|    | On the committee s website as soon as it is available.            |
|----|---|
| 1  | NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.   |
| 2  | RPTS JACKSON  |
| 3  | HIF082030   |
| 4  |   |
| 5  |   |
| 6  | FISCAL YEAR 2017 EPA BUDGET                                       |
| 7  | TUESDAY, MARCH 22, 2016   |
| 8  | House of Representatives  |
| 9  | Subcommittee on Energy and Power                                  |
| 10 | joint with the  |
| 11 | Subcommittee on Environment                                       |
| 12 | and the Economy   |
| 13 | Committee on Energy and Commerce                                  |
| 14 | Washington, D.C.  |
| 15 |   |
| 16 |   |
| 17 |   |
| 18 | The subcommittees met, pursuant to call, at 2:00 p.m., ir         |
| 19 | Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Ed Whitfield        |
| 20 | [chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power] presiding.     |
| 21 | Members present: Representatives Whitfield, Shimkus,              |
| 22 | Harper, Olson, Barton, Murphy, Latta, McKinley, Pompeo, Griffith, |
| 23 | Johnson, Long, Ellmers, Bucshon, Flores, Mullin, Hudson, Cramer,  |

Upton (ex officio), Tonko, McNerney, Green, DeGette, Capps,
Sarbanes, Yarmuth, Loebsack, Schrader, and Pallone (ex officio).

Staff present: Will Batson, Legislative Clerk, Energy and Power, Environment and the Economy; Mike Bloomquist, Deputy Staff Director; Allison Busbee, Policy Coordinator, Energy and Power; Jerry Couri, Senior Environmental Policy Advisor; Tom Hassenboehler, Chief Counsel, Energy and Power; A.T. Johnston, Senior Policy Advisor; Ben Lieberman, Counsel, Energy and Power; David McCarthy, Chief Counsel, Environment/Economy; Mary Neumayr, Senior Energy Counsel; Annelise Rickert, Legislative Associate; Chris Santini, Policy Coordinator, Oversight and Investigations; Chris Sarley, Policy Coordinator, Environment and Economy; Dan Schneider, Press Secretary; Peter Spencer, Professional Staff Member, Oversight; Dylan Vorbach, Deputy Press Secretary; Christine Brennan, Minority Press Secretary; Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff Director; Timia Crisp, Minority AAAS Fellow; Jean Fruci, Minority Energy and Environment Policy Advisor; Caitlin Haberman, Minority Professional Staff Member; Rick Kessler, Minority Senior Advisor and Staff Director, Energy and Environment; Josh Lewis, Minority EPA Detailee; John Marshall, Minority Policy Coordinator; Dan Miller, Minority Staff Assistant; Alexander Ratner, Minority Policy Analyst; Matt Schumacher, Minority Press Assistant; Andrew Souvall, Minority

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

Director of Communications, Outreach and Member Services; and

48 Tuley Wright, Minority Energy and Environment Policy Advisor.

Mr. Whitfield. [presiding] I would like to call this hearing to order.

This is a joint hearing of the Energy and Power Subcommittee with the Environment and the Economy Subcommittee. Of course, the subject of today's hearing is the FY 2017 budget for EPA.

I would like to recognize myself for five minutes.

We, of course, welcome Administrator McCarthy. I went down before the hearing started. I know she has been testifying before the appropriators, and now, she is going to be testifying before us. I suggested that, after she finished with us, that she go on to another committee and testify there.

[Laughter.]

But there is no secret that there is a really serious division in the country over some of the programs at EPA, certainly the Clean Energy Plan. The administration, we recognize, views climate change as the No. 1 issue facing mankind, and they have moved forward aggressively to address it in the U.S. with the Clean Energy Plan. From my personal view, I think it is being done because of international commitments that the President has made as a result of his Georgetown speech and his other commitments internationally to be a leader in addressing climate change.

But I think that it has really come to a head in this country over the controversy of the Clean Energy Plan with the lawsuits

filed by -- is it 26 states or 27 states? Twenty-seven states filed a lawsuit. I think that shows quite clearly that there is real angst over the extreme process that EPA is utilizing to adopt this Clean Energy Plan.

I might say once again that even Larry Tribe, who is a respected constitutional lawyer, said in some ways it was like tearing up the Constitution. So, many people do feel like that, you know, you can address climate change, but you ought to at least follow the law. Other people say, well, the ends justify the means.

But the Supreme Court did stay the Clean Energy Plan by a vote of 5-to-4. Even under the Utility MACT, the Supreme Court ruled that cost should have been considered. We all recognize that, by the time they made their decision, the regulated bodies had already implemented the plan. So, it had been done, even though the Court said there were some problems with it. And even under the Tailoring Rule, the Supreme Court issued a decision that called that into question as well.

So, one of the reasons many of us on my side of the aisle are upset is that we feel like the EPA is being too aggressive and that they have adopted a plan to be aggressive, recognizing that when you have a divided government, the only way that a party can contest it is go to court. If you go to court, and if you

don't get a stay, then, frequently, by the time the decision is made and all the court procedures have been exhausted, it is too late.

So, that is why we are going to do everything we can do to do serious oversight to make sure that the stay issued by the Supreme Court is followed, recognizing that even on that there is probably different legal opinions about what can and cannot be done.

But we know that the EPA's proposed budget is \$8.267 billion, which is \$127 million increased over the enacted level for FY 2016 and certainly higher than the FY 2009 enacted level of \$7.6 billion.

All of us want to have a lot of questions for you, Ms.

McCarthy. As I say, we disagree with you on many things. We respect you as a person and we recognize that you are a talented person with very strong views. And we have very strong views.

Unfortunately, we are going to have a vote during this process, but it won't take long. I think we are only going to have about 30-minute votes.

So, with that, I would like to yield back the balance of my time and recognize the gentleman from New York for his five-minute opening statement.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And, Chair

Whitfield and Chair Shimkus, for holding this hearing I say thank you. It is important for us to focus on the Environmental Protection Agency's budget request for fiscal year 2017.

Might I welcome, also, our Administrator McCarthy? Thank you for being here to share your thoughts and provide information, and thank you for your sound leadership and your stewardship of many of the programs that make for better results with the environment.

Public health and a clean environment are intricately linked, and I strongly believe that these principles support economic growth. Whether it is reducing air pollution, financing drinking and clean water infrastructure, or helping support the cleanup of brownfields for reuse, the EPA plays an essential role in keeping Americans and our environment healthy.

I know there are many members who believe that cutting the EPA budget will block the agency from issuing regulations and enforcing environmental laws, but, in reality, much of the budget supports state and local governments, either through grants and loans or with information and technical assistance. Cuts to the EPA budget cause additional burdens on state and local governments.

The EPA has and will continue to play a critical role in our nation's response to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and

addressing the threat of climate change. Despite what some may believe, climate change is happening and needs actions. The Clean Power Plan is essential to this response.

I also want to point out that this committee still has not held a single hearing to examine the poor and deteriorating state of drinking water infrastructure around the country. This is an area of jurisdiction that we have neglected, and I find that very troubling.

EPA has estimated the 20-year capital needs for this infrastructure at some \$384 billion. The American Society of Civil Engineers has graded our drinking water infrastructure a "D". Federal support for drinking water systems is primarily done through the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, or the SRF, which was created and last authorized in 1996. Through the SRF, we provide grants to states to administer this funding, giving them plenty of flexibility to address the greatest concerns that they have in the individual states.

Since 2003, we have made little to no effort to reassess whether the federal government is doing its fair share. The hundreds of thousands of water main breaks every year, trillion gallons of water lost through leaks, millions of lead service lines, and prevalence of century-old pipes suggest that we are not.

USA Today recently reported that nearly 2,000 water systems across all 50 states have exceeded the EPA's lead action level within the past 4 years. That is unacceptable.

The federal commitment is simple, not good enough, and we must step up to help states and local communities finance these projects. A majority of the Democrats on this committee have cosponsored the Assistance, Quality, and Affordability, or AQUA Act, which would reauthorize the Drinking Water SRF at Recovery Act levels and beyond, in addition to making some much-needed updates to the Safe Drinking Water Act.

We stand ready and willing to be partners in this effort. For inspiration, we need not look any further than our colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee who passed a bipartisan surface transportation bill that included a \$70 billion transfer from the General Fund. We would only need a fraction of that to make major headway in our drinking water infrastructure backlog, that infrastructure which is hidden infrastructure.

But, sadly, without the need for extension after extension of the Drinking Water SRF, we have forgotten the bipartisan nature of this issue in this committee. It is time to get serious about this committee's role in protecting public health and maintaining our drinking water infrastructure. Every job and every life

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 187 relies on water. It relies on the commitment that we will demand 188 nothing less than safe drinking water. It is time to come 189 together, recognize this, and take action. 190 With that, Administrator McCarthy, I look forward to your testimony and to working with you to continue our progress in 191 192 environmental protection. Again, thank you for being here. With that, I yield back. 193 194 Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back. 195 At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Shimkus, who is chairman of the Environment and the 196 197 Economy Subcommittee, for five minutes. 198 Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 199 And welcome, Administrator McCarthy. 200 Hopefully, we can continue to work on coal ash and, as we 201 talked about earlier, getting TSCA over the finish line. We 202 appreciate some of the expertise your office has been able to 203 provide for us to make those decisions. 204 Madam Secretary, there is real pain in coal country, as you 205 know. Market conditions have some effect, but, also, they just 206 can't keep up with the numerous rules and regulations that they 207 are trying to meet, whether that is Casper or cooling towers, Clean 208 Power Plan, mercury, MATS, stream protection rule, Waters of the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

It is just too much that they can handle and have any

U.S.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. consistency and planning. That is why the coal regions of our country are in dire straits. When you lose a coal mine, you lose all the periphery jobs. You lose the grocery stores, the gas stations, and the like. We know that you are here asking at least the appropriators for more money. I am fresh off the campaign trail. I had to tell my folks that you were at 2008 funding levels and at 1989 staff levels. And all my constituents said, well, that is still too much. So, we have an education to do. I had to remind them there are some things that I think are important that the agency does, too. We have the Superfund responsibilities. We have brownfield reclamation. There are things that we need to do. But the environment out there today makes it difficult for the public to really appreciate the budget request and the job challenges that our nation is facing right now. But I want to thank you for your service and the professionalism that you have shown. I will have a couple of tougher questions when we get to those, but I know that you are up to it. With that, I appreciate your coming. And, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back. At this time I recognize the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr.

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

Pallone, for five minutes.

2.42

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and, also,

Administrator McCarthy, for being here today to discuss the EPA's

programs and budget.

EPA's work is critically important to protecting the health of our communities and our environment. The President's fiscal year 2017 budget funds the EPA at \$8.267 billion, a modest increase of \$127 million from the fiscal year 2016 enacted level. And this also deals with the funding level approved as part of the bipartisan budget agreement in October.

I support this increase, but it is important that we all recognize that far more resources are needed to properly address all the environmental issues facing our nation today. A clean environment is essential to public health and to a strong economy.

It is also important to recognize that EPA's budget represents a small portion of the overall federal budget, less than one-quarter of 1 percent. We should also remember that EPA shares over 40 percent of its funding with the states and tribes to help them implement federal environmental laws and achieve national goals. These funds support local economies and communities big and small.

The recent drinking water crisis across the nation demonstrates how important it is to invest in our drinking water

systems. I commend the President for increasing the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund, or SRF, by nearly \$160 million. Our drinking water systems need more funding to help provide clean and safe drinking water to communities.

While I am happy to see this funding increase, I must reiterate that so much more is needed. The Drinking Water SRF has been underfunded for years. According to EPA's most recent needs survey, \$385 billion is needed over the next 20 years to modernize and repair our drinking water systems.

We should be working together to make these critical investments to ensure the health of our communities. We have reached a point where essential water and waste infrastructure needs repair and replacement. We simply cannot allow this essential infrastructure to deteriorate further. If we do, we are going to be forced to spend more when a crisis occurs, and the longer we delay, the more expensive it will become to fix.

The President's budget also provides an increase of nearly \$68 million for climate and air-quality-related initiatives, which I support. We should be investing in programs that build climate resiliency and reduce the impacts of extreme weather events. I especially appreciate EPA's plans to help communities integrate climate adaptation policies to help them address our changing climate and plan for the future.

In addition, the President's budget increases funding by nearly \$40 million for the cleanup of Superfund and brownfield sites across the nation. These are vital programs for protecting human environmental health, while also creating jobs and improving the economy. As of March 1st, brownfields programs have created more than 100,000 jobs and in the first 2 months of this year have revitalized over 4500 acres of land.

While I appreciate EPA's efforts, the remaining Superfund and brownfields sites are becoming more complicated to clean up, and with limited resources, the time and cost to complete this work is extended significantly. With so many people living near contaminated sites, we must continue providing robust support for these programs. Cleanup of these sites transforms from liabilities to assets that generate needed revenues and economic opportunity.

Finally, I would like to voice one area of concern, proposed cuts to the BEACH Act Grant Program. As someone elected to represent part of the Jersey shore, I understand the importance of protecting and improving the quality of our beaches and their importance to local economies. I am disappointed that, once again, the budget eliminates funding for this critical program, and I am troubled by EPA's unwillingness to prioritize funding to fight water-borne pathogens of pollution that affect coastal

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 302 recreation. This program deserves continued support, and I will 303 work with my colleagues to ensure adequate funding. 304 But, again, I look forward to the Administrator's testimony. 305 Thank you, and I yield back. 306 Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back. 307 At this time the Chair recognizes the chairman of the full committee, Mr. Upton, for five minutes. 308 309 The Chairman. Administrator McCarthy, welcome back. 310 look forward to our discussion on EPA's proposed 2017 budget. 311 I know that the agency has an ambitious agenda that it would 312 like to put in place before the President's tenure in the White 313 House is completed, but the EPA should focus, I believe, its 314 efforts less on finalizing a wave of new regs and more on getting 315 back to the basic functions for which the agency was created. 316 Improving public health by ensuring the quality of the air 317 we breathe and the safety of our drinking water supply, that is 318 the reason Republicans and Democrats came together in 1970 and 319 created the EPA. It was also the reason Congress passed many 320 bipartisan public health bills, like the Clean Air Act and the 321 Safe Drinking Water Act, for the agency to administer. 322 However, the heartbreaking events unfolding in Flint are a 323 sign that perhaps the EPA has strayed from its core mission. Make

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

no mistake, the system failed at all levels that resulted in the

lead contamination problems with Flint's water supply. It is clear to me that EPA's poor performance of its duties under the Safe Drinking Water Act were, in fact, part of the problem.

I hope that, in the same bipartisan spirit that launched EPA in 1970, that we can rededicate ourselves to the basic public health protections that are the reasons that this agency was brought into existence, the most recent example being our bipartisan work to strengthen the public disclosure requirements in the Safe Drinking Water Act. Not only was it a step in the right direction, more importantly, I hope that it provides the reset needed at the agency to focus it on doing the tasks assigned to it under the Safe Drinking Water Act, including compliance and verification activities.

What we are doing now will not prevent damage in Flint, but we owe it to the people of Flint, as well as other communities across the country that may face lead-contaminated water supplies, to sharpen EPA's oversight role in protecting public health.

I know many people in D.C. are eager to lay blame on one political party or another when disasters like Toledo, Gold King Mine, Flint threaten a community's drinking water. Regardless of who is responsible, we need to address the crises that those people face.

I am interested in being part of the solution, and I know that you, also, want to be part of the solution. It is going to take creative solutions, and surely there will be challenges. I know that we can put our heads together and put a greater emphasis on problem-solving and doing right by the American people, rather than playing the blame game. And that is certainly my perspective.

While we are talking about places where we can and should be working together, I want to follow up on what John Shimkus indicated with our committee's reform efforts for the Toxic Substances Control Act, or TSCA. As you know, we worked very hard to put together a bipartisan bill that addresses legal shortcomings in the law. I know that your agency would like to see reform occur in this Congress. I look forward to your support in helping it get to the President's desk. We look to working constructively with you.

And I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Whitfield. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. McNerney, for five minutes.

Mr. McNerney. Well, thank you, Mr. Chair.

The EPA plays an important role in our society in protecting our citizens and our environment. Safe and clean drinking water has recently risen to the headlines because of the discovery of

pipes corroded by using contaminated water in Flint, Michigan. This water has permanently harmed their children and shaken people's trust in our public services. This type of occurrence will become more common if we fail to invest in our failing infrastructure or if we fail to invest in the means to monitor our safe drinking water. Clean and safe drinking water should be a guarantee for every American. It is not only irresponsible, but criminal to withhold funds and resources to protect lives.

The EPA also has a significant responsibility to fight climate change. Climate change is considered a contributing factor to crop failures and droughts in the Middle East and the African Sahel. Climate change is causing weather patterns to bring super-storms such as Sandy and Katrina. The evidence for climate change is dramatic and growing.

The EPA has the experience and science to help us push back on climate change, and they are working on lowering carbon emissions and developing clean energy sources. We need reliable and resilient grid that we can depend upon. And I am going to take this opportunity to recommend to my coal state colleagues to embrace carbon sequestration before the coal industry collapses entirely.

Climate change is also affecting people's health across the globe. Unchecked climate change could lead to 6 million to 7.9

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 394 million acres of forest being destroyed by wildfires at a cost 395 of \$940 million to \$1.4 billion. It could also lead to the 396 destruction of ecosystems, such as coral reefs that support economic activity, including 35 percent of the coral reefs in 397 398 Hawaii, at an economic loss of \$1.2 billion. 399 Both clean water and climate change are huge issues, but ones I am confident the EPA can address and ensure that American lives 400 401 are protected. 402 Now I know my colleagues would like to greatly reduce or 403 eliminate the EPA, but what would we have without the EPA? you have doubts, just visit Beijing or Kolkata, and you will find 404 405 out. 406 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back. 407 Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back. 408 And that concludes the opening statements. And so, at this 409 time, Ms. McCarthy, I would recognize you for five minutes for 410 your opening statement. 411 Be sure to turn the microphone on and get it real close. 412 413 414 415 416

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

417

418

419

420

STATEMENT OF GINA McCARTHY, ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Ms. McCarthy. Thank you so much.

Mr. Whitfield. Thank you.

Ms. McCarthy. Thank you, Chairman Whitfield, Chairman Shimkus, Chairman Upton, Ranking Member Tonko, Ranking Member Pallone, and all the members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you to discuss EPA's proposed fiscal year 2017 budget. I am joined today by the agency's Deputy Chief Financial Officer, David Bloom.

EPA's budget request of \$8.267 billion for the 2017 fiscal year lays out a strategy to ensure steady progress in addressing environmental issues that affect public health. For 45 years, our investments to protect public health and the environment have consistently paid off many times over. We have cut air pollution by 70 percent and cleaned up half of our nation's polluted waterways. All the while our national economy has tripled.

Effective environmental protection is a joint effort of the EPA, states, and by tribal partners. That is why the largest part of our budget, \$3.28 billion, or almost 40 percent, is provided directly to our state and tribal partners.

In fiscal year 2017, we are requesting an increase of \$77

million in funding for state and tribal assistance categorical grants in support of critical state work in air and water protection, as well as continued support for our tribal partners.

This budget request also reinforces EPA's focus on community support by providing targeted funding and support for regional coordinators to help communities find and determine the best programs to address local environmental priorities.

The budget includes \$90 million in brownfields project grants to local communities. That is an increase of \$10 million, which will help to return contaminated sites to productive reuse.

This budget prioritizes actions to reduce the impacts of climate change and support the President's Climate Action Plan. It includes \$235 million for efforts to cut carbon pollution and other greenhouse gases through common-sense standards, guidelines, and voluntary programs.

The EPA's Clean Power Plan continues to be a top priority for the EPA and for our nation's inevitable transition to a clean energy economy. Though the Supreme Court has temporarily stayed the Clean Power Plan Rule, states are not precluded from voluntarily choosing to continue implementation planning. And EPA will continue to assist states that voluntarily decide to do so.

As part of the President's 21st Century Clean Transportation

Plan, the budget also proposes to establish a new mandatory fund for the EPA, providing \$1.65 billion over the course of 10 years to retrofit, replace, or repower diesel equipment and up to \$300 million in fiscal year 2017 to renew and increase funding for the Diesel Emission Reduction Grant Program.

The budget also includes a \$4.2 million increase to enhance vehicle engine and fuel compliance programs, including critical testing capabilities.

We also have to confront the systemic challenge that threatens our country's drinking water and the infrastructure that delivers it.

This budget includes a \$2 billion request for the State Revolving Loan Fund and \$42 million in additional funds to provide technical assistance to small communities, loan financing to promote public/private collaboration, and training to increase the capacity of communities and states to plan and finance drinking water and wastewater infrastructure improvements.

The EPA requests \$20 million to fund the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act, our WIFIA program, which will provide direct financing for the construction of water and wastewater infrastructure by making loans for large, innovative projects of regional or national significance.

This budget also provides \$22 million in funding to expand

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 491 the technical, managerial, and financial capabilities of drinking 492 Included is \$7.1 million for the Water water systems. 493 Infrastructure and Resilience Finance Center and the Center for Environmental Finance that will enable communities across the 494 495 country to focus on financial planning for upcoming public 496 infrastructure investments, expand work with states to identify financing opportunities, in particular for rural communities, and 497 498 enhance partnership and collaboration with the U.S. Department 499 of Agriculture. EPA is also seeking a \$20 million increase to the Superfund 500 501 Remedial Program, which will accelerate the pace of cleanup, 502 supporting states, local communities, and tribes in their efforts 503 to assess and clean up sites and return them once again to 504 productive reuse. 505 EPA's fiscal year 2017 budget request will let us continue 506 to make a real and visible difference to communities and public 507 health every day and provide us with a foundation to revitalize 508 the economy and improve infrastructure across the country. 509 Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and I look 510 forward to answering your questions. 511 [The prepared statement of Ms. McCarthy follows:] 512 513 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT 1\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

Mr. Whitfield. Thank you, Ms. McCarthy. We appreciate that statement.

And I will recognize myself for five minutes to get started here.

Soon after the Supreme Court issued the stay on the Clean Energy Plan, I was reading an article and it said that in a letter you said that the rule had been suspended and has no legal force, the rule being the Clean Energy Plan. I was curious, who did you write that letter to? Was that letter sent to all the states or was this a letter that just was an interagency letter to members that work at EPA and colleagues?

Ms. McCarthy. I don't know which letter you are referring to.

Mr. Whitfield. It says, "While Administrator McCarthy has suggested that her agency will continue to provide tools and outreach to states, none of these efforts by EPA should be perceived as requiring states to act. The rule has been suspended and has no legal force," the letter stated.

So, did you send the letter to the states saying that the rule has been suspended and has no legal force?

Ms. McCarthy. That would be an accurate statement, sir, and I assume that I did notice people, but I don't know which particular letter. I just don't recall.

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. Mr. Whitfield. So, you don't recall? You don't recall 537 538 sending out a letter? You don't recall sending a letter to the 539 states? 540 Ms. McCarthy. I certainly have said that in person and in 541 letters to a number of individuals explaining that there is a stay 542 in place and EPA won't be implementing or enforcing the law, and that it has to work through the courts, but we would certainly 543 continue to work voluntarily with states that voluntarily want 544 545 to continue --546 Mr. Whitfield. But you don't recollect yourself sending a 547 letter to the states saying that? 548 Ms. McCarthy. I actually believe that I did, sir, but I 549 haven't -- you know, reading a portion of it doesn't give me 550 complete enough recollection to be able to confirm it positively. 551 Mr. Whitfield. Well, did you send a letter to every --552 Ms. McCarthy. I did send a letter to states letting them 553 know what happened, yes, sir. 554 Mr. Whitfield. Okay. Okay. Now, prior to the Supreme 555 Court stay, each state was expected, by September of this year, 556 to submit a State Implementation Plan to EPA, is that correct? 557 Ms. McCarthy. That is correct, yes. 558 Mr. Whitfield. And have they been notified that that State 559 Implementation Plan is no longer expected by September?

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 560 Ms. McCarthy. I believe everybody is aware of that, yes, 561 sir. 562 Mr. Whitfield. Okay. And now, Ms. McCabe has talked a lot 563 about, and you have also, saying you are working with states that 564 want to proceed. How many states would that be? 565 Ms. McCarthy. Well, we are certainly working with many 566 Every day that changes. I know that 25 or so states have states. 567 indicated publicly that they are doing some portion of planning 568 and continuing to think about it. But many states understand that 569 there is a transition in the energy world right now and that the Clean Power Plan is on hold, but it is going to be looked at on 570 571 its merits, and they are continuing to think about --572 Mr. Whitfield. But they can do the transition without the 573 Clean Energy Plan, correct? 574 Ms. McCarthy. Well, the energy transition is happening 575 regardless of that, yes. 576 Mr. Whitfield. Yes, I mean, it is all about pricing 577 primarily. Ms. McCarthy. Right. 578 579 Mr. Whitfield. But two component parts that Ms. McCabe 580 keeps stressing is the Clean Energy Incentive Program and the 581 Those are an integral part of the Clean Energy Plan. Model Rules. 582 Without those, the Clean Energy Plan would not be very effective.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

Would you agree with that?

Ms. McCarthy. No, sir. The Clean Power Plan actually is a rule that is moving forward on its own through the courts. The Model Rule was something that the states suggested that we do for them, and part of the Model Rule is how the states might handle the CEIP. So, both of those are related, and those are efforts that the states have asked us to do separate, and also related, but on its own separate.

Mr. Whitfield. Well, she refers to those as two key pieces, the Clean Energy Incentive Program and the Model Rules, key pieces. But she says it will be done consistent with the Court ruling.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Whitfield. How do you determine that it is consistent with the Court ruling?

Ms. McCarthy. Well, the Clean Energy Incentive Plan is part of the Clean Power Plan as it stands that the Court is going to look at. Separate from that, there is a question of how states might look at the Model Rule and how that might be also an opportunity to take comment on it and look more specifically at how states might look at their Clean Energy Incentive Program.

So, those are being done for the benefit of the states' understanding, and it is being done at the request of states that

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. voluntarily want to think about how they might comply and think about the planning process. Mr. Whitfield. Might comply with what? Ms. McCarthy. Might think about complying consistent with the Clean Power Plan, but it is not an underlying rule of the plan. It is all voluntary and it is the states asking us to help them as they are doing their voluntary planning moving forward. Mr. Whitfield. My time has expired. At this time I recognize the gentleman from New York, Mr. Tonko, for five minutes. Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you again, Administrator McCarthy, for being here today. The fiscal year 2016 Omnibus included \$863 million for the Drinking Water SRF, which was a \$44 million decrease from fiscal year 2015. So, I was grateful that the administration has recognized a critical need to invest in our drinking water systems by increasing its request by \$158 million for this year. But can you please explain the relationship between the Clean and Drinking Water SRFs? Ms. McCarthy. Yes. I mean, both of those are SRF programs. One manages our wastewater system, the other our drinking water We tend to look at them together, but we also tend to

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618

619

620

621

622

623

624

625

626

627

look at what the outstanding needs are in both. Clearly, both of them are necessary for clean drinking water, let's make that clear, and rivers and streams that are clean.

But, when we looked back at what the demand was for each over a period of time, looking out to 2030, we realized that drinking water at this point is in dire need of additional assistance, and we balanced that in terms of how we are looking at both in this budget.

Mr. Tonko. So, you acknowledge, then, that there is this flexibility to shift funds between the two SRFs in order to address their specific needs, is that right?

Ms. McCarthy. They have that opportunity to be able to shift as well. There is quite a bit of flexibility in terms of the use of both funds.

Mr. Tonko. Yes, and it is why I am disappointed to see the \$1 billion request for drinking water was at the expense of over a \$400 million decrease in clean water. The combined total is some \$250 million less than last year's enacted level, and even worse when compared to the last budget request.

So, can you explain the decision to offset the drinking water increase with the clean water? I know you are concerned for, obviously, having to grow the one account, but, overall, it appears as though there is a dire need to have very robust funding.

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

Ms. McCarthy. Yes. I think there needs to be a very serious and larger conversation about this, as I am sure you would agree, overall. Our challenge was to meet the funding levels that were in the bipartisan Budget Act of 2015. So, we didn't have an opportunity to look for significant new funding.

Every time that those numbers are increased, it is at the expense of EPA's operating budget. Frankly, with a budget that is only looking for a 2-percent bump-up, it will be very hard for the agency to continue operating at an efficient and successful level if we have to continue to look at significant more investment within our budget for those activities.

Mr. Tonko. Right, which speaks to the role of Congress here, as we control the purse strings. It appears as though we have to do a much more, again, robust effort for our water issues.

While I understand the budgets are tight, robbing Peter to pay Paul doesn't seem to be the appropriate solution. I am sure you would agree that both drinking and wastewater systems, as you are indicating, need additional federal support. And so, we must ensure that both are adequately funded.

As I mentioned earlier, the EPA estimates that there is this 20-year capital needs level of some \$384 billion. This estimate has increased in each report since 1995, and I would guess the next estimate will follow that trend. So, we have spent 20 years

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 675 funding the SRF between \$800 million and \$1 billion. This request 676 appears to be much of the same. I have heard from the mayors in my district, from town 677 678 supervisors in my district, that cash-strapped local government 679 simply cannot come up with the financing on their own. And I have had tremendous glaring examples of painful consequences of 680 681 underfunding. 682 The Administrator of the EPA does a lot of work with state 683 and local governments. In your experience, will we make 684 significant progress in closing this \$384 billion gap by maintaining the current federal funding levels? 685 686 Ms. McCarthy. No, it doesn't even come close or consider 687 the fact that we are looking at new, emerging contaminants that 688 simply won't be resolved through the technologies we have in hand. 689 Mr. Tonko. And do you believe that a more lucrative, a more 690 robust, sustained commitment is needed to reduce the 691 infrastructure project backlog that exists? 692 Ms. McCarthy. I think there needs to be a much larger 693 conversation about how you can start investing in a way that is 694 commensurate with the challenge and the core needs of our 695 communities and families. 696 I thank you for that. Mr. Tonko. 697 Earlier I had mentioned the AQUA Act that I have introduced.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 698 It is driven by the Recovery Act funding levels. And so, that 699 defines our first-year commitment in that legislation of \$3.1 700 billion and, then, ramping up to \$5.5 billion. Again, we would call for tremendously-focused attention to the water 701 702 infrastructure in this country. 703 I thank you, Administrator McCarthy, for, again, responding in a way that I think is deeply rooted in commitment to helping 704 705 our state and local governments. 706 Mr. Chair, I hope this is an issue that we can continue to 707 investigate to ensure communities across this nation are getting support to meet their public health, public safety, and 708 709 infrastructure needs, all very important. I think some of the 710 flare-ups we have seen across this nation in all geographic 711 regions remind us that our work is far from done. 712 So, with that, I will yield back. 713 Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman's time has expired. 714 At this time I recognize the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. 715 Shimkus, for five minutes. 716 Mr. Shimkus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 717 So, again, welcome, Administrator. 718 The good news is we got your letter today in response to 719 statements for the record from Acting Assistant Administrator 720 McCabe, who testified before us in October. The bad news is they

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

create some more questions. And so, I want to read the story, and maybe you can help get this clarified for us.

The basis of my questions in the statement for the record was to ask about the Regulatory Impact Analysis that was used to promulgate the CO2 regulations. So, throughout the transcript, I continue to kind of push McCabe on give us how you calculated how many power plants would be operating, because if you are going to do a Regulatory Impact Analysis and the cost, basic Economics 101 says supply and demand. There is a 31-gigawatt difference between the Energy Information Agency and what this Regulatory Impact Analysis says from your agency.

So, we were hoping that, for the record, we would get back what was the formula that the EPA used to calculate the amount of power plants that were going to be decommissioned. What we got was a statement. The EPA discussed the assumptions underlying each of these projections in the Regulatory Impact Analysis accompanying the final Clean Power Plant.

So, the questions I asked to be clarified using the Regulatory Impact Analysis were responded by a letter that says refer to the Regulatory Impact Analysis. If you could help us get the real data and a better answer, I would appreciate that.

Ms. McCarthy. Mr. Chairman, I will do the very best I can to answer your questions today or to provide you followup on it.

Mr. Shimkus. Yes. I mean, it is just the bottom line is, if you have lost 70 power plants, that does have an effect on -Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Shimkus. And we just want to find out how you all figured that out versus the Energy Information Agency. And so, we are glad you got that letter to us punctually. Otherwise, I would have had to send another letter. So, thank you.

Since we have talked about TSCA a little bit, as you know, we are hoping to get something to the President. There are three questions. Do you have any idea what it might cost you to assess 10 chemicals in a given year? This is what we need. So, 10 or 20. And then, really, the third question is, did you consider what would be a budget baseline for operating a reformed TSCA program and if fees were capped at \$18 million per year? We are trying to get an idea of, if there are fees, what are your costs? Are they in the ballpark and stuff?

Ms. McCarthy. Well, that is well within the range of the technical information that both you and Congressman Pallone have been asking for. I am more than happy to support, to provide you with whatever information I can.

Mr. Shimkus. Thank you. Thank you very much.

And I am glad you mentioned Ranking Member Pallone. He has been very, very helpful on movement of this, and we are hopeful

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. we will get to some agreement in the future. My last question, because I have a minute-and-a-half left, is I did mention in my opening statement Superfund cleanup, Has the ratio of administrative cost to cleanup cost CERCLA. changed over the last few years and, if so, how? My big concern is always we have the Superfund. A lot of it goes for the administration and the litigation cost. the ratio between that portion of the fund and actually cleanup cost? Ms. McCarthy. Yes. Mr. Shimkus. And do you know if there has been any significant change in that? I want money to go to cleanup more than bureaucracy. Ms. McCarthy. I don't know the answer, but we will certainly follow up. Mr. Shimkus. Okay. Thank you. Since I have 45 seconds left, I will yield back my time and thank the chairman. Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back. At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman, Mr. McNerney of California, for five minutes. Mr. McNerney. Thanks for indulging and confusing, Mr.

Chairman.

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

774

775

776

777

778

779

780

781

782

783

784

785

786

787

788

[Laughter.]

Administrator McCarthy, I know the EPA is working to deal with drought issues.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. McNerney. Of course, I am from California. We know about drought.

Can you explain some of the ways that EPA is working to address drought through technology and innovation?

Ms. McCarthy. Yes, sir. We are working pretty hard through our National Resilience effort. We are working with other agencies to develop tools that communities can use to identify both what the drought challenge is and a variety of tools in which they can design systems more effectively. Those are everything from stormwater to their drinking water systems, looking at potential impacts, keeping our communities safe, making sure that our water and wastewater facilities are operating correctly. And so, we have a variety of tools that we work.

We also have people that go to the communities. We have regional folks that go to communities and work with them and try to help design solutions, so they can manage the kind of adaptive behavior that they need to have in a changing climate.

Mr. McNerney. Do you believe that California can become regionally self-sufficient? In other words, different parts of

California can become water self-sufficient ultimately?

Ms. McCarthy. You know, there are smarter people in California than I that know the answer to that question. But I know that we are available to work with anyone in California that wants to roll up their sleeves and look at this issue.

Mr. McNerney. Thank you.

I have been a proponent of water use efficiency, and it is important, especially considering threats to our water supply, for us to protect our water sources and to conserve our water supply. One program that aims to help communities conserve water and promote long-term sustainable infrastructure is the WaterSense Program. Can you please describe some of the successes of the WaterSense Program?

Ms. McCarthy. Well, I am more than happy to supply you with a lot.

But WaterSense is beginning to be seen, and it has been used in California, as a really good opportunity. Basically, it does the boring work of water conservation. It allows you to take a look at where your water is going, how much it costs, where it is leaking, and how do you take advantage of that, everything from how you can conserve in a household to how you can look at it from a systems approach, from a community or a region. So, we have some really dedicated people that are doing great work at all

levels on WaterSense.

Mr. McNerney. Well, moving on, the gas leak in California has raised the public awareness of how gas is leaking into the environment. I know it is not exactly related, but do you believe there is sufficient data related to loss and accountable gas, so that we understand how much gas is actually leaking into the environment across the country?

Ms. McCarthy. Actually, we have been learning recently, most recently, through our last Greenhouse Gas Inventory how little we actually have known about the methane leaks in our oil and gas sector in our pipelines. We are getting educated. It is more than we ever thought before, but there clearly needs to be a continued effort to gather information. We fully intend to do that.

Mr. McNerney. So, what do we have to do to get a hold of this and to stop the leakage or to reduce the leakage?

Ms. McCarthy. Well, we have announced that we are actually going to put out an information collection request to the industry to get information from the oil and gas sector, in particular. And then, the challenge will be what are the cost-effective and available technologies that can reduce those leaks, look at the operating practices that need to be done differently to maintain those.

But the good news about methane, in particular, and natural gas is that it is a product that is leaking, not a byproduct. And so, the more you can capture it, the more it is a very cost-effective way to do business.

Mr. McNerney. There is an economic driver, in other words?

Ms. McCarthy. Yes, that's right.

Mr. McNerney. Very good.

So, what is the current state of carbon sequestration?

Ms. McCarthy. Carbon sequestration is available. It continues to be something that we are going to be relying on more and more. The Department of Energy has a robust program that is looking at carbon sequestration as well as use in sequestration. It is being utilized in a number of facilities in the U.S. We would like it to be more used. We would like the cost to go down considerably as it is being used, so that it becomes more and more available. It is most cost-effective when it is joined with enhanced oil recovery. That is when you have a good system or when it is used to actually produce chemicals.

Mr. McNerney. So, can we save the coal industry with carbon sequestration?

Ms. McCarthy. I actually think that carbon sequestration is going to be important, not just domestically, but, clearly, internationally. Coal is going to be around, whether it is in

882 the U.S. or it is in other countries. And it is important for 883 us to have technologies that can allow coal to continue to be part 884 of the energy system. 885 Mr. McNerney. Thank you. 886 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 887 Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back. 888 We do have a series of four votes on the Floor. But, before 889 we go, I am going to get Mr. Upton and Mr. Pallone. And then, 890 once they complete, we will try to come back here at 3:30 to give 891 everyone else an opportunity to ask questions. 892 Ms. McCarthy. Yes, sir. 893 Mr. Whitfield. Mr. Upton, you are recognized for five 894 minutes. 895 The Chairman. Great. And thank you, Mr. Chairman. 896 Again, Ms. McCarthy, we are glad that you are here today. 897 I want to thank you just real quickly for your support of 898 the bill that we passed. Every member of this committee supported 899 it on the House Floor, H.R. 4470, which did pass 416-to-2, to try 900 to clear up the confusion and close the gaps when communities like 901 Flint are known. We are hoping that that gets to the President's desk in some form when it comes back from the Senate. 902 903 A couple of questions. We are going to have a hearing in

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted

two of our subcommittees together next month that really looks

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 905 to the future on this issue, not pointing fingers. It is my understanding that we are working with your Assistant 906 907 Administrator for Office of Water, Joel Beauvais --908 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 909 The Chairman. -- to be our EPA person who is going to come 910 testify. 911 A question that I had for you, a couple of questions as it 912 relates to the future, I know in the Protecting America's Waters 913 book, I will read you briefly, it says, "In FY 2017, the EPA will 914 begin to fund WIFIA projects. EPA expects that entities with 915 large-scale, complex water and wastewater projects will be 916 attracted to WIFIA through the EPA....will work to provide 917 assistance through a diverse set of projects." 918 How many communities do you think may apply for funds once 919 that program is out? 920 Ms. McCarthy. Yes, we are requesting \$20 million --921 The Chairman. Right. 922 Ms. McCarthy. -- 15 of which would be used for leveraging 923 opportunities. It is not clear to me how many that would --924 The Chairman. Fifty communities? Thirty? Twenty? 925 Ms. McCarthy. It depends upon the size. 926 The Chairman. Any idea? Will there be some accommodation 927 for rural areas, I mean some setaside for rural communities that

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

are under 100,000 population?

Ms. McCarthy. Yes, we haven't yet determined that, sir. I'm sorry.

The Chairman. Okay.

Ms. McCarthy. But I am happy to take your comments or concerns about that, if you would like me to.

The Chairman. Yes. I know that you are working on a new Copper and Lead Rule. What is your expectation as to when that will be ready to be put out for comment?

Ms. McCarthy. We would like it to be done as soon as possible, but I think the tragedy in Flint has made it very clear to us that we have to tackle this in a substantive way. So, our goal is to get a rule both proposed and finalized next fiscal year.

The Chairman. As you look at the entire country, how many communities -- I know Flint is in terrible distress over what happened. I would hope that there are no other communities in that same position. But how many communities do you think or how many states have communities like that that are in need of resources that could replace some of their lead lines to their residents? How widespread of a problem is that? We have seen stories in different publications. USA Today has had some good ones in the last number of days in terms of communities. What would your estimate be?

Ms. McCarthy. Let me give you a sense of this. I want to make sure I answer your question. There are about 68,000 public water systems that have to report to us under the Lead and Copper Rule. About 96 percent of those have had no exceedances of the action level over the past three years.

So, what I am trying to do is, I think Flint is unique, but I think there are challenges in communities. One of the things that I did was to write to every governor and to write to every what we call the primacy agency, the agency that is responsible for that at the state level, to ask them to do a few things; to get back to us to make sure that they are following and implementing the current statute; to ask them to identify where their lead lines are publicly and put it on the web; to start publishing their results --

The Chairman. And that is a little bit of a requirement that we had in our bill, right, H.R. 4470, if you found a problem, right? You would do that?

Ms. McCarthy. That is exactly right. That is exactly the same thing. Because one of the things we realize is, with Flint happening, you are right, it is a failure of government --

The Chairman. Knowing that my time is expiring, and I want to let Mr. Pallone have the balance before these votes, do you think that it is possible that, when we convene again next month,

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 974 when we have this hearing on looking to the future, do you think you will have some of that information available that you can 975 provide to us prior to the hearing? 976 Ms. McCarthy. We will. We know there is about 10 million 977 978 lead lines, but the challenge is to treat water so that it is not 979 corrosive, to systemically get rid of the lead lines, and then, to address the lead that is actually in people's plumbing 980 981 fixtures. So, it is a multifaceted challenge, and it is one we 982 have to tackle. 983 The Chairman. Thank you. 984 Yield back. 985 Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back. 986 At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New 987 Jersey, Mr. Pallone, for five minutes. 988 Mr. Pallone. Thank you. 989 We have got to be guick because we are going to go vote, and 990 I have to cover both Superfund and beaches in one fell swoop here. 991 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 992 Mr. Pallone. So, on the Superfunds, cleaning up toxic 993 Superfund sites not only reduces health risk, it helps create jobs 994 during the cleanup and through newly-uncontaminated and 995 productive land ready for redevelopment, as you know. 996 Unfortunately, Congress has failed to reinstate the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. Superfund tax, leading to fewer resources for the program. 997 998 fact, the resources have essentially been cut in half over the 999 last two decades. Without those revenues, important Superfund 1000 cleanups have been delayed. The backlog of sites has grown and, 1001 of course, that shifts it to the taxpayers. 1002 So, let me ask you first, would you say that the success of 1003 the Superfund program depends directly on the funding it receives? 1004 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 1005 Mr. Pallone. And would more funding, then, mean more 1006 cleanups? 1007 Ms. McCarthy. Absolutely. We are requesting an additional 1008 \$20 million, which would get us three to five more started, but 1009 we certainly have a significant backlog. 1010 I appreciate that. I think that it is clear Mr. Pallone. 1011 that the Superfund and brownfields programs show that creating 1012 jobs and cleaning up the environment are not mutually-exclusive. 1013 Now let me get to my beaches questions. Representing a 1014 coastal district, it has always been one of my top priorities to 1015 ensure that water at our nation's beaches is not contaminated and dangerous for those who visit them to swim, surf, and fish. 1016 that is why, as you know, I was disappointed to see that the BEACH 1017 1018 Act Grant Program has been zeroed-out again in the President's

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

States utilize these funds to monitor water quality and

budget.

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 1020 notify the public when our coastal waters are not safe for 1021 swimming. 1022 So, my question is, do you believe EPA's BEACH Grants have 1023 been successful over the years in expanding the number of beaches 1024 tested nationwide and keeping swimmers out of contaminated 1025 waters? 1026 Ms. McCarthy. Yes, I believe that it has been a good 1027 I think where we have challenges is that it was supposed 1028 to start up to make sure that communities and states have the 1029 ability to monitor and do this effectively. We believe that that 1030 ability is now there, which is why we think in a tight budget it 1031 is one of the areas in which we can be a little bit tighter in 1032 terms of --1033 Mr. Pallone. Well, you know I disagree because I think that 1034 a lot of these towns don't have the resources. 1035 Ms. McCarthy. Right. I know. 1036 Mr. Pallone. So, I am going to try to work with you and my colleagues, as we did last year, to restore this funding --1037 1038 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. -- that helps address these health risks. 1039 Mr. Pallone. The other issue related is another successful method is 1040 1041 spotting spilled oil in commercial areas like the New York-New 1042 Jersey Harbor and collecting it before it damages the environment.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted

It was the helicopter. You know that in 2014 EPA cancelled the Helicopter Monitoring Program in EPA Region 2, but operated it in the summer to monitor the waters in the Harbor and to identify debris, oil slicks, and algae blooms. Since the Helicopter Monitoring Program was cancelled, how is EPA engaging and participating in the Floatables Action Plan in the New York and New Jersey Region.

Ms. McCarthy. We are certainly monitoring the activities that both of the states have taken to have boots on the ground there, to make sure they see the oil as it occurs and are able to address it. And we have a task force that, I think you know, we pulled together to make sure that we understand what the implications of having disinvested in that helicopter might be, if any. So, we want to continue to work with it with you, sir, on this issue because I know it is important to you.

Mr. Pallone. When we spoke about this last year, you said that there would be, basically, a web of protection in place to guarantee no gaps in coverage with respect to monitoring the New Jersey coast. Has the EPA taken some specific actions to fill the gaps left by the cancellation of the helicopter?

Ms. McCarthy. Well, I think we felt that the helicopter at this point, because of the actions that the states have taken, was not as necessary as it was before. We didn't feel like we

| speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. |
|---|
| would be putting the water at risk by not continuing to fund it.  |
| And so, we do feel that there is a robust system in place.  |
| Mr. Pallone. See, the problem that I have with both the   |
| BEACHES Act and the helicopter is that, you know, using New Jersey  |
| as an example, but I am sure New York is the same, you know, the  |
| state and the towns and the counties all complain that they have  |
| less money and that they can't fill the gap. And so, that is why,   |
| if there was any way, obviously, to get the BEACHES Grants back   |
| in place or to get the helicopter back in place, and to pay for   |
| it federally, it would make a big difference. Because I know you  |
| believe that the states and the localities can make up the  |
| difference, but I really don't think that is the case.  |
| Ms. McCarthy. I appreciate that, sir. Thank you.  |
| Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.   |
| Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back.   |
| Ms. McCarthy, once again, I apologize for this interlude,   |
| but I want you to know we have one of the best subway sandwich  |
| stores in the basement.   |
| [Laughter.]   |
| We will be back at 3:30, hopefully.   |
| Ms. McCarthy. Thank you so much.  |
| Mr. Whitfield. We will recess until 3:30.   |
| [Recess.]   |
|   |

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

Mr. Whitfield. We will reconvene the meeting and the hearing.

Thank you for your patience, Ms. McCarthy.

At this time I would like to recognize for five minutes the gentleman from Texas, the vice chairman of the Energy and Power Subcommittee, Mr. Olson.

Mr. Olson. I thank the Chair.

And welcome, Ms. McCarthy.

We have had our disagreements. Some are pretty strong. But there are some things we agree upon, like the Houston Astros going to Yankee Stadium and kicking the tar out the New York Yankees 3-to-zip last September.

[Laughter.]

1089

1090

1091

1092

1093

1094

1095

1096

1097

1098

1099

1100

1101

1102

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

Ms. McCarthy. Totally agree on that one.

Mr. Olson. There we go.

And I appreciate the positive steps you have taken on exceptional events in that new rule. Thank you for that.

That being said, though, I have heard recently that EPA has a proposal to change the rules on how locals work with you all on transportation issues, projects, highway projects. I am told that the changes to transportation and air modeling could add months' delay and hundreds of thousands of dollars to highway projects.

States are saying that this new, quote/unquote, "AERMOD Model" is more complex and less accurate than current models.

Apparently, the Federal Highway Administration's concerns may have fallen on deal ears with EPA.

So, my question is, did EPA know of FHA's concerns? If so, were they ignored, and why are they ignored, if so, as well?

Ms. McCarthy. I am sorry, I am afraid that I am going to have to get back to you on that. I am not familiar with any recent changes to the AERMOD Model. But, certainly, our goal in any model change is to get more accurate as well as more simple in terms of how you can ensure compliance and work can continue.

Mr. Olson. I like accurate and simple. That sounds good, yes, ma'am. Let's work together to make this stuff work. Work with me to get some information and make sure there is no problem here.

Ms. McCarthy. That would be great.

Mr. Olson. Great. Thank you.

Question No. 2 is, last week I introduced a bipartisan new bill on the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, H.R. 4775. It has almost a dozen revisions that would make the implementation of the ozone standards and other NAAQS practical and cost-effective. I don't know if you have had a chance to look at that bill yet. Have you seen that yet, ma'am? Or it is

1135 | probably too quick?

Ms. McCarthy. I have not studied it, sir, no.

Mr. Olson. Can I get you to promise to work with me to get that bill at least discussed, where we can come to work together to get some commonsense, if that is the right term for it, but something that guys could achieve out there? Because I am concerned about right now many counties are in non-containment with the current standards. And going lower, let them get full attainment, and then, let them go lower. So, let's work on that together. Can we do that, please?

Ms. McCarthy. Well, sir, I will be happy to continue to talk to you on it. I do know, if this is on the -- is this ozone that we are talking about?

Mr. Olson. It is ozone, yes, ma'am, mostly, yes.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes. Okay.

Mr. Olson. And Question No. 3, as states struggle to implement EPA's Ambient Air Quality Standards, they send SIPs, State Implementation Plans, to you, EPA. You approve these plans, so that states can go about their business of having cleaner air. Your budget documents indicate that at the end of 2015, FY 2015, EPA had 557 backlogged SIPs.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Olson. And while the Clean Power Plan is in limbo now

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

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 1158 because of the courts, the Supreme Court, can you shift that money to get rid of this backlog of these SIPs? Can you take it from 1159 the Clean Power Plan and make it address these backlogs of SIPs? 1160 1161 Is it money you need or what do you need to get this backlog fixed? 1162 Ms. McCarthy. Actually, the challenge for us -- and we do 1163 have a plan that we have worked on with the states that is racheting 1164 down the backlogs in the system. 1165 You mentioned the exceptional events. 1166 Mr. Olson. Yes. 1167 Ms. McCarthy. What we found was our failure to address 1168 exceptional events well and to make that a streamlined opportunity 1169 for states to talk about when they have an anomaly that they want 1170 credit for, we found that in California the minute we did an 1171 exceptional event policy for high-wind events, they could release 1172 200 State Implementation Plans. 1173 Mr. Olson. Yes, yes, yes. 1174 Ms. McCarthy. So, it is more than money. It is really 1175 looking at what the substantive issues are and making sure we are 1176 doing our job to speak to the policy itself, so that the regions 1177 are comfortable in going through the approval process and getting 1178 that done. 1179 Mr. Olson. Great. And one final invitation, olive branch 1180 Mr. McNerney from California talked about carbon capture

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. sequestration. Ms. McCarthy. He is. Mr. Olson. You mentioned that EPA has some projects that are viable for enhanced oil recovery. That is right there in my district. It is called the Paris Power Plant, the Petra Nova Project. Ms. McCarthy. Yes. Mr. Olson. Come on down and see it. They have got four coal generators and four natural gas. They are capturing coal out of one generator, putting it in a pipeline. There is an oil field about 65 miles to the south. Getting that in there, pressure, more oil; it pays for itself. Come down and see it personally. Ms. McCarthy. Thank you, sir. I appreciate the invitation. Mr. Olson. You are welcome. Thank you. The gentleman yields back. Mr. Whitfield. At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Green, for five minutes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Green. Administrator McCarthy, thank you for being here today. is always a pleasure to have you before the committee. And I thank

you for coming to Houston last month for the CERAWeek, and I am

1181

1182

1183

1184

1185

1186

1187

1188

1189

1190

1191

1192

1193

1194

1195

1196

1197

1198

1199

1200

1201

1202

glad they treated you well there at that energy conference.

Ms. McCarthy. They did. Thanks.

Mr. Green. One of my questions -- and we talked about it when you were in Houston -- families in our district in eastern Harris County, they are very concerned about the Dioxin and the pollutants found in the San Jacinto River waste pits. Now the waste pits were declared a Superfund site eight years ago, and to date, no final decision has been made.

Ms. McCarthy, when will EPA make a final decision on remediating the San Jacinto River waste pits?

Ms. McCarthy. Sir, I will have to get back to you when the final decision is. I know that the concern is to make sure that we address the interim measures that we need to keep the opportunity to have that safe and go through the process to define the final remedy.

Mr. Green. Okay. Local stakeholders in our district are concerned that EPA will decide to keep the Dioxin in the river underneath a temporary armored cap that was put in place a few years ago. Our communities fear that the armored cap would fail, as it did recently either during a major flood/hurricane or the damage by the barge which happened recently.

CERCLA requires and prefers remedies that will permanently and significantly reduce the volume, toxicity, and movement of

the hazardous substances for the protection of human health and the environment. And I join the local stakeholders in calling that for removal.

The concern I have, Ms. McCarthy, is leaving Dioxin in the flood plain in an aquatic environment is not an appropriate permanent solution. What would prevent the EPA from adopting the most preventative remedy possible for the Superfund site, like building a container wall and, then, removing that Dioxin facility?

Ms. McCarthy. Generally, what we do, sir, is when we put out for comment a proposed remedy, when you look at a proposed plan, we will put a range of options out, and we look at that from how protective they are, how certain we are that they are going to remain protective, as well as look at the costs associated with that. So, I am sure you will see that we will put out a full range of options for folks to comment on, and I appreciate the fact that you have communicated with me strongly about the interests of your constituents here.

Mr. Green. And I appreciate EPA having a hearing in Channelview, Texas --

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Green. -- six weeks ago or so, and I was glad to be there.

I also notice, is it true that EPA requested \$1.13 billion for Superfund for the next fiscal year, the lowest request in 14 years? Is it \$1.13 billion, the budget request?

Ms. McCarthy. I am not aware of how low it is compared to other years. I know that it is an increase over what we had requested last year of \$20 million.

Mr. Green. And is it true that EPA completed work on only eight Superfund sites in fiscal year 2014, the lowest number of construction completions since 1997?

Ms. McCarthy. I can get back to you on that as well, sir.

Mr. Green. Okay. Given the low number of sites, which includes the San Jacinto River, I would hope our budget proposal would be much higher than what the EPA requested.

Last month in your visit to Houston we discussed our quality and monitoring. We are challenged in Houston, and I want to work with you and improve our situation as rapidly as possible. Can you give me a quick overview of EPA's budget on air monitoring and improvement?

Ms. McCarthy. Yes, sir. We have a robust monitoring network, but we are requesting an additional \$40 million for monitoring technology for the states. As you know, we have requested an increase in state and tribal categorical grants of about \$77 million.

So, we do think we have good monitors out there. We need more ability to be able to support state efforts. One other thing that I think is important to remember is that in your area I think that your community is working very hard, the communities in that area are. There are significant challenges in port areas.

Mr. Green. Yes.

Ms. McCarthy. And that really is something that our DERA Program has supported. We are looking for \$10 million again this year, but the President has also proposed a climate infrastructure fund that could really ramp up our ability to be able to support reductions in pollution in the port areas. That could have appreciable difference in the quality of air in Houston.

Mr. Green. Well, thank you. Having the Port of Houston, an industrial port, it is important, particularly with our industries on the side.

Ms. McCarthy. And they do a good job. I have actually been there to give them some awards before. They are doing a great job.

Mr. Green. Well, we are trying. In fact, I know we have one refinery who has problems, and I suggested to EPA that that refinery ought to be able to monitor their own fenceline.

Because, again, in our area we have literally fenceline-to-fenceline of industry, and we want to know who the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. bad actors are or the ones who need help. That fenceline monitoring by the industry would be helpful. Ms. McCarthy. And the technology is there. In fact, our most recent changes to the refinery rule are going to start requiring that. So, we are interested in the same thing, sir.

Mr. Green. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your patience.

I would like to submit a question on methane emissions to the Administrator, and appreciate you responding.

Mr. Whitfield. Without objection.

1296

1297

1298

1299

1300

1301

1302

1303

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 1305 At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Latta, for five minutes. 1306 1307 Mr. Latta. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1308 And, Administrator, thanks so much for being with us today. 1309 Last October the EPA revised its 2008 Ozone Standards. Is 1310 that correct? 1311 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. Yes, sir. 1312 Mr. Latta. How many counties does EPA expect will be 1313 designated to be in non-attainment with the 2015 standards? 1314 Ms. McCarthy. Actually, to the best of my recollection --1315 and I can get back to you on that -- it is going to amount to, 1316 we estimated about a dozen areas potentially, in addition to some 1317 areas in the State of California which face particularly unusual 1318 challenges because of the geology. 1319 Mr. Latta. But do you know how many counties, just not the 1320 states? 1321 Ms. McCarthy. That is how many areas that we are looking 1322 at. 1323 Mr. Latta. Because looking with the Congressional Research 1324 Service, based on their most recent data, they are looking at 1325 probably 241 counties in 33 states. Does that sound correct? 1326 Ms. McCarthy. I think that may be an overestimate on the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

basis of what we believe our current on-the-books rules will do

in terms of reducing NOx and VOC emissions.

We have taken a lot of steps, as you know, to reduce air pollution, and we think they will have an appreciable difference in terms of the years. We are not looking at what is out of attainment now because attainment isn't until 2017. So, we are looking at data from 2014, 2015, and 2016 to make a judgment on what is in non-attainment. We don't think that is going to amount to a significant amount of designated areas.

Mr. Latta. Okay. But, just out of curiosity, then, why did CRS come up with 241? Weren't they looking at the data?

Ms. McCarthy. I would be happy to go back and take a look at that and, also, to verify the number of areas we are talking about. I apologize, but --

Mr. Latta. Yes, if you can do that, I would appreciate if you would get back to the committee on that.

Ms. McCarthy. I am happy to do that.

Mr. Latta. Okay. Then, also, going right along with that, because, again, in my district I have 60,000 manufacturing jobs in northwest plus central Ohio. Has the EPA done any analysis of the impacts of either the 2008 or the 2015 standards on manufacturing in areas designated as being in non-attainment?

Ms. McCarthy. We certainly have done an impact assessment.

Our understanding of this is that we are focused more on what the

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 1351 impacts are and what it means for individual states and in 1352 counties. I don't recall a specific impact on industries in those I know there will be challenges, but I don't think we have 1353 1354 understood them to be appreciable. 1355 Mr. Latta. Let me ask this, could you define, when you say 1356 you have done impact assessment, how would you define that impact 1357 assessment, especially if you say you haven't really been looking 1358 on the manufacturing side? But, again, there is just massive 1359 thrust in Ohio. Also, when we look at what happened in the last 1360 several years, we are at least about 74-75 percent coal-fired 1361 power plants in Ohio, and it is down in the 70 percent now. 1362 how would you define, then, the term "impact assessment"? 1363 Ms. McCarthy. I am sorry, can we reclarify again, sir, what 1364 you are talking about? 1365 Mr. Latta. Well, right. You said that you had been working 1366 on some impact assessments. 1367 Ms. McCarthy. Which rule are we talking about, sir? 1368 Mr. Latta. Pardon me? 1369 Ms. McCarthy. Which rule? 1370 Mr. Latta. Okay. This would be the 2008 and, also, 2015, 1371 when we look at the non-attainment. 1372 Ms. McCarthy. Okay. Right. 1373 Mr. Latta. Right.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted

Ms. McCarthy. Well, you know, we have done some analysis, sir, to look at the impact of designation on industries and whether or not they can continue. I think you know that it does put a burden when you are in non-attainment in order to not make the unhealthy air more unhealthy as industries grow. So, there are opportunities to look at offsets that can continue to expand industries. We just have not identified that those are insurmountable in any area. They are more challenging in California than anywhere else. But, usually, when you are looking in other states, you find opportunities for offsets at reasonable cost that can allow even new industries to locate in non-attainment areas.

Mr. Latta. Okay. Just to follow up on that again, because I am not sure I caught what you just said a little bit earlier, you said whether they can continue. Are you talking about the manufacturing or the power, or both?

Ms. McCarthy. I was talking about manufacturing. At the levels they are manufacturing and even with new facilities coming in, you need to account for the emissions that you may add into the area, but you can do that using offsets, which means you can look at your permitting process and identify the least-expensive way to get NOx reductions and utilize that for new facilities coming in, which is what I understood to be the major issue.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 1397 Mr. Latta. Okay. Mr. Chairman, if I could ask, also, if 1398 maybe we could follow up on that question and, then, also, maybe the earlier question to the Administrator and get back to the 1399 1400 committee? 1401 Mr. Whitfield. Absolutely. Without objection, so 1402 ordered. 1403 At this time the Chair would recognize the gentleman from 1404 Iowa, Mr. Loesback, for five minutes. 1405 Mr. Loesback. Thank you, Mr. Chair. 1406 Good to see you, Madam Administrator, as always. 1407 Ms. McCarthy. You, too. 1408 Mr. Loesback. I appreciate the work you are doing. 1409 A couple of questions. The first one, as you know, the 1410 Department of Energy states, using ethanol as a vehicle fuel has 1411 measurable CHG emissions benefits compared with using gasoline. 1412 Carbon dioxide released when ethanol is used in vehicles is, in 1413 fact, offset by the CO2 captured when crops used to make ethanol 1414 are grown. 1415 Now, given the role of renewable fuels, given the role that

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

renewable fuels play in cutting down greenhouse gases, shouldn't the recent RFS Renewable Volume Obligations, RVOs, be increased to achieve this goal?

Ms. McCarthy. We certainly are looking to be as aggressive

1416

1417

1418

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 1420 as we can, knowing that the U.S. is a leader in biofuels. 1421 Mr. Loesback. Right. Ms. McCarthy. In looking at the aggressive nature of the 1422 1423 renewable fuels standard, we are looking for every opportunity 1424 to both make it aggressive, but also recognize that it has to be 1425 achievable at the same time. 1426 Mr. Loesback. Right. Because you are working on 2017, I 1427 assume, is that correct? 1428 Ms. McCarthy. Yes, that is correct. 1429 Mr. Loesback. Yes. 1430 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 1431 Mr. Loesback. And you will be hearing from a lot of us, no 1432 doubt --1433 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 1434 Mr. Loesback. -- as you did in the past when it came to 1435 the past renewable fuel standard. I know it is controversial. 1436 Not everybody is onboard with it on either side of the aisle, for 1437 that matter, as well. 1438 Ms. McCarthy. But, sir, you have spoken to me from Congress. 1439 I am implementing the law as it is, and that is what I do. Mr. Loesback. Yes, and I look forward to continuing to have 1440 1441 that conversation. In fact, I have some corn growers here in the 1442 I just happened to meet with them prior to this

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted

meeting. And so, that is something that is clearly important to them and to the whole State of Iowa, for that matter, but not just Iowa, many other places around this country as well.

The second one has to do with WOTUS.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

1443

1444

1445

1446

1447

1448

1449

1450

1451

1452

1453

1454

1455

1456

1457

1458

1459

1460

1461

1462

1463

1464

1465

Mr. Loesback. I am sure all my colleagues are in agreement that providing clean water is critical for all of us. Folks in the agricultural community recognize as well that we have got to have clean water.

One program, in particular, of course, the Waters of the U.S., has had a bit of an uphill battle over the years, as we have seen. It is in the courts as we speak. But I think everybody can agree that we have to have clarity on the rules before anything else. That is the one thing I hear from folks in the agricultural community in Iowa more than anything else.

I have been taken out to ditches, and folks there are frightened, to be quite honest, that without necessary clarity, that all kinds of lawsuits and all kinds of actions could be taken against them. And I have to say I understand their concerns. I want to have clean water. I want to make sure we do the right thing, but so do those folks in rural areas.

But we have got to have the clarity when it comes to things like not just streams and rivers, but ditches and ponds, and what

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. have you. There is real concern in farm country that there still isn't that kind of clarity with respect to WOTUS. Can you speak to that? Ms. McCarthy. Well, I think that we tried to actually provide greater clarity. That is what the Clean Water Rule was intended to do. I actually think we accomplished that in many ways, and we need to have a really good conversation about that, knowing that it is in the courts at this point. But let me give you an example on ditches. Believe me, I never created the word "ditch". It is in the statute, which is why we had to deal with it. But we made it really clear that ditches exclude intermittent and ephemeral ditches. It is only when a ditch has been constructed in an existing stream or wetland that it becomes significant enough to warrant protection. Mr. Loesback. Can you tell me what "intermittent" means? Sorry to interrupt. What does "intermittent" mean? Ms. McCarthy. Basically, you are talking seasonal or just when it rains. I mean, that is what we are talking about. So, we have tried to make it clear that these intermittent, these only have water in them every once in a while, do not constitute a jurisdictional water. Mr. Loesback. Well, you know, I have heard the stories like,

what if there is 7 inches of rain and it is not intermittent?

1466

1467

1468

1469

1470

1471

1472

1473

1474

1475

1476

1477

1478

1479

1480

1481

1482

1483

1484

1485

1486

1487

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. Ms. McCarthy. Yes. Mr. Loesback. But that creates an environmental problem as such. And a DNR person comes out and checks it out, and all of a sudden the farmer is in trouble because it happened to rain 7 inches that night. Ms. McCarthy. Well, that is why what we did here is make it much clearer than the existing rule actually does. it clear that that does not constitute a jurisdictional water. Only if it was a stream to begin within and you have channeled So, we tried to get clearer. it. We have also gotten clearer on erosional features, to make the case that, if it rains hard, it looks like there are streams everywhere. Mr. Loesback. Right. Ms. McCarthy. Those don't count. Mr. Loesback. Right. Ms. McCarthy. It only has to be something that is constructed or natural that really can impact the downstream water Mr. Loesback. Well, my time is almost up. Ms. McCarthy. Otherwise, there is no connection.

Mr. Loesback. And I do appreciate this conversation.

hope we continue to have this conversation. I know you came to

1489

1490

1491

1492

1493

1494

1495

1496

1497

1498

1499

1500

1501

1502

1503

1504

1505

1506

1507

1508

1509

1510

the Iowa State Fair a few years ago.

1512

1513

1514

1515

1516

1517

1518

1519

1520

1521

1522

1523

1524

1525

1526

1527

1528

1529

1530

1531

1532

1533

1534

Ms. McCarthy. I did.

Mr. Loesback. I will personally invite you out there if you are willing to come.

Ms. McCarthy. Well, thank you.

Mr. Loesback. And I can guarantee you we can get some folks in the agricultural community together and have a conversation.

Ms. McCarthy. I will take every opportunity I can. Thank you very much.

Mr. Loesback. Thank you.

And thank you, Mr. Chair, for letting me go over. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back.

At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. McKinley, for five minutes.

Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you again, Ms. McCarthy, for coming.

I am curious, you have given us kind of a smorgasbord of things to go after here a little bit this morning. If I could just touch base on one, I want to get it clarified. You said that there was more than one facility using carbon capture. You didn't mean coal-fired power plants, did you? Because there is only one coal-fired power plant using carbon capture, is that not correct,

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 1535 in America? 1536 Ms. McCarthy. I would have to go back and check, sir. haven't looked recently. 1537 Mr. McKinley. That is what you said to me two years ago and 1538 1539 last year. So, I hope you do get back to us on that. But Kemper 1540 is the only one. You know that. It is the only one. 1541 Ms. McCarthy. I do know. I know Kemper, yes. 1542 Mr. McKinley. So, my other question, have you ever visited 1543 the West Virginia coal fields or been in a West Virginia 1544 coal-powered plant? 1545 Ms. McCarthy. Not that I am aware of, sir. 1546 Mr. McKinley. Have you ever been to one in Kentucky or 1547 Wyoming? 1548 Ms. McCarthy. No, sir. 1549 Mr. McKinley. That is what I was afraid of. So, I am just 1550 curious, you are part of this bureaucracy that is passing all of 1551 these legislative fiats and regulations, but never really 1552 touching base with the people that you are affecting their lives. 1553 When he was here the other day, the Secretary said he wants 1554 to come to West Virginia and he wants to see because he had heard 1555 about the Longview Power Plant. Do you know anything about the 1556 Longview Power Plant? 1557 Ms. McCarthy. No, sir, I don't.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 1558 Mr. McKinley. That is one of the most efficient, if not the 1559 most efficient, power plant in America, and it doesn't use carbon 1560 capture. 1561 So, I would extend the invitation to you again and again. 1562 I have done that. And whatever your schedule is, it has never 1563 permitted you to come West Virginia. So, I think we had better 1564 take this seriously, the impact we are having on people's lives. 1565 In the last couple of weeks, some of the candidates have been 1566 saying that we need to move away from coal and other fossil fuels 1567 in their campaigns. One of them said we are going to put a lot 1568 of coal miners out of work. Do you agree with that? Is that good 1569 for the economy, to put our coal miners out of work? 1570 Ms. McCarthy. Well, it is certainly not good for anybody 1571 to be out of work in an economy. 1572 Mr. McKinley. So, you would disagree? You would disagree 1573 with that premise that someone said we ought to put them out of 1574 work? 1575 Ms. McCarthy. Personally, I do not agree that anyone in the 1576 United States of America should go without a job who wants to work. 1577 Mr. McKinley. Thank you. Okay. So, if I could go back to part of your testimony, also, you 1578 1579 talked about a stable climate.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. McKinley. And you want to maintain a stable climate, but, unfortunately, the rest of the world doesn't seem to be following in those footsteps in that stable climate. We have got a chart someplace they are going to put up here in a minute that shows -- my clock is ticking.

Ms. McCarthy. Technology is always tricky.

Mr. McKinley. Yes, it is always. Well, thank you.
Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, I was told that chart would be up.

It shows that China is going to increase its production or use of coal by 460 gigawatts of power and India another 360 gigawatts of power. I don't know what it is going to take. The world is not following our leadership.

So, I am curious, two or three years ago, I raised the same question to you. You were going to get back to me and I never heard back from you again. That was that, according to the IPCC with the United Nations, it said that, if we terminated all coal-fired power plants in America, so that we didn't burn one ton of coal in America, the total reduction to CO2 on the globe would only be two-tenths of 1 percent. Do you think that is a measurable impact on the climate of the world, especially given that the other nations aren't going to follow? So, if we terminate two-tenths, but, yet, the other nations of China and India are going to way more than make up for that loss, that it

is worth it to our economy to put all our people and our coal companies out of work for something that is not measurable?

Ms. McCarthy. Sir, I am not looking at making any choices on the kinds of energy that are generated. I am really trying to keep my eye on my job, which is to try to reduce pollution in ways that are reasonable.

Mr. McKinley. But you are taking -- someplace along the line, it was not yours, but others. The Interior just put 33 percent of our coal reserves in the western coal on federal land, they put it on the shelf and said we don't have access to it to generate power. Forty percent of America's power comes from coal from federal lands, and 33 percent of our reserve comes from federal lands. And they just put 33 percent on the shelf. We can't access it.

So, it may not be your Department, but you are part of that administration that has this war on coal that is saying we are not going to use coal. And even your successors are talking the same language. I don't understand. If it doesn't have an impact on climate change around the world, why are we subjecting our hardworking taxpayers and men and women in the coal fields to something that has no benefit?

Ms. McCarthy. I think, sir, we see it as having had enormous benefit in showing sort of domestic leadership as well as

The statements

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 1627 garnering support around the country for the agreement we reached 1628 in Paris. 1629 Mr. McKinley. But even though no one is following this? 1630 China has doubled. Since that Paris accord, China has already 1631 announced that they are going to put up 360. India has announced 1632 that they are going to double their use of coal since the Paris 1633 accord. 1634 I am afraid my time is over. 1635 Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman's time has expired. 1636 We will ask the staff to get that chart and we will include 1637 it in the record. 1638 [The information follows:] 1639 1640 

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

Mr. Whitfield. At this time I recognize the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. Schrader, for five minutes.

Mr. Schrader. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

And I appreciate the Secretary for being here. It is always a good time, very interesting comments so far. I learn a lot at these types of hearings about my friends and colleagues around the country.

We have a big issue out in Oregon, and I think we saw it nationally, with our forest burning up during this last summer, unprecedented wildfires, unprecedented carbon pollution into the atmosphere, exactly the opposite I think of what we are trying to do with all these programs at EPA.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Schrader. In that regard, we are trying to use and work our forests in a much more sustainable manner. There is an opportunity for more active timber management, I think, that would take that carbon fuel, if you will, out of the forests and make it healthier. The devil is always in the details, just to say.

One thing I would ask you to look at in your Department, and in trying to encourage use of a carbon-neutral life-cycle resource like wood and like our forests, is look at some of the standards that you have. In September the agency put out some standards

regarding government procurement --

Ms. McCarthy. Yes, we did.

Mr. Schrader. -- you know, dealing with different third-party verification processes. I am very concerned that it, inadvertently I hope, discriminates against a large part of our land mass, particularly in the West, where there is alternate ways to look at certification of these forests for sustainable practices or FSC. Out where we are, it is a lot of SFI. I won't bore the committee with all the acronym evaluations here, but you understand where I am going with that.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Schrader. I would urge you to take a look at that. My evaluation on your website is that they all meet the criteria you have put out there. I have gone through an appendix from your agency that talks about the different pieces or evaluations that each goes through. It looks almost exactly the same when it comes to species, monitoring, control, and response to disease and disturbances, these sorts of things, reforestation. There is a difference maybe in the acreage size. That is the only thing I can see there.

Frankly, rural Oregon is not doing well. Rural America isn't doing well. They have not recovered from the Great Recession. I see that Portland is doing great. But I am

interested in how the rest of the country is doing.

What has happened, because of these artificial standards that I think are misapplied and could stand some revision -- these forests could be put back to sustainable use. Decrease our carbon footprint and, hopefully, employ lots of people in this country, folks in my state.

I will give you a quick example. In Oregon there is over 4.3 million acres that are certified by the three big programs that are out there. EPA's current recommendation, current interim rule, would exclude over 4.1 million of those 4.3 million acres. That just doesn't seem right, Madam Secretary.

We all want to be in the same place, I think, on this. I think you would get broader support for some of the rules and some of the work you are trying to do at EPA if you opened up a little bit to some of these other certification programs that are just as valid, very well certified by third-party people. If you could do that, I would really appreciate it. But maybe get back to myself and maybe members of the committee on how you are going to be looking at that.

Ms. McCarthy. Well, sir, I really appreciate your comments. We did hear that we were too narrow in the interim. You know, we went with the standard that the Department of Energy was using, which is why it seemed like a reasonable first step.

Mr. Schrader. Sure.

1710

1711

1712

1713

1714

1715

1716

1717

1718

1719

1720

1721

1722

1723

1724

1725

1726

1727

1728

1729

1730

1731

1732

Ms. McCarthy. But in no way was it the only step that we are taking. So, we are taking a look already at all the other standard-setting opportunities that we have to see if they are comparable, equally aggressive, how we would take account of those. And we recognize that there is work to be done, and we are starting that work now.

Mr. Schrader. All right. Well, very good, because there is a lot of lives, jobs, and community sustainability at stake here -- Ms. McCarthy. I agree.

Mr. Schrader. -- as well as our forests.

Ms. McCarthy. Thank you.

Mr. Schrader. Thank you.

With that, I will yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back.

At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Griffith, for five minutes.

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

Mr. McKinley was talking earlier and raised concerns about the fact that coal on U.S. federal lands are off-limits. Many, many jobs have been lost. You acknowledge that it is always bad for folks to be unemployed. Large numbers of people in Mr. McKinley's district and in my district are now unemployed as a

result of policies of this administration, including your agency itself.

And you indicated -- and correct me if I got it wrong -- you indicated that you were just doing your job, trying to set examples. But I would submit that, because of the concerns that Mr. McKinley raised with China increasing, even after the Paris accord was reached by the President, and India, according to Mr. McKinley, is going to be doubling their use of coal. Of course, they want to be energy-independent, as many nations want to, and they have some coal.

I am just concerned that we are actually doing more harm to the world's environment, particularly in relationship to the air, because when we take our previously-reasonable regulations and we ratchet it up and we throw folks out of work, we raise the cost of energy in our country and we put our manufacturers at a disadvantage. And then, they decide that it is easier in some cases, in some not, but in some cases they decide it is easier to go places where they don't have those regulations, whether it be Mexico or China or India, or some other nation, but where they don't have the regulations that we have. So, we are actually creating a net increase in air pollution.

I am just wondering, have you all not looked at that? Now I understand your job is just the United States. But when you

are putting my folks out of work and Mr. McKinley's folks out of work, and I think that there is a good likelihood that there is a net increase, I am just wondering, have you all looked at the possibility that you may be inadvertently creating -- and we can disagree about what is and isn't a pollutant -- but are you inadvertently creating a net increase in the Northern Hemisphere for the air that we all breathe, whether it is in China or India or in Salem, Virginia?

Ms. McCarthy. Well, if you are looking at greenhouse gases, sir, it doesn't matter where it is emitted. I think it matters to all of us.

I will say that we have been working with a lot of businesses, a lot of international businesses, that are actually expressing serious concern that we do take notice of climate change and take action on it.

But I will also say that the administration, I think, is very cognizant that the coal communities, the communities that rely on coal are facing significant challenges. We are interested in really moving forward with the President's POWER Plus proposal to see how we can build an economy that will be more sustainable and lasting.

Mr. Griffith. Look, I don't disagree with that. That is an area where I think we have got to put some resources there --

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Griffith. -- to try to help these communities. But that being said, what do you do in a community where we had a dispute over a piece of land because in Dickenson County in my district there were two pieces of flat land in the entire county that could be built on, and they needed a new high school. So, they had to use eminent domain to take one of the two pieces.

How are we going to reinvent the economy? They have mountains, they have water, and they have trees.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Griffith. We don't have flat land. In Buchanan County, the largest chunk of our flat land is formerly a surface mine that leveled things out, but folks think that is bad. So, it really puts us in a dilemma.

And then, I have another dilemma that I think I have to bring up. That is many of my constituents don't understand an EPA that has eight buildings in the Washington, D.C., area. It has got 12 different zip codes. It has got so many employees floating around up here. And they say to me, "Why don't you defund the EPA completely?" And I have always defended by saying, "Well, let's look at our clean water programs. There are other things that the EPA does that I think are good."

And then, we have the Flint, Michigan problem.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Griffith. I don't know how I am going to tell those folks now where we have got these programs like clean water, when, clearly -- and I know that there was some dispute in another committee earlier this week -- but, clearly, the EPA dropped the ball.

It looks like to me -- I was in on one of those hearings in O&I, in our Government Reform Committee -- it looks clearly to me like one of your employees was doing a coverup, told Ms. Walters of Flint, Michigan that they had handled Del Toral. The employee of the EPA who it appears was punished for blowing the whistle on the lead out there, I think that is a problem.

Then, a former employee now, Ms. Hedman, comes in and says that she didn't think she did anything wrong. My constituent, Mark Edwards, a Virginia Tech professor -- and, look, I don't know his politics, but Blacksburg is not a conservative area. It is one of the most liberal areas of Virginia and one of the most liberal areas in my district. But he says, if you are part of a government agency, it means you don't have to say you are sorry, and said that she was "willfully blind, unremorseful, and completely unrepentant, and unable to learn from her mistakes".

How do I defend an EPA that that is the condemnation coming out of my district from the professor, Dr. Edwards? That is the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. thing I have always pointed to as being one of the good things. My time is up. I don't know if the chairman will allow you to answer that or not. I apologize, Mr. Chairman. I yield back. Mr. Whitfield. Did you want to respond or not? Ms. McCarthy. I am sure it is not an easy answer, sir. But, you know, I have asked the office of our Inspector General to take a look at this. I think the distinction I was trying to make is Flint is, no doubt, a tragedy. I know how it came about. Why I don't know, but I know how it came about. The question for EPA is, did we respond quickly enough when we found out that there was a problem? Did everybody raise it as quickly as they could, so that we could address it? a significant issue of accountability that we need to face, and we will face that. The individual in the region did resign, knowing it was on her watch. But we will see what the Office of the Inspector General says. Mr. Griffith. I don't think it is just the Inspector General, Madam. I believe it is also you. You are the boss. Ms. McCarthy. Yes, yes. Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman's time has expired. At this time the Chair recognizes the gentlelady from

1825

1826

1827

1828

1829

1830

1831

1832

1833

1834

1835

1836

1837

1838

1839

1840

1841

1842

1843

1844

1845

1846

California, Ms. Capps, for five minutes.

Mrs. Capps. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Members. Thank you for holding this hearing.

Thank you, Administrator McCarthy, for being here today.

Clean drinking water, wastewater treatment, stormwater management systems, these are critical to our nation's basic functioning. Accessible water for agriculture is paramount to our economy and food security.

But, unfortunately, and as has been discussed, our nation's water infrastructure is aging and deteriorating, and the impacts of this deterioration are significant and they are costly.

We also know that climate change is directly threatening our ability to guarantee the delivery of safe and reliable drinking water, and at the same time it exacerbates the inadequacies of our nation's water infrastructure. So, it is kind of a perfect storm.

One effect of climate change that has been particularly devastating to my home State of California is drought, a word we hadn't talked about it for a little while, but it is always there. While parts of California have had a little rain recently as a result of some kind of ongoing El Nino, this relief has not been equally felt across the State and we are by no means out of the woods.

For example, in my district is a lake called Lake Cachuma. It is the source of our drinking water for over 220,000 residents in and around Santa Barbara. This vitally-important reservoir has less than 15 percent of the water it can hold. Given the impacts of climate change, drought will, unfortunately, continue to be a pervasive issue, not only in California, but in other states as well.

We have to act now to minimize the impacts of the changes and ensure that we are prepared. We have to do everything at once, juggle a lot of balls for the challenges that are ahead.

I know EPA is working to address these issues. And just yesterday the President announced the establishment of the National Drought Resilience Partnership, NDRP -- they always get an acronym right away -- as part of his Climate Action Plan. NDRP will help to coordinate drought-related efforts, which is good, communities to mitigate the effects of the drought and build resilience. Those are the keywords, mitigation and resilience against future droughts. Everything has to be done at the same time. The NDRP will help coordinate it, do all of this, and I applaud the President for these efforts, as it clearly needs to be a priority for us all.

I have a few questions for you, if we can kind of zip through them. I wanted you to just briefly describe EPA's role in the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. NDRP. Ms. McCarthy. Well, EPA is part of the project. Mrs. Capps. Yes. Ms. McCarthy. EPA brings to it a level of expertise in how communities can work through these issues. We provide tools. Mrs. Capps. So, you are at the table? Ms. McCarthy. Oh, absolutely, yes. Mrs. Capps. Okay. So, are there some existing programs that you have already that will help to implement this initiative? Ms. McCarthy. Yes. We have been leading really a federal effort to look at resiliency issues and to develop tools that communities can use to understand opportunities for capturing water, keeping it local, and preserving it and conserving it. Mrs. Capps. And can I go home and talk about how the EPA's drought-related efforts will assist communities like ours right on the central coast --Ms. McCarthy. Yes, you can. Mrs. Capps. -- because they are waiting for some good news? Ms. McCarthy. Yes. Mrs. Capps. Okay. They look to the sky and the rain doesn't come enough. And now, they are going to look to you, Administrator McCarthy. As part of the NDRP, what kind of outreach and education

1894

1895

1896

1897

1898

1899

1900

1901

1902

1903

1904

1905

1906

1907

1908

1909

1910

1911

1912

1913

1914

1915

strategies will be utilized? A lot of this is in how we present ourselves in the community. You know, are we here to work with existing partnerships? And there are many of them on the ground.

Ms. McCarthy. Well, we certainly, as part of our proposal, are looking for some more additional money to look at making sure we have basically what we call circuit riders, which is individuals with expertise in this area, so that they can be available full time to go work with communities on this issue.

Mrs. Capps. Can you describe that? There is another minute left on my time. It goes fast.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mrs. Capps. I would like to hear more about these circuit riders? That is kind of a western term.

Ms. McCarthy. Well, circuit riders mean that you can't build expertise everywhere and afford to get everybody up to a certain level. So, you, basically, have people in each region whose job it will be to work with communities, identify opportunities for tools that are available to us. We actually have a whole local community package on our web page of tools that they can look at and make available to themselves. Hopefully, it will help them jumpstart. Then, we share best practices. We look at what communities like yours that we could marry with and make progress moving forward.

I am going to suggest what you are saying. Hopefully, there is a way I can do that with some of my district folks.

What has happened now with this word drought that is looming large of us is that this suddenly has everybody's attention. We have got all these constituencies all needing water. And so, reclaiming, recycling, we are building a desal plant, we have to look to you as a partner at the table.

Ms. McCarthy. One of the issues we need to look at is how that is connected with infrastructure and investments like drinking water, stormwater. You need to keep water local.

Drinking water systems like the one in Flint loses 30 to 40 percent of its water in leaks alone. We simply can't afford that.

Mrs. Capps. No, we can't afford that. We need that water that is leaking in Flint in my district.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mrs. Capps. Thank you.

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

At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Johnson, for five minutes.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Administrator McCarthy, thanks for being with us today.

Ms. McCarthy. Thank you for having me.

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

Mr. Johnson. As you know, America's brick industry, brick and tile industry is struggling in our current economy. It is made up largely of small family-owned businesses that have been in business for generations and for the most part or in many cases are the only source of employment in the communities in which they reside, where they provide jobs and a tax base for their communities.

The House recently passed bipartisan legislation that would impose a legislative stay of the Brick MACT Rule, pending judicial review. Administrator McCarthy, is the EPA willing to provide an administrative stay to protect these small businesses, especially given what happened to this industry before the rule was vacated in 2007, after they had already come into full compliance with a previous rule in 2003?

Ms. McCarthy. We actually think that, when we met with small businesses, we did, I think, a good job at listening to the flexibility they needed in the rule itself. We provided very flexible options for smaller businesses, so they could comply. We actually gave maximum time as well for compliance.

So, we believe that the rule as written should continue to move through the courts. Hopefully, we will have that on the books because it yields significant reductions in toxic pollutants in a way that we think small businesses can manage --

Mr. Johnson. Yes, I am going to get to that aspect of it in a moment. But here's the problem: the industry doesn't see it the way that you just described it.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Johnson. They spent hundreds of millions of dollars to comply with the 2003 rule, only to have it set aside by the courts in 2007. Then, when the EPA started formulating this new Brick MACT, they started with a baseline of where the 2007 rule that was set aside ended off --

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Johnson. -- giving the industry very little credit for the accomplishments of the reductions that they had achieved with the hundreds of millions of dollars that they had invested for control technology between 2003 and 2007.

So, here they are again under stress. I mean, there are only about 7,000 jobs in America attributed to the brick industry. The industry is telling us that many of these small businesses will close down. And here is the real crux of the issue: we don't import brick in America. We have got a brick and tile industry that makes our construction materials. We don't import it from anybody else.

Ms. McCarthy. No.

Mr. Johnson. I mean, unless we want to start making

The statements

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2009 buildings and homes out of sticks and straw, we had better figure 2010 this out because these companies cannot continue to stand up under this duress. And we are not suggesting that we not move forward 2011 2012 with the rule. We are just suggesting that we delay the rule, 2013 an administrative stay, work with your Department to do that, 2014 until the judicial reviews are completed. If the courts say, 2015 fine, go ahead, then we have something else to talk about. 2016 that seems to be the prudent thing to do, rather than put this 2017 industry through another round of egregious compliance that the 2018 courts could come back and set aside, but, then, the damage will 2019 have been done again and we may lose a lot of our brick 2020 manufacturing capability. 2021 Ms. McCarthy. Well, sir, I think the administration has 2022 already submitted a SAP indicating that we really don't want to 2023 give up what amounts to 30 tons of reduction of toxic emissions. 2024 So, they are willing to give up bricks and our Mr. Johnson. 2025 ability to build buildings and homes for that? 2026 Ms. McCarthy. No, sir. We think that small businesses have 2027 been given enough flexibility in the rule as it has been designed. 2028 But I certainly understand your concern. 2029 Mr. Johnson. We disagree. 2030 Ms. McCarthy. If we have the Congress and the President move 2031 forward, we will certainly abide by it.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

Mr. Johnson. Well, we disagree strongly.

2.041

Your agency has recently proposed an update to the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule. Many states and stakeholders have raised concerns about the feasibility of implementing EPA's proposal, especially within a short period of time. It has got a proposed implementation of this summer or the summer of 2017.

So, has your Department, your agency, done a specific analysis of this latest proposal on the reliability of the electricity grid and, if not, why not?

Ms. McCarthy. I certainly know that we have done a regulatory impact assessment on this rule. This rule, it used to be called the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule. I think we still do call it that. But this is an actually very sophisticated and should be very successful trading program. So, it does provide lots of flexibilities to get these reductions, and it is a rule that we just proposed. We are in the comment period. We certainly want to take cognizance of the comments that come in and anticipate any adjustments that are necessary before the rule might be finalized.

Mr. Johnson. I know I am over my time, Mr. Chairman.

But would the EPA consider reproposing this rule, given the concerns that have been raised about the likely unworkability of the proposal?

Ms. McCarthy. Well, we just proposed it, sir. It is going to be important for us to see what the comments look like when they come in.

Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman's time has expired.

At this time the Chair recognizes the gentlelady from Colorado, Ms. DeGette, for five minutes.

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

Thanks, Administrator McCarthy, for coming over today.

In 2005, when Congress passed the Energy Act, they exempted hydraulic fracturing from the Safe Drinking Water Act, as you know. In 2009, our former colleague Maurice Hinchey and I, we secured funding for the EPA to study the effects of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water. Up to that date, the research on fracking was very limited and it mostly consisted of reviews of similarly-limited literature.

So, especially being from Colorado, where we have a lot of fracking going on, I thought it was important that we understood the impacts of hydraulic fracturing on drinking water. So, last June the agency issued a draft version of the assessment, and it found that there were mechanisms by which hydraulic fracturing activities could impact drinking water resources.

But, then, at the same time, the press release and the

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

executive summary that came out also prominently stated that hydraulic fracturing has not led to, quote, "wide systematic impacts," end quote, to the drinking water of the United States.

I was, frankly, surprised in this press release that it would say that because the study that we authorized was designed to develop the understanding of specific ways that contamination could occur with hydraulic fracturing. Frankly, I am glad that we haven't had wide systematic impacts, but it doesn't matter whether we have had it, if it could occur.

And so, what we were trying to do is to say figure out the preliminary research that could characterize the currently little understood or unknown pathways to contaminating of drinking water from hydraulic fracturing, not in broad proclamations.

And then, in the draft version of the study the EPA said, quote, "The limited amount of data collected before and during hydraulic fracturing activities reduces the ability to determine whether hydraulic fracturing affected drinking water resources in cases of alleged contamination." End quote.

And then, the Scientific Advisory Board charged with reviewing the study agreed that the broad declarations in the summary and press materials, quote, "are presented ambiguously and are inconsistent with the observations, data, and levels of uncertainty presented in the report". So, basically, this

The statements

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2101 preliminary version that was released last June, it just created 2102 even more confusion, which is what we have had since 2005. And so, what I am worried about is that the EPA doesn't know 2103 2104 still, and cannot estimate still, what the potential impacts of 2105 drinking water contamination are. The assessment identifies 2106 several mechanisms by which a spill, leak, or migration of 2107 hydraulic fracturing fluids could potentially contaminate 2108 drinking water, but the scope of the study didn't have the EPA 2109 evaluate how those events would affect human health. 2110 So, pretty soon here, I am hoping in the next few months, 2111 the EPA will release the final report. I am hoping what it will 2112 do is more clearly emphasize the risk, the real scientific risk, 2113 to drinking water resources and what we can do, how we can get 2114 that data to ensure that our drinking water is safe. 2115 Anyway, you might want to comment on that in one minute and 2116 four seconds. 2117 [Laughter.] 2118 Ms. McCarthy. Okay. My only comment is I think that it was 2119 clearly a necessary study for us to do. I think very often, when 2120 we put out a science study, people will pick and choose --2121 Ms. DeGette. Right. 2122 Ms. McCarthy. -- sentences in it. You know, basically, 2123 we said we didn't have evidence of widespread systemic impacts

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. to drinking water, but we clearly did identify that there are potential mechanisms in the water system where impacts could occur, but there were also opportunities for offsetting those by taking the right preventive measures --Ms. DeGette. Right. Ms. McCarthy. -- like looking at how you construct a well, understanding your groundwater flow and pattern before you even consider inserting hydro-frack fluid into the groundwater --Ms. DeGette. Right. Ms. McCarthy. -- or below the groundwater. So, there are challenges here, but we did suffer from having little real data, significant amounts of data, to more effectively be able to speak with certainty about what was going on. Ms. DeGette. Well, I am just hoping that, when you all issue the final results of the study, that you can clearly say where the gaps still are. Because that is exactly why we need the study, to be able to say how you can do fracking in a safe way that protects our drinking water, which I think it can happen, but we need to get that data to know how. Ms. McCarthy. In many ways, we are relying on states like Colorado. Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Okay. Thank you. The gentlelady's time has expired. Mr. Whitfield.

2124

2125

2126

2127

2128

2129

2130

2131

2132

2133

2134

2135

2136

2137

2138

2139

2140

2141

2142

2143

2144

2145

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

At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Hudson, for five minutes.

Mr. Hudson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Administrator McCarthy, for joining us today.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Hudson. Administrator, I am sure you are familiar with EPA's proposed rule released last July that proposed new greenhouse gas standards for medium and heavy-duty trucks.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes, sir.

Mr. Hudson. Are you aware that in the middle of that proposed rule there is a proposal by EPA to make it illegal to modify vehicles used solely for competition?

Ms. McCarthy. No, sir, I don't believe that that is what it says, but I certainly understand the section that you are talking about.

Mr. Hudson. Well, I can read the language to you. It says, "Certified motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines and their emission control devices must remain in their certified configuration even if they are used solely for competition or if they become non-road vehicles or engines."

It seems pretty clear to me. In your opinion, are owners of vehicles that have been modified so they can be used for competition now abolished in the law?

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

Ms. McCarthy. Sir, there is a clear exemption in the statute that addresses NASCAR and other professional raceways and why we do not regulate those vehicles. I think we were very directly trying to make sure that we are doing no more than what we have done before in terms of either compliance or enforcement. And we are trying to recognize that exemption and that rule.

Now I fully recognize that this has raised a lot of confusion and we need to address this confusion moving forward, because there is no way -- NASCAR has been a great partner of EPA. They do great work on biofuels. The last thing I want to do is alienate them. That is for sure.

Mr. Hudson. I appreciate that, but NASCAR is one facet.
Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Hudson. But what about the man or woman who likes to take a car in their backyard and fix it up and take it down to the local drag strip and race it? I mean, that kind of modification it appears very clearly is now ruled out.

Ms. McCarthy. Well, we have never ever enforced on an individual of that nature. What we are trying to do is get at manufacturers of these devices, that they sell and make sure that they sell them only for competitive dedicated vehicles. Because it is really challenging to us to make sure that the certified vehicles remain in compliance with air regulations.

Mr. Hudson. Well, I appreciate what you are saying, but it says here emission fuel devices must remain a certified configuration, even if they are used solely for competition. I mean, it sounds different; the rule sounds different from what you are explaining.

Ms. McCarthy. We will do the very best we can. We have had substantial amounts of discussion. Whatever we can do to clarify this, we are going to be able to take those steps.

Mr. Hudson. Well, I think taking the words "solely used for competition" out --

Ms. McCarthy. I will have to see it in its entirety, and I am not a lawyer. I appreciate the need to use common-sense language. I know that what I have told you is what our intent was. We will make sure that the language matches that.

Mr. Hudson. Okay. Well, I certainly appreciate that because not only is this an important way of life for a lot of Americans who enjoy taking cars and modifying them, so they can race, but it is a billion-dollar industry of aftermarket folks who make parts for people to use in competition.

I remember, back in February, you testified before the committee and you made the point that not one EPA regulation has ever cost one job. I am telling you this is a billion-dollar industry that would be wiped out if we can't clarify this and make

The statements

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2216 sure the intent you have expressed is reflected in the regulation. 2217 Ms. McCarthy. Thank you, sir. 2218 Mr. Hudson. Thank you. 2219 With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 2220 Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back. 2221 At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from North 2222 Dakota, Mr. Cramer, for five minutes. 2223 Mr. Cramer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2224 Thank you, Ms. McCarthy, for being with us. 2225 Ms. McCarthy, I have a couple of questions, maybe a statement 2226 and a request. Are you familiar or how familiar are you with a 2227 series of enforcement actions that your agency is working with 2228 the DOJ on using Section 114 to basically find consent, I guess, 2229 or a consent decree with a number of North Dakota oil companies? 2230 How familiar are you with that action? 2231 Ms. McCarthy. I am somewhat familiar with it, sir. 2232 Mr. Cramer. Yes. Does it seem like it makes sense to use 2233 a consent decree or to bully, if you will -- my term, bully, and 2234 many companies' term, by the way -- bully companies into some sort 2235 of agreement apart from a transparent process? 2236 Ms. McCarthy. Well, actually, sir, settlement agreements 2237 are reached in order to get compliance and make it easier for both 2238 the industry as well as --

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2239 Mr. Cramer. Let me ask, are you familiar with a memo from 2240 Cynthia Giles from your office, the enforcement shop, to Regional Directors where she discusses the EPA's plan of, quote, 2241 2242 "innovative enforcement" to force upon companies the compliance 2243 tools that go well beyond the regulations and laws as they 2244 currently exist? Are you familiar with that memo? 2245 Ms. McCarthy. I am not sure what --2246 Mr. Cramer. Are you familiar with the term "innovative 2247 enforcement"? 2248 Ms. McCarthy. Well, we actually are using a lot of 2249 innovation to make sure that we can use our resources wisely, take 2250 advantage of new technologies that are out there. 2251 Mr. Cramer. Okay. Technologies such as perhaps FLIR 2252 cameras? Are you familiar with the use of FLIR cameras to capture 2253 images of --2254 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 2255 Mr. Cramer. -- methane gas escaping? 2256 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 2257 Mr. Cramer. Do you know that FLIR cameras do not measure 2258 the amount of methane that is being leaked from a --2259 Ms. McCarthy. Yes, sir. 2260 Mr. Cramer. Okay. So, how do you, then, justify going to 2261 a company and saying, "You are not in compliance" based on this

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

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2262 FLIR camera which does not measure the amount of the emission and, 2263 then, I guess threaten them with a fine of several thousand dollars 2264 per days since the construction? Are you familiar with threats 2265 of fines of millions, tens of millions, hundreds of millions, even 2266 multiple billions of dollars against companies? 2267 Ms. McCarthy. I am aware that we have reached settlements 2268 using that as a --2269 Mr. Cramer. You have not reached any settlement in North 2270 Dakota with an oil company yet. You have with Mobil, a gas 2271 company, very different than oil --2272 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 2273 Mr. Cramer. -- in Colorado; Colorado, a non-attainment 2274 state, and North Dakota, an attainment state. 2275 My point is this: by attainment -- you seem confused -- that 2276 means attaining, meeting the compliance, compliant with your 2277 Ambient Air Quality Standards. North Dakota does that. 2278 My point is this: this is a State Health Department issue, 2279 in my view, not an appeal issue. North Dakota is a compliant 2280 state, not a non-compliant state. Our industry, in response to 2281 early notices from the EPA, well over a year ago, nearly two years 2282 ago now, our State Health Department, our Oil and Gas Division 2283 which operates under the North Dakota Industrial Commission, 2284 which is three elected officials, the governor, attorney general,

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

and the commissioner, working with industry, came up with a comprehensive plan, a global plan to deal with 100 percent of the emissions.

Your agency, ignoring that, rather than participating in that, has picked one company at a time -- there are now somewhere around half a dozen to a dozen companies -- to try to find consent, in other words, admission of guilt to something that I don't believe they are guilty of, by using this innovative enforcement activity. I find it, frankly, reprehensible. Frankly, I find it illegal.

But, when companies are forced, especially with \$40-a-barrel oil to less, forced to either pay millions of dollars in attorneys' fees to fight this or comply or consent, sometimes it is cheaper to consent. I don't think that is an appropriate regulatory regime, quite honestly.

I would rather see, here is what I would in the last minute. I want to ask you this closing question, and I am looking for a really good answer. Will you commit today to, instead of using these 114, this bullying tactic -- again, my term -- extortion tactics, would you, instead, work with our State and work with our Health Department, work with our Industrial Commission, our Oil and Gas Division, and our industry who want to comply 100 percent -- they all want to comply -- work with them on a global

|      | speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. |
|------|---|
| 2308 | solution that actually reaches attainment rather than a fine or   |
| 2309 | a penalty? How about we do that? You agree to that today and  |
| 2310 | we will have a great industry.  |
| 2311 | Ms. McCarthy. I will say 114 is an information-collection   |
| 2312 | request.  |
| 2313 | Mr. Cramer. Yes, it is.   |
| 2314 | Ms. McCarthy. And the tool that you are talking about is  |
| 2315 | a screening mechanism that asks the question whether or not we  |
| 2316 | think there may be significant violations of emissions of volatile  |
| 2317 | organic compounds. And that is why you ask for the information  |
| 2318 | from the companies. I wouldn't characterize it as a bullying  |
| 2319 | tactic.   |
| 2320 | Mr. Cramer. Well, except I think an issue is used to try  |
| 2321 | to extort huge fines  |
| 2322 | Ms. McCarthy. It is used to see whether or not they are in  |
| 2323 | compliance, and that has nothing to do with non-attainment. That  |
| 2324 | has to do   |
| 2325 | Mr. Cramer. Explain that to the DOJ attorneys.  |
| 2326 | My time has expired.  |
| 2327 | Mr. Whitfield. Well, I appreciate your raising that issue   |
| 2328 | because all of us have heard about that issue, and I am glad that   |
| 2329 | he brought it to your attention.  |
| 2330 | Ms. McCarthy. Could I just mention, and we are certainly  |

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

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2331 happy to -- we are in discussions with the State of North Dakota 2332 on this, and we would love to be able --Mr. Cramer. Well, we could save a lot of your budget money 2333 2334 if you would just let the State handle it. 2335 [Laughter.] 2336 Mr. Whitfield. At this time the Chair recognizes the 2337 gentlelady from North Carolina, Ms. Ellmers, for five minutes. 2338 Mrs. Ellmers. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2339 And thank you, Ms. McCarthy and Mr. Bloom, for being here 2340 today for this subcommittee hearing. 2341 Administrator McCarthy, the 2015 ozone standards 2342 immediately apply to preconstruction permits that businesses need 2343 to grow and create jobs. That means businesses will have to 2344 immediately show their projects meet the 2015 Ozone Standard, 2345 something that may be hard to demonstrate in an area that it is 2346 or may be going into non-attainment status. 2347 What preconstruction permitting relief will EPA provide for 2348 areas in this situation? 2349 Ms. McCarthy. I am sorry, what preconstruction -- what did 2350 you say? 2351 Mrs. Ellmers. What preconstruction permitting relief will 2352 the EPA provide for areas in this situation? What are the options 2353 for a non-attainment status area for preconstruction permitting?

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

Ms. McCarthy. Right. The non-attainment designation isn't even going to be made until 2017. So, we are working with states to make sure that they understand what their attainment status might look like, but there is a fairly-lengthy process. We work back and forth with the governor of each state to identify non-attainment areas.

Mrs. Ellmers. Okay. So, that does not go into effect until 2017?

Ms. McCarthy. We haven't even finished collecting that data that would go into determining non-attainment yet. That is through 2016.

Mrs. Ellmers. Okay. So, the Obama administration pledged the United States would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 26 to 28 percent below 2005 levels by 2025. Were you consulted? Was the EPA consulted on that? I mean, how did the President come up with that number by 2025?

Ms. McCarthy. This has to do with reductions of greenhouse gases nationally. That is a determination that is made by the White House in consultation with all of the agencies, including EPA, that look at what existing authority we have, what is planned, what is reasonable, and what is achievable.

Mrs. Ellmers. So, can you explain that process then? So, you are saying that EPA was involved. No. 1, what other agencies

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

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2377 were involved? And describe that process to us of how that became 2378 the determining number. Ms. McCarthy. Actually, I wasn't involved in the 2379 2380 calculation of that number. EPA's job was to look at our regulatory authority, what we thought was reasonable and 2381 achievable under our existing authorities. We provided that 2382 information to the White House. Other agencies similarly did 2383 2384 that. And that was the commitment, and the accounting was done behind that to submit for our commitment. 2385 2386 Mrs. Ellmers. Was the public consulted on this beforehand? 2387 Ms. McCarthy. I apologize. 2388 Mrs. Ellmers. No problem. Was the public, was there a 2389 comment period for the public on this? Again, I am trying to find 2390 out how we came up with that number and was there consideration 2391 of public comment. 2392 Ms. McCarthy. I am not aware of that process. 2393 Mrs. Ellmers. Okay. Well, I quess what I am asking now is, 2394 can you provide for the committee what it was or the sources that 2395 the EPA used to -- I know you said that this has more to do with 2396 jurisdiction, the involvement of regulations and authority. Can you provide for the committee, you know, what information you used 2397 2398 to come up with the EPA's authority on that? 2399 Ms. McCarthy. I can see what I can make available to you

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

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2400 2401 Mrs. Ellmers. Okay. 2402 Ms. McCarthy. -- and at what level. The reason I am just 2403 double-checking is I believe that number was by 2030, not 2025. 2404 Mrs. Ellmers. Not 2025? Okay. 2405 Ms. McCarthy. I could be wrong, but I am just having trouble 2406 Mrs. Ellmers. Okay. Questionable 2030. Okay. All 2407 2408 right. 2409 I just want in the time I have left -- I only have about 40 2410 seconds left -- EPA's budget document states that the Clean Power 2411 Plan is, quote, "The President's highest priority for the EPA and 2412 the central element of the U.S. domestic climate mitigation 2413 agenda." 2414 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 2415 Mrs. Ellmers. Is the Obama administration's pledge to 2416 reduce emissions by 26 to 28 percent below 2005 levels contingent 2417 on the Clean Power Plan? 2418 Ms. McCarthy. Well, the Clean Power Plan was a reflection 2419 of what we thought the direction of the energy transition was 2420 heading. What we are seeing already is that the energy transition 2421 is happening towards the low-carbon sources even more quickly than 2422 we had anticipated. So, we fully expect the Clean Power Plan,

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

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2423 when it is looked at on its merits, would be found to be legally 2424 solid. We don't think we are going to lose any ground in terms 2425 of our ability to make those commitments real. 2426 Mrs. Ellmers. Okay. So, just in closing, because I am 2427 actually over time, you don't believe that there would be a delay 2428 further at the court level as far as the Clean Power Plan goes? 2429 Ms. McCarthy. I think that the Clean Power Plan will be 2430 found to be legally solid and it will move forward, and that we 2431 will not be in a position to have lost ground in the end, when 2432 it is fully implemented. 2433 Mrs. Ellmers. Thank you very much, and I yield back. 2434 Mr. Whitfield. At this time the Chair recognizes the 2435 gentleman from Indiana, Dr. Bucshon, for five minutes. 2436 Mr. Bucshon. Thank you very much. 2437 Sorry. 2438 Ms. McCarthy. I am sorry. 2439 Mr. Bucshon. No, no, no, I just totally paused my time while 2440 you had to get some counsel from your staff. 2441 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 2442 Mr. Bucshon. A couple of things. First of all, earlier in your testimony you mentioned carbon capture and sequestration, 2443 2444 facility sites that are working in the United States. Can you 2445 give me the name and the address of all of those places that are

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

|      | on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.          |
|------|---|
| 2446 |   |
| 2447 | Ms. McCarthy. I would be happy to do that.                      |
| 2448 | Mr. Bucshon. And whether or not they are in continuous          |
| 2449 | operation?  |
| 2450 | Ms. McCarthy. Yes.  |
| 2451 | Mr. Bucshon. Because that I am aware of I mean, maybe           |
| 2452 | I am wrong but there aren't any. There is a couple of one       |
| 2453 | in Illinois and one up in Canada. If there are some down in the |
| 2454 | South, maybe Louisiana that are working                         |
| 2455 | Ms. McCarthy. We definitely want to                             |
| 2456 | Mr. Bucshon I would be interested in knowing because            |
| 2457 | you made it sound like this is an ubiquitous thing across the   |
| 2458 | country, that carbon capture is                                 |
| 2459 | Ms. McCarthy. I would be happy to do that, sir. I do            |
| 2460 | realize that  |
| 2461 | Mr. Bucshon is working because                                  |
| 2462 | Ms. McCarthy. But it is used not just on coal facilities,       |
| 2463 | on generating facilities. It has other applications where it is |
| 2464 | being used today.   |
| 2465 | Mr. Bucshon. Okay. So, are there any coal facilities that       |
| 2466 | it is working on right now today?                               |
| 2467 | Ms. McCarthy. I believe it is in Kemper here and I believe      |
| 2468 | there is a dam in Canada where it is being fully utilized.      |
|      |   |

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2469 Mr. Bucshon. Yes, and the one in Canada is going broke, by 2470 the way, and the one in Illinois --2471 Mr. Whitfield. And Kemper is not operating. 2472 Mr. Bucshon. And Kemper is not operating. 2473 Ms. McCarthy. Okay. 2474 Mr. Bucshon. So, the idea is that was misleading, I think, 2475 to say that carbon capture and sequestration, when we were talking 2476 about coal-fired power plants, is commercially-viable. 2477 Indiana I have every coal mine in the State. So, to my knowledge, 2478 it is not commercially-viable or economically-viable to implement 2479 that in Indiana. If it was, I would be in favor of it being on 2480 all of our coal-fired power plants. 2481 Just so you know, I agree the temperature is changing. 2482 agree that, with technology and innovation, we should always be advancing how to use all of our fuels. I agree with that premise. 2483 2484 What I don't agree with is federal agencies setting regulations 2485 that can't be met with current technology, and that is what this 2486 is doing. 2487 So, with that said, I am going to change course a little bit and talk about athletic fields. 2488 2489 Ms. McCarthy. Okay. 2490 Mr. Bucshon. We have noticed that, I think, in recent media 2491 reports in the press about alleged potential adverse health

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

effects young people might experience from playing on crumb rubber athletic fields. Almost two months after the committee sent you a letter asking a number of questions about this situation, Dr. Thomas Burke signed a letter stating that, although the EPA was aware of the number of studies that showed no elevated health risks, the studies are limited and did not comprehensively address the concerns about risks to children's health from these exposures.

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Bucshon. EPA then said that, in order to fill in the gaps, it was planning to work with the State of California on a comprehensive evaluation of tire crumb. Ultimately, the EPA decided not to work with California and now is collaborating with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Consumer Product Safety Commission on a one-year study.

So, the question I have is, what changed the EPA's mind about working with California. I mean, I am just generally interested in getting the information, so that all of us can make an assessment of whether this is or is not a problem for kids.

Ms. McCarthy. Well, I appreciate that. Part of the challenge that we were facing was that some of the studies, the earlier studies that had been done, really weren't looking at the material that is being used currently in most fields. We are

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2515 finding that the material themselves, those small balls that are 2516 being used, actually have an opportunity for potential exposures that we hadn't really looked at. And the materials themselves 2517 2518 are changing. So, we felt that it was prudent, given the 2519 concerns, to just take a look at it because the material itself 2520 is changing. 2521 Mr. Bucshon. Sure. 2522 Ms. McCarthy. How it is being utilized is different. 2523 thought we should at least close the loop to make sure that there 2524 weren't human exposure potentials that we hadn't yet evaluated. 2525 Mr. Bucshon. Okay, and I appreciate it. So, the study, is 2526 it one year? You are planning on a one-year study --2527 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 2528 Mr. Bucshon. -- that will have the impacts? 2529 Ms. McCarthy. We are hoping to have good data by the end 2530 of this year. 2531 Mr. Bucshon. Okay. Tell me the kind of description of it 2532 because I was a healthcare provider before I was a doctor, and 2533 sometimes it takes many, many years to determine the health 2534 impacts. If you do a study for a year --2535 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 2536 If you do a study for a year, then you may not Mr. Bucshon. 2537 know what the health impacts are for 5 or 10 years later.

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

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2538 just kind of interested in that. 2539 Ms. McCarthy. When we got together, we realized that there were studies being done, but people were concerned. And the 2540 2541 scientists said the first question to look at is whether there 2542 was any potential exposure route. If I can't ingest it, if it 2543 can't get in my blood, if it can't get into my system -- so, this 2544 is really about identifying whether there is an exposure route. 2545 Mr. Bucshon. That makes total sense. Okay. So, it is just 2546 the initial study is about exposure, only about exposure, not --2547 Ms. McCarthy. It is not what that exposure results in in 2548 terms of health impacts. 2549 Mr. Bucshon. Okay. Okay. That clarified it. 2550 Well, this seems to me a developing important issue related 2551 to athletic fields not only for children, but other athletes. 2552 so, I appreciate your work. 2553 Thank you for being here. 2554 I yield back. 2555 Ms. McCarthy. Mr. Chairman, I apologize. I raised 2556 confusion. I think it is 26 to 28 percent by 2025. I had a little 2557 brain freeze. So, I just wanted to thaw it out while I had a 2558 moment. 2559 Thank you very much for bringing that to our Mr. Whitfield. 2560 attention.

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

At this time I recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Mullin, for five minutes.

Mr. Mullin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Administrator, thank you for being here today. I cannot imagine how bad your head must be hurting going through this entire line of questioning, but we do appreciate your time and your effort for being here.

I have a couple of questions. On January 14th of this year, I sent a letter, along with 14 other members who sit on this committee and subcommittees, with three questions about your agency's plan to send U.S. federal employees overseas to help countries meet emission chart targets that were set at the Conference of Paris at the end of last year. We requested the answers by January 29th. It is now March 22nd, and we have yet to hear from anybody. Are you aware of this letter? Have you received this letter?

Ms. McCarthy. I am sure the agency has. I will double-check on the response. Is this specific to Paris or is this more broad?

Mr. Mullin. This is specific to Paris, to a statement that you made while speaking to send federal employees, EPA employees, over to other countries to help them identify emissions. Are you familiar with that?

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2584 Ms. McCarthy. Not particularly, but I will certainly look 2585 at it. 2586 Mr. Mullin. You gave a speech at the Council of Foreign 2587 Relations --2588 Ms. McCarthy. Okay. 2589 Mr. Mullin. -- and you mentioned that the EPA would deploy 2590 employees to certain countries to help these countries learn how 2591 to identify and measure sources of greenhouse gas emissions. 2592 The letter that we sent to you specifically asked three 2593 different questions. Now, one, I do have a letter here with me 2594 that I will be happy to give to you, and I would like to submit 2595 it, also, for the record. I have a copy for you to have. 2596 [The information follows:] 2597 2598 \*\*\*\*\*\* COMMITTEE INSERT 3\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

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

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2599 Mr. Mullin. It asks three questions. And those three 2600 questions, since you are here today, I am going to go ahead and ask you. One, how many U.S. federal employees will be deployed 2601 2602 to participate in these countries? 2603 Ms. McCarthy. I don't know the answer to that question, sir. 2604 I think you are referring to the work we do with the Department 2605 of State to do capacity-building in other countries. Very often, that is --2606 2607 That may be true, but in your statement you said Mr. Mullin. 2608 that the EPA was going to deploy these. 2609 Ms. McCarthy. The EPA does do that, but we often resource 2610 from the Department of State for those --2611 Mr. Mullin. So, how many employees do you plan on sending? 2612 I mean, you are here today to talk about your budget, and I am 2613 kind of concerned that the EPA is using taxpayer dollars to send 2614 employees to other countries to help them with a non-binding 2615 agreement that was set in Paris. 2616 Ms. McCarthy. Well, the kind of resources that we have in 2617 our international unit is actually very small. If we want to 2618 utilize more for a purpose like this, which is our

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

capacity-building, related to the Paris agreement, then it

usually is the Department of State provides us those direct

resources.

2619

2620

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2622 Mr. Mullin. We have reached out personally from my office. 2623 The Oversight Committee has also reached out, to zero response, 2624 none. 2625 Ms. McCarthy. Yes, sir. 2626 Mr. Mullin. Your office has yet to respond back to us. We 2627 asked for January 29th. And so, once again, I will ask these three 2628 If you don't have the answers, I would really 2629 appreciate your getting back to us --2630 Ms. McCarthy. Okay. 2631 Mr. Mullin. -- in a timely manner --2632 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 2633 Mr. Mullin. -- which hasn't happened so far. 2634 One was, how many federal employees are going to be deployed? 2635 Second, how long will these employees be deployed? And third, 2636 what will the cost be to deploy? 2637 Ms. McCarthy. Okay. So, I will go check on the response 2638 and --2639 Mr. Mullin. Do you have any answers to that right now? 2640 Ms. McCarthy. I do not know the answers to those questions. 2641 Mr. Mullin. Do you think it is appropriate to send 2642 individuals from the EPA that are being paid by taxpayer dollars 2643 from the United States to help countries meet a non-binding 2644 agreement?

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

|      | on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.           |
|------|--|
| 2645 | Ms. McCarthy. Sir, we do work internationally because            |
| 2646 | pollution knows no boundaries.                                   |
| 2647 | Mr. Mullin. How much do you spend in the EPA working in other    |
| 2648 | countries? Is it EPA? I mean, because we have a hard enough time |
| 2649 | dealing with you guys in the United States, much less in other   |
| 2650 | countries.   |
| 2651 | Ms. McCarthy. We have very few resources in this regard,         |
| 2652 | but we utilize them in   |
| 2653 | Mr. Mullin. What are the resources you                           |
| 2654 | Ms. McCarthy. We spend a lot of time training trainers in        |
| 2655 | other countries to   |
| 2656 | Mr. Mullin. When you say "very little," what is that number?     |
| 2657 | I mean, you are referring to a specific number by saying "very   |
| 2658 | little". How much is that number?                                |
| 2659 | Ms. McCarthy. Well, let me tell you.                             |
| 2660 | Mr. Mullin. I would appreciate that.                             |
| 2661 | Ms. McCarthy. This has to do with the total number of grants     |
| 2662 | is less than 1 percent.  |
| 2663 | Mr. Mullin. What is that 1 percent? What does that               |
| 2664 | represent in dollar amounts?                                     |
| 2665 | Ms. McCarthy. One point six million.                             |
| 2666 | Mr. Mullin. One point six? And that is not including what        |
| 2667 | the State Department helps offset, is that correct?              |
|      |  |

|      | on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.              |
|------|---|
| 2668 | Ms. McCarthy. That would be our resources. The State                |
| 2669 | Department would  |
| 2670 | Mr. Mullin. Can you give me   |
| 2671 | Ms. McCarthy. Oh, I am sorry. I am sorry. That includes             |
| 2672 | State Department.   |
| 2673 | Mr. Mullin. That includes the State Department?                     |
| 2674 | Ms. McCarthy. Is that what you said?                                |
| 2675 | Mr. Bloom. Or come from other federal agencies.                     |
| 2676 | Ms. McCarthy. Let me get back to you.                               |
| 2677 | Mr. Mullin. I would appreciate the total numbers, if you            |
| 2678 | don't mind.   |
| 2679 | Ms. McCarthy. I don't want to be incorrect.                         |
| 2680 | Mr. Mullin. I am out of time, but I would make sure in a            |
| 2681 | timely manner that you respond back to us, because, once again,     |
| 2682 | this is talking about budget and we are talking about dollars spent |
| 2683 | here. Thank you.  |
| 2684 | Mr. Whitfield. And also, I mean, that is a very good point.         |
| 2685 | We would like to know the total dollar value of the grants given    |
| 2686 | to other countries by EPA.  |
| 2687 | Mr. Mullin. Yes.  |
| 2688 | Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  |
| 2689 | Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman's time has expired.                    |
| 2690 | At this time the Chair will recognize the gentleman from            |
|      |   |

|      | on the Committee's website as soon as it is available.           |
|------|--|
| 2691 | Missouri, Mr. Long, for five minutes.                            |
| 2692 | Mr. Long. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.                               |
| 2693 | And, Ms. McCarthy, I understand that the EPA has set a           |
| 2694 | standard of 70 parts per billion for the 2015 Ozone Standards.   |
| 2695 | Does this mean that counties over 70 parts per billion will be   |
| 2696 | designated as being in non-attainment, I think is the phrase you |
| 2697 | use, with the 2015 standards?                                    |
| 2698 | Ms. McCarthy. It means that we are looking at 2014, 2015,        |
| 2699 | and 2016, using a specific formula to identify those that are in |
| 2700 | non-attainment.  |
| 2701 | Mr. Long. But the ones that will be in non-attainment are        |
| 2702 | the ones that are over 70 parts per billion, correct?            |
| 2703 | Ms. McCarthy. Yes.   |
| 2704 | Mr. Long. Okay.  |
| 2705 | Ms. McCarthy. Using that formula.                                |
| 2706 | Mr. Long. And will those counties become subject to new          |
| 2707 | planning requirements like State Implementation Plans, and other |
| 2708 | obligations?   |
| 2709 | Ms. McCarthy. Yes, sir.  |
| 2710 | Mr. Long. Counties that are below 70 parts per billion will      |
| 2711 | not be subject to these same planning requirements, is that      |
| 2712 | correct?   |
| 2713 | Ms. McCarthy. They may be subject to earlier requirements,       |

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2714 depending upon whether --2715 Mr. Long. No, I am not talking about earlier requirements. I am talking about this requirement. 2716 2717 Ms. McCarthy. No, sir, they would not be. 2718 Mr. Long. Okay. The EPA has said that most areas will be in compliance with the 2015 standards by 2025 under existing 2719 2720 regulations and programs. Once these counties meet the standards 2721 in 2025, will the non-attainment designation automatically be 2722 lifted or is there a process for that, also? 2723 Ms. McCarthy. No, there is a process for that. 2724 Mr. Long. Okay. My understanding is that, once an area is 2725 designated to be a non-attainment, it is locked into a complex 2726 bureaucratic process to meet these standards, followed by an 2727 additional 20 years of the maintenance plan and oversight from 2728 the EPA. How is it that the county that is just over 70 parts 2729 per billion gets locked in a 20-year-plus process while similar 2730 counties just barely under 70 parts per billion do not have to undergo this process? Could you explain --2731 2732 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 2733 Mr. Long. -- the wisdom of that to me? 2734 Ms. McCarthy. I think that what we try to make sure that 2735 we do is, when you are designated as non-attainment, we try to 2736 make sure that whatever actions the state took to drive down the

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

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2737 pollution that level and to achieve healthy air does not 2738 backslide. So, it is just a question of maintaining those actions, so that you can continue moving forward, knowing that 2739 2740 you have not only achieved it on a given date, but you don't 2741 backslide and start allowing emissions that would, then, drive 2742 you into non-attainment again. 2743 Mr. Long. But the ones that barely got under the 70 billion, 2744 do they have to worry about backsliding? 2745 Ms. McCarthy. No, they don't because we have determined 2746 that that is the level that we are seeking to achieve to provide 2747 healthier air, and there is no reason why, legal reason why we 2748 would want them to do more. We want everybody to stay below that 2749 70 level. 2750 Mr. Long. Is there any way to reduce the 20-year regulatory 2751 burden on counties that are just barely out of the window? 2752 Ms. McCarthy. Well, we are talking to the states because 2753 I think there is an opportunity to streamline that process, and 2754 we are working with states all the time to try to make sure that 2755 we do that, to streamline the process of redesignating them as 2756 areas of attainment and, also, that we make sure that we don't overburden them with this obligation for anti-backsliding. 2757 2758 We know that states worked hard to get there. They don't

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted

want to backslide. We just want to make sure that we have a system

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2760 in place that maintains that. But if there are ways in which we 2761 can streamline it, we certainly want to do it. Mr. Long. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back. 2762 2763 Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back. 2764 At this time I recognize the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. 2765 Harper, for five minutes. 2766 Mr. Harper. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2767 Administrator McCarthy, I know it has been a long day. We 2768 thank you for coming, though, to help us understand some of these 2769 issues in a better manner. 2770 The Clean Power Plan includes various compliance deadlines 2771 for states ranging from September of this year, when plans would 2772 have been due, through 2030. Assuming that the rule is upheld, 2773 won't each deadline under the rule be extended by the amount of 2774 time for completion of judicial review? 2775 Ms. McCarthy. Well, that is not actually what the Supreme 2776 Court said, but we assume that the courts will make that judgment 2777 over time or leave that to EPA to make their own judgment. 2778 is usually spoken to, but not at this stage. 2779 Mr. Harper. Well, let me ask you, are you aware that in the filings submitted to the Supreme Court that the Solicitor General 2780 2781 explicitly said that the effect of the stay would be toll every 2782 sequential step of the rule's implementation?

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

Ms. McCarthy. I think what he was speaking to was that the request for a stay included that in it, but the Supreme Court did not choose to make that determination. They simply said that it would be stayed until it made its way back. And we expect that it will be there in due time and that the courts really will speak to that or give it to EPA to make that determination. But I don't know what choice they are going to make until they go and make it.

Mr. Harper. Sure. The Solicitor General also said that granting the stay -- and I am quoting what he said -- "would toll all of the rule's deadlines, even those that do not come due until many years after" the case would be resolved, for the period of time between the rule's publication and the ultimate disposition of this suit. Was the Solicitor General right or wrong when he --

Ms. McCarthy. No, he was speaking to the full breadth of what folks were looking for who were seeking a stay. But the Supreme Court didn't speak to that issue. The only thing they spoke to was the stay of the rule. They didn't speak to any tolling or what it meant in terms of compliance timelines.

Mr. Harper. Sure. Are you encouraging states and utilities to continue to work with EPA in the event that the rule is upheld?

Ms. McCarthy. We are certainly encouraging states to continue to look at where their energy system is moving forward, and we have made ourselves available to states that voluntarily want to keep looking at their implementation options. And we will keep working with them on that, but we certainly won't do anything that implements or enforces the rule, consistent with the Supreme Court stay dictates.

Mr. Harper. The point of the stay was to protect the economic interests of states and stakeholders, regardless of whether the rule is overturned. So, you appear to be signaling the states that they must continue to take action and expend resources, and signaling to utilities that they must respond to the potential rule, which appears to undermine the purpose of the stay. If you can't respect the purpose of the Supreme Court's stay, it appears that Congress may have to take steps to come in and prevent you from taking any action that effectively undermines the state.

Ms. McCarthy. Well, as I have said, sir, EPA is not dictating any implementation of this rule or telling any state they have to do anything. We are just offering an ability to support them, as we always do.

Mr. Harper. So, that is not happening in any conversations with any utilities that you are aware of?

A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2829 Ms. McCarthy. No, not that I am aware of, sir. 2830 Mr. Harper. In your testimony you state, "Although the 2831 Supreme Court has stayed the Clean Power Plan Rule, the stay does 2832 not preclude all continued work on the CCP." Has EPA discontinued 2833 any of its previously-planned activities relating to the Clean 2834 Power Plan since the stay was issued and, if they have, what 2835 activities have been discontinued? 2836 Ms. McCarthy. Well, we have been working with the 2837 Department of Justice, and it is very clear we have discontinued 2838 our implementation and enforcement of the rule. What we have not 2839 discontinued is our willingness to work with states that want to 2840 voluntarily keep moving forward to look at planning, but we 2841 certainly are not indicating to states that we expect to see their 2842 preliminary plans come in or that they should be working on those 2843 at this point in time. 2844 Mr. Harper. Has there been any action to encourage the 2845 utilities or states to continue to work with you? Any incentives 2846 or anything of any nature? 2847 Ms. McCarthy. We have not provided any incentive for that, 2848 no. 2849 Mr. Harper. Has EPA reassigned any of its staff to other 2850 projects as a result?

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

Ms. McCarthy. I can't answer that specifically. I don't

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2852 manage the staff at that level. 2853 Mr. Harper. Yes. I believe my time is close enough. Ι 2854 will yield back. 2855 Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back. 2856 At this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, 2857 Mr. Flores, for five minutes. 2858 Mr. Flores. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 2859 Administrator McCarthy, thank you for joining us today. 2860 In November of 2014, the EPA proposed a new, more stringent 2861 standard for ozone prior to finalizing the implementation standards for the standard set in 2008. In fact, what this did 2862 2863 is it forced states to make decisions under a new standard without 2864 final implementation rules on the prior standard, all again coming 2865 from your agency. And so, not only from an air quality 2866 standpoint, but also from an administrative standpoint, does it 2867 make sense to permit the 2008 standard to be fully implemented 2868 prior to doubling down and creating a new standard? 2869 Ms. McCarthy. Actually, that is not the way the law has been 2870 worked or has been implemented. The prior standards remain in 2871 Some states achieved those. In fact, we have had great 2872 success in NOx reductions or ozone compliance since we first

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements

started identifying health-based standards and moving forward.

So, we do not believe you have to -- in fact, I don't think

2873

the law says that we are supposed to wait until one is done before we do and take a look at whether the health-based standard needs to be adjusted. It is required for us to look at that every five years, regardless of attainment status.

Mr. Flores. Well, but you rolled out a new set of rules at the same time right after you rolled out the implementation standards for the 2008 rules. And so, what you basically created is two sets of standards that states have to follow.

The National Association of Clean Air Agencies testified to EPA that the new ozone standard will have a profound impact on the work of state and local air pollution control agencies, which differs from what you just said. Did the EPA assess the impact that implementing the new ozone standards would have on state and local agencies that were already trying to implement the 2008 standard?

Ms. McCarthy. We did look at that impact, sir, and we did a cost/benefit analysis of that. And we determined that the benefits far exceeded the cost, but there is no question that it provides the need for both EPA and states to actually expend more resources. And for that reason, this budget includes both additional resources for EPA for that implementation as well as a request that state resources be also boosted up as a result of this.

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2898 Mr. Flores. Wouldn't it make more sense for these standards 2899 to be harmonized, so that you could flow from the 2008 standard to the 2015 standard, instead of trying to worry about the dual 2900 2901 implementation? 2902 Ms. McCarthy. Well, sir, we do the best we can to make sure that we are not requiring duplication of the states as they move 2903 2904 forward with their implementation planning. 2905 Mr. Flores. Now the EPA chose to project the cost of its 2906 new ozone standard to 2025. In a sense, EPA bases its entire 2907 economic analysis on predicted 2025 air quality. 2908 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 2909 Mr. Flores. Would the agency support extending compliance 2910 deadlines under the standards to 2025? 2911 Ms. McCarthy. We have not considered that at this point, 2912 sir. We are actually following the statutory timelines. 2913 Mr. Flores. In the budget, EPA has requested funding for 2914 implementation of new National Ambient Quality Standards. 2915 got two parts to this question. One, when will EPA begin the 2916 process of implementing the 2015 standards? 2917 Ms. McCarthy. We are already in the process of providing guidance to the states on that. We have yet to complete 2016 and 2918 2919 see what that data looks like because the actual attainment 2920 decisions and non-attainment decisions are based on 2014, 2015,

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

and 2016 data. And then, we have the process of working with governors from that point forward to see where the non-attainments areas they would suggest, and we look at those. So, we are talking about non-attainment designations in 2017. That is when we also make determinations on how difficult the attainment process is, which dictates how quickly attainment needs to be achieved. And then, that is how they do their state implementation plans to coordinate with achieving those reductions in those time --

Mr. Flores. Right, but when you established the last set of standards in 2008 --

Ms. McCarthy. Yes.

Mr. Flores. -- it almost immediately, EPA almost immediately began reviewing that standard, but it didn't finalize the implementation for seven years, until 2015. So, shouldn't we have a system where we prioritize implementation of existing regulations before we expend resources on a new implementation?

Ms. McCarthy. Well, I think the way we look at it -- and you are right, we should be avoiding duplication as much as possible or any extra work -- but it is almost as if we now know what the health-based goal is. And getting there is the challenge. The fact that we get partway there with one decision and further along with another is not shifting direction. It is all moving to the direction of healthy air.

on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. 2944 Mr. Flores. I would submit that you have created a lot of 2945 confusion in the real world, and that is something that, you know, 2946 you and I are going to disagree on that. 2947 Ms. McCarthy. Yes. 2948 Mr. Flores. Just I am going to throw out one last thing. I sent you a letter on May 29th of last year regarding the Regional 2949 2950 Haze Plan for Texas. I got a letter from the Region 6 Director 2951 about two months later in 2015, and he said he couldn't comment 2952 on anything because you were in the rulemaking process. I never 2953 did get a followup to that letter. So, I would like, now that 2954 you have completed your rulemaking for the Regional Haze Project, 2955 I would like to get a followup letter to answer the six questions 2956 I put in my May 29th letter --2957 Ms. McCarthy. Yes, sir. 2958 Mr. Flores. -- from 2015. 2959 So, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 2960 Mr. Whitfield. The gentleman yields back. 2961 And that concludes the questions today. 2962 Ms. McCarthy, I just want to make a couple of comments, and 2963 Mr. Tonko may or may not want to make some summary statements. First of all, I think anyone who has worked with you likes 2964 2965 you because you have a great personality and you are effective 2966 But I think you also recognize that America really in what you do.

This is a preliminary, unedited transcript.

within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the

is a divided country today and there really is a red and blue America.

And one of the reasons, certainly not the only reason, but one of the reasons those of us on our side of the aisle, when we go back to our districts, a common theme that we hear is the excess authority and pushiness, for lack of a better word, of the EPA. That comes about for a lot of different reasons, the Clean Power Plan being one of those.

Congress had nothing to do with that. Now I recognize that many on the left side of this dais support it. But that was initiated by the executive branch entering into international agreements, non-binding, and the EPA has been driven because of that.

Twenty-seven states filed lawsuits to try to delay it. I talked in an opening statement about the Brick MACT. You all lost that in the U.S. Court of Appeals, the Utility MACT, the Tailoring Rule, the Clean Energy Plan. So, many people out there in the country say here's EPA going right down the road trying to accomplish their goals set by this administration without a lot of input from the Congress, and many times being overruled by the courts. Now I recognize that a stay is not a decision on the substantive part of a rule, but it is a probability or they would not have issued the stay.

So, I just want to point out that you all have the Clean Air Act, you have the Clean Water Act. All of us want to protect the environment, but I just want you to know personally that there are many people out there who do feel that EPA particularly is being overly-aggressive. And I don't know what the final outcome of that is going to be, but it is something that should concern all of us. Like I said, America is divided. There is no question about that. We know that.

But I want to thank you for spending the entire day testifying before the Appropriations Committee, our committee, about your budget. We appreciate your willingness to work with us, and we will be submitting the individual requests that members have made about additional information they have requested. And we will keep the record open for 10 days here for additional comments.

I now recognize Mr. Tonko for whatever time he might want.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for the hearing.

And thank you, Administrator, for joining us and for all of your cooperation and for your leadership.

Rather than focusing on our divided nation, I will talk about a united nation that is united in its need for clean water. It affects every life; it affects every job.

And so, we look forward to working with you and EPA on

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

|      | 135  |
|------|--|
|      | This is a preliminary, unedited transcript. The statements within may be inaccurate, incomplete, or misattributed to the speaker. A link to the final, official transcript will be posted on the Committee's website as soon as it is available. |
| 3013 | advancing clean drinking water as an outcome that provides   |
| 3014 | resources to our states and local governments, and will have a   |
| 3015 | strong outcome, I think, for both residential opportunities,   |
| 3016 | families and children, and for businesses alike.   |
| 3017 | So, thank you again.   |
| 3018 | Mr. Whitfield. Thank you, Mr. Tonko.   |
| 3019 | And that concludes today's hearing, and thank you again.   |
| 3020 | [Whereupon, at 5:17 p.m., the subcommittees were adjourned.]   |
|      |  |