456	according to law enforcement recommendations and that is what
4457	I followed.
4458	Mr. Lujan. It has been recently reported by EPA ethics
4459	officials that on at least two personal trips you flew in
4460	coach on Southwest Airlines using a companion pass from Ken
4461	Wagner, your subordinate at the EPA. Clearly a plane ticket
4462	has more than nominal value. Are you aware that federal

4463	ethics rules prohibit you from accepting gifts from
4464	subordinates?
4465	Mr. Pruitt. And that is not represented accurately what
4466	you said. We actually flew like carpooling. We shared costs
4467	from Oklahoma
4468	Mr. Lujan. Did Ken Wagner give you the boarding pass?
4469	Mr. Pruitt. There was no gift whatsoever.
4470	Mr. Lujan. All right, well, I think that those ethics
4471	officials will continue to look into that.
4472	Mr. Pruitt, your travel since becoming administrator has
4473	taken you to Morocco, Italy, and to luxury resorts around the
4474	United States. We have even heard from Kevin, a political
4475	appointee who worked in your office that you told staffers
4476	to, quote, find me something to do, close quote, in order to
4477	schedule travel to your desired destinations. Unfortunately,
4478	it seems your desired destinations have rarely included low-
4479	income communities and communities of color facing serious
4480	environmental risks.
4481	The biggest problem with the pay-to-play system is that
4482	those most at risk are also the most unable to pay for your
4483	attention and concern. Of your extensive travel spending how
4484	much would you say you spend visiting low-income communities

4485	and communities of color?
4486	Mr. Pruitt. I wouldn't consider East Chicago, which I
4487	have made trips there, I was in Region 5 recently this week,
4488	and San Jacinto in Houston as indicated earlier. The trip to
4489	Italy was a G7 trip occurring a week after the Paris
4490	decision. I was there for 4 days around the G7. There is a
4491	free trade agreement that is in existence in Morocco and the
4492	ambassador of Morocco invited me to Morocco to negotiate the
4493	environmental chapter on that free trade agreement. Both of
4494	those things are very important to the scope of our duties at
4495	the EPA.
4496	Mr. Lujan. Mr. Administrator, you have gone to great
4497	lengths to keep your calendar secret but what has come out is
4498	it is clear that most of your meetings and stakeholders have
4499	been with industry and not impacted communities. I think we
4500	can agree with that. Do you see the problem with granting
4501	greater access to polluting industries than impacted
4502	communities?
4503	Mr. Pruitt. I have met with stakeholders across the
4504	country on these issues, people that we regulate that their
4505	voices have not been heard for many years. Those farmers and
4506	ranchers that I have met with, they are our first

4507	environmentalists and first conservationists.
4508	Mr. Lujan. Do you understand that you have a
4509	responsibility to protect the health and environment of low-
4510	income, minority, tribal, and indigenous communities?
4511	Mr. Pruitt. Absolutely.
4512	Mr. Lujan. Throughout your brief tenure as EPA
4513	Administrator you have directed significant policy changes
4514	made with disproportionately harm to low-income, minority,
4515	tribal, and indigenous communities. The repeal of the once
4516	in, always in policy mentioned by my colleague, Ms. Dingell,
4517	for example, the weakening of coal ash regulations is
4518	another. But Mr. Pruitt, today you repeatedly blamed your
4519	chief of staff, your chief counsel, career officials, and
4520	others. Yes or no, are you the EPA Administrator?
4521	Mr. Pruitt. I said that in my opening statement,
4522	Congressman. And I didn't blame anyone. I just simply
4523	shared facts with you as
4524	Mr. Lujan. Mr. Administrator, it is just a simple yes
4525	or no question, sir. Are you the EPA Administrator?
4526	Mr. Pruitt. I said in my opening statement that I take
4527	responsibility. I have made changes historically and making
4528	changes going forward and I simply have not failed to take

4529	responsibility. I have simply recited the facts of what has
4530	occurred.
4531	Mr. Lujan. It is a simple question, Mr. Pruitt. Are
4532	you the EPA Administrator?
4533	Mr. Pruitt. Yes.
4534	Mr. Lujan. Just to be clear, do you run the EPA?
4535	Mr. Pruitt. I do.
4536	Mr. Lujan. Yes or no, are you responsible for the many,
4537	many scandals plaguing the EPA?
4538	Mr. Pruitt. I have responded to many of those questions
4539	here today with facts and information.
4540	Mr. Lujan. Are you able to answer that in yes or no?
4541	Mr. Pruitt. That is not a yes or no answer,
4542	Congressman.
4543	Mr. Lujan. It is pretty simple that it is a yes or no
4544	answer here. There is clear concern with what has been
4545	happening not just by the entire Congress. And I appreciate
4546	you being here today, but these questions need to be asked
4547	and answered.
4548	Mr. Pruitt. And we have answered them today.
4549	Mr. Lujan. And you are not the only one that has been
4550	doing these ugly things, these horrific things, these

4551	scandal-plagued things in this administration, and I hope
4552	this is one of many hearings that this committee will have so
4553	we can get to the bottom of this and make sure taxpayers are
4554	made whole.
4555	Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired.
4556	Seeing there are no further members wishing to ask
4557	questions I would like to thank our witness for being here
4558	today. Before we conclude I would like to ask unanimous
4559	consent to submit the following documents for the record, I
4560	just want to make sure I get them all in, letter to the
4561	chairman and ranking member from Lauren Atkins; report from
4562	GAO on EPA's use of fiscal year 2017 appropriations; letter
4563	from the American Association for the Advancement of Science;
4564	Mr. Rush Holt; article from the Roanoke Times; questions from
4565	Ms. Castor; letter from the American Geophysical Union;
4566	letter from 985 scientists.
4567	In pursuant to committee rules, I remind members that
4568	they have 10 business days to submit additional questions for
4569	the record and I ask that witnesses submit their questions
4570	within 10 business days upon receipt of the questions.
4571	Without objection, the subcommittee is adjourned.
4572	[Whereupon, at 1:41 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]