| 1 | NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC. |
|----|--|
| 2 | RPTS MOLLEN |
| 3 | HIF116180 |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | THE FISCAL YEAR 2019 ENVIRONMENTAL |
| 7 | PROTECTION AGENCY BUDGET |
| 8 | THURSDAY, APRIL 26, 2018 |
| 9 | House of Representatives |
| 10 | Subcommittee on Environment |
| 11 | Committee on Energy and Commerce |
| 12 | Washington, D.C. |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in |
| 17 | Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Shimkus |
| 18 | [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding. |
| 19 | Members present: Representatives Shimkus, McKinley, Barton, |
| 20 | Blackburn, Harper, Olson, Johnson, Flores, Hudson, Cramer, |
| 21 | Walberg, Carter, Duncan, Walden (ex officio), Tonko, Ruiz, |
| 22 | Peters, Green, DeGette, McNerney, Cardenas, Dingell, Matsui, and |
| 23 | Pallone (ex officio). |
| 24 | Also present: Representatives Long, Costello, Bilirakis, |
| | |

Lance, Griffith, Rush, Eshoo, Schakowsky, Butterfield, Castor, Sarbanes, Welch, Lujan, Loebsack, Kennedy, and Engel.

Staff present: Jennifer Barblan, Chief Counsel, Oversight & Investigations; Mike Bloomquist, Staff Director; Samantha Bopp, Staff Assistant; Daniel Butler, Staff Assistant; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Kelly Collins, Legislative Clerk, Energy/Environment; Jerry Couri, Deputy Chief Counsel, Environment; Jordan Davis, Senior Advisor; Lamar Echols, Counsel, Oversight & Investigations; Wyatt Ellertson, Professional Staff, Energy/Environment; Margaret Tucker Fogarty, Staff Assistant; Adam Fromm, Director of Outreach and Coalitions; Ali Fulling, Legislative Clerk, Oversight & Investigations, Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection; Jordan Haverly, Policy Coordinator, Environment; Zach Hunter, Director of Communications; Peter Kielty, Deputy General Counsel; Bijan Koohmaraie, Counsel, Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection; Tim Kurth, Deputy Chief Counsel, Communications & Technology; Ben Lieberman, Senior Counsel, Energy; Ryan Long, Deputy Staff Director; Milly Lothian, Press Assistant and Digital Coordinator; Mary Martin, Chief Counsel, Energy/Environment; Drew McDowell, Executive Assistant; Brandon Mooney, Deputy Chief Counsel, Energy; Annelise Rickert, Counsel, Energy; Peter Spencer, Senior Professional Staff Member, Energy; Jason Stanek, Senior Counsel, Energy; Austin Stonebraker, Press Assistant; Hamlin Wade, Special Advisor, External Affairs;

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

| Andy Zach, Senior Professional Staff Member, Environment; |
|---|
| Michelle Ash, Minority Chief Counsel, Digital Commerce and |
| Consumer Protection; Priscilla Barbour, Minority Energy Fellow; |
| Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff Director; Jacqueline Cohen, Minority |
| Chief Environment Counsel; Jean Fruci, Minority Energy and |
| Environment Policy Advisor; Tiffany Guarascio, Minority Deputy |
| Staff Director and Chief Health Advisor; Caitlin Haberman, |
| Minority Professional Staff Member; Rick Kessler, Minority Senior |
| Advisor and Staff Director, Energy and Environment; Jourdan |
| Lewis, Minority Staff Assistant; John Marshall, Minority Policy |
| Coordinator; Jon Monger, Minority Counsel; Kaitlyn Peel, Minority |
| Digital Director; Alexander Ratner, Minority Policy Analyst; Tim |
| Robinson, Minority Chief Counsel; Michelle Rusk, Minority FTC |
| Detailee; Andrew Souvall, Minority Director of Communications, |
| Outreach and Member Services; Tuley Wright, Minority Energy and |
| Environment Policy Advisor; C.J. Young, Minority Press Secretary; |
| and Catherine Zander, Minority Environment Fellow. |

Mr. Shimkus. The subcommittee will come to order. Before we begin, I would like to take a moment to address the guests in our audience. First of all, thank you for coming. We think engaged citizens are a welcome and valuable part of the political process. I only wish every hearing drew this much interest.

The purpose of this hearing is to hear from the Administrator of the EPA on important matters currently before the Agency including the subcommittee's continued interest in the workings of the Environmental Protection Agency. It is an opportunity for the subcommittee to ask questions and have a thoughtful discussion on these issues. The number of people in the audience this morning demonstrates the strong interest in these topics and we welcome that interest and your attendance today.

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

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

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

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

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

efforts to reshape the bureaucracy.

As the author of the changes to Title I of the Toxic Substances Control Act, I also want to commend you for reducing the backlog of applications for new chemicals. I understand the backlog has crept back up by one-third of its normal level, but I look forward to seeing what actions you take including the use of new user fees to help EPA operate its new chemicals review process more expeditiously.

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

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

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

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

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

I believe that no matter how well intentioned any regulatory effort may be, the only way to get a lasting solution, especially one that will not spend more time in court than on the books, is by having Congress settle this issue by statute. I urge you, Mr. Administrator, and the other members of the executive branch to patiently work with us in good faith on a legislative solution

| 169 | to the Renewable Fuel Standard. |
|-----|---|
| 170 | With that I have 50 seconds left. Seeing no one wishing that |
| 171 | time, I yield back the balance of my time and recognize the ranking |
| 172 | member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York, Mr. |
| 173 | Tonko, for 5 minutes. |
| 174 | [The prepared statement of Mr. Shimkus follows:] |
| 175 | |
| 176 | ************************************** |

Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. We are here today to discuss EPA's budget for fiscal year 2019. The President has called for a nearly 30 percent cut at EPA which would severely impair the Agency's ability to fulfill its mission, to safeguard public health, and our environment. We know all too well the costs of failing that mission, of the pain of communities, of children and families who suffer illness resulting from pollution in their air and water. So yes, I am concerned that EPA is increasingly allowing polluters to set the agenda and threaten public health with minimal accountability.

Under Administrator Pruitt, common-sense public health and environmental protections are being slated for elimination with no regard for scientific evidence and little justification beyond the wishes of regulated entities. These actions include reopening clean car standards without any mention of health or pollution, continuing to repeal the Clean Power Plan and dismissing the science of climate change, implementing TSCA reform that ignores bipartisan congressional intent, and a number of attempts to undermine the Clean Air Act.

I expect the courts will agree that many, if not all, of these actions are unjustified. In addition, I am troubled by the dismissal of science by the Agency's political leadership.

Hundreds of scientists have left EPA with no apparent plan to replace them. Expertise on the science advisory boards has been

eroded and the recently proposed rule to undermine the use of science in rulemakings will severely limit the Agency's ability to safeguard public health.

I know many career employees at EPA simply want to work hard to ensure the air we breathe is clean and the water we drink is safe. To them I say thank you. But the Agency's political leadership is pursuing a different agenda and the mounting evidence of serious ethics violations, incredible investigations at the highest level cannot go unscrutinized. Mr. Chair, I value this subcommittee's bipartisan record. There are times that we disagree, but we have worked through tough issues together and are often able to find bipartisan balance. I know there are those in the majority who support rollbacks of EPA rules, but all of us should be troubled by the numerous reports of misuse of taxpayer dollars and apparent conflicts of interest that have made the Administrator a frequent subject of investigation.

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

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

2.2.1

222

223

expenditures. And in almost all cases, the more we have learned the worse they get.

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

Mr. Administrator, the evidence is clear. You have failed as a steward of American taxpayer dollars and our environment. You claim to believe in the mission of the EPA, but your actions including your mistreatment of EPA's dedicated career staff tell a very different story. Evidence from your time in state government should have made this obvious, but only in recent weeks have we come to fully understand the extent of your political ambitions, your tendency to abuse your position of personal gain, and to advance the agendas of your political benefactors and what appears to be a propensity for grift.

2.42

249 But, most importantly, your conduct as Administrator has 250 demonstrated a lack of respect for American taxpayers and the 251 Agency you were appointed to lead and has affirmed the regrettable 252 but inevitable conclusion that you were never fit for this job 253 and your refusal to provide any serious transparency, accept any 254 accountability, or show even the slightest contrition is 255 inexcusable. 256 Mr. Chair, no one is above the law. Congress must hold this 257

Mr. Chair, no one is above the law. Congress must hold this Administrator accountable on behalf of the American people, and I hope our committee can continue to investigate and bring the truth of these important issues to light in a bipartisan manner. With that I yield back.

Mr. Shimkus. The chair thanks the gentleman. The chair now recognizes the Chairman of the full committee, Greg Walden from Oregon, for 5 minutes.

The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pruitt, welcome back to the House Energy and Commerce Committee. As you know, we scheduled this hearing to focus on the EPA's policy and budget priorities some time ago, but you surely understand that members on both sides of the aisle have some serious questions about the management and operations of the Agency. We expect you to answer these questions fully and truthfully.

I am concerned that the good progress being made on policy

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

front is being undercut by allegations about your management of the Agency and use of its resources. These issues are too persistent to ignore and I know many members are looking forward to hear more clarity from you today. You will have ample opportunity to help provide us with any information that can help answer these questions. Additionally, there are numerous ongoing investigations into these issues and I want you to commit to the committee that you will provide us with all the same information you provide to the EPA Inspector General and other congressional committees.

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

I also appreciate your desire to rebalance the power between Washington, D.C. and the states making our efforts more efficient and helping deliver tangible results to communities across the

country. To truly succeed we need stronger local, state, federal, and private partnerships where we can team up and leverage all available resources to accomplish the goals of cleaner water, cleaner air, and cleaner soils. Importantly, I appreciate your stated commitment to administer the law as Congress intended and to have the Agency concentrate on its statutory obligations under environmental and public health laws as well as the Administrative Procedures Act.

Bringing new transparency to your public processes, especially when it comes to the data and science that underpins policies, is truly a welcome change from past EPAs. Mr.

Administrator, too many of your predecessors believed a clean environment was also incompatible with a healthy economy. I share your view that we can and must have both in America. We need common sense regulation that protects the public, actually cleans up the environment, and does so in a way that does not unnecessarily suffocate the economy. I believe the EPA should focus on innovative problem solving and partnership with states, the private sector, and other stakeholders that leverage their resources and expertise.

As with our hearing with you 5 months ago, I remain interested in the goals you are establishing for the programs at EPA and the

I look forward to our discussion today about the Agency's budget

and the EPA's direction now and in the future.

321 metrics you intend to use to measure their progress. 322 Particularly, I noticed objective number 5 in the proposed budget 323 discusses staffing and internal management issues. 324 important that EPA not be bloated, but it is essential that EPA 325 have the staff with proper expertise, implementing and enforcing 326 programs that correlate with their experience; finding that 327 critical staffing balance is one of the most important roles of 328 anyone given the enormous task of managing a large, 329 taxpayer-funded enterprise. 330 Finally, I want to applaud those objectives in the Agency's 331 budget that reduce red tape result in the regulated community 332 better knowing what is expected of them and promoting prompt, 333 even, and fair enforcement of the law. I look forward to learning more about all of that today. So I thank you for joining us again 334 335 before the Energy and Commerce Committee and I look forward to 336 your testimony. 337 With that Mr. Chairman I yield back the balance of my time. 338 [The prepared statement of Mr. Walden follows:] 339 **********INSERT 2****** 340

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

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Administrator Pruitt has brought secrecy, conflicts of interest, and scandal to the EPA. In any other administration, Republican or Democrat, you would be long gone by now. So far, 140 House Democrats have signed on to a resolution introduced by Ms. Castor expressing no confidence in you, Mr. Pruitt.

Additionally, four Republican House members have also called on you to step down.

And the voices are growing. Just look at the critiques from former Bush EPA Administrator and New Jersey Governor Christine Todd Whitman who called Administrator Pruitt's tenure, and I quote, a slap in the face to fiscal responsibility and responsible governance, and said also that evidence is abundant of the dangerous political turn of an agency that is supposed to be guided by science. Another former Republican EPA Administrator William Reilly called Administrator Pruitt, and I quote, a third-rate ideologue.

Past administrators of both parties believed in the EPA's mission and understood that they had been given a sacred trust by the people of our country. Unfortunately, this is not the case with you, Mr. Pruitt. Clearly, you do not believe in EPA's

Mr. Pallone.

mission and appear to have forgotten that you are here to serve all the American people, not merely a select few or just yourself. And the fact is, Administrator Pruitt has used this office as nothing more than an opportunity to either enrich himself or his corporate friends and President Trump seems to be perfectly fine with all these actions. So much for draining the swamp.

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

There are so many outstanding questions that we need truthful answers to today but because so far we have only gotten half-truths, misleading answers, or outright falsehoods. For instance, you rented a condo at well below market value and then emphatically claimed on Fox News that your landlord's lobbyist husband had no business before the EPA, a statement that was proven to be untrue. And it is that kind of conduct that prompted Ranking Members Tonko, DeGette, and vice Ranking Member Castor and I, to

request that you be placed under oath for this hearing and that it be expanded to include the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

The Chairman did not agree to that request, but I would remind you what Chairman Walden said to the press when he declined our request. He said, lying to Congress is a crime regardless of whether or not you are sworn in. So now committee Republicans have conveniently told the press that they are investigating you for some of your outrageous ethical abuses, yet I have seen no evidence from committee Republicans that that is really happening.

Fortunately, committee Democrats have been demanding answers and five independent federal investigations are now being done into your conduct at our request. Yesterday, I joined with Ranking Member Cummings of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee to request an additional investigation by the Office of Special Counsel into your troubling pattern of apparently retaliating against EPA employees who question your extravagant spending and I am confident that these investigations will affirm what I have come to believe is true that you are unfit to hold public office and undeserving of the public trust.

And I don't say those words, you know, because I particularly dislike you or, you know, hold you in ill repute. I just think that every indication we have is that you really should resign

and you are undeserving of the public trust. And I yield back,

Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. We now

conclude with members' opening statements. The chair would like

conclude with members' opening statements. The chair would like to remind members that pursuant to committee rules, all members' opening statements will be made part of the record.

We would also now like to thank and welcome our distinguished witness, U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, for being here today. You will have an opportunity to give an opening statement followed by a round of questions by members. You are joined by the Honorable Holly Greaves, Chief Financial Officer. Welcome to you also, we appreciate you being here.

And, Mr. Administrator, we now recognize you for 5 minutes for your opening statement.

417

418

419

420

421

422

423

424

425

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE E. SCOTT PRUITT, ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Mr. Pruitt. Well, good morning to you, Mr. Chairman,
Ranking Member Pallone, members of the committee, it is good to
be with you today and I appreciate the opportunity to discuss these
matters that you have raised.

There is consequential and important work being done at the EPA since the beginning of the Trump administration both in terms of improved environmental outcomes as well as substantial regulatory reform. We are stripping burdensome costs from the American economy at an unprecedented pace and we are doing this while inspiring confidence in the American people that it is government going to work with them as opposed to against them, to achieve harmony between jobs and growth and environmental stewardship.

In the short time of the Trump administration we have made enormous progress as far as improved environmental outcomes. These are just a few: We have removed over three times the number of polluted sites in contaminated communities across the country as compared to the previous administration for 2017, and for 2018 we are on pace to remove as many as ten times the number of polluted sites. We are working cooperatively with the states to improve air quality through the approval of 350 state improvement plans.

And with regard to water we are leading a multiagency approach that has set a goal of eradicating lead from our drinking water within 10 years, largely through the utilization of a tool that you provided, WIFIA. It is my goal to prioritize applications for critical water infrastructure over the 10 years to hopefully see four billion a year dedicated to the replacement of lead service lines in order to reduce lead in our drinking water.

President Trump has set an ambitious goal for the EPA under his administration and our measurable achievements are a testament to the effectiveness which a results-driven EPA can achieve. President Trump did not only task us with accomplishing the core mission of the EPA acting more efficiently and more effectively than ever before, he also demanded comprehensive regulatory reform. That transformational change is happening. In just 1 year, the Trump administration has saved the American people almost \$8 billion in regulatory savings. And the EPA alone is responsible for nearly two dozen regulatory actions, saving Americans one billion of that eight billion in regulatory cost.

These actions are providing America's job creators with the regulatory clarity they deserve. By repealing and replacing the so-called Clean Power Plan we are ending a one-size-fits-all regulation on energy providers and restoring rule of law. By rescinding and rewriting the 2015 Waters of the United States rule we are ending Washington's power grab over land use decisions

across the country. It is indisputable that we have made enormous progress in advancing President Trump's reform agenda and pruning back decades of regulatory overreach that was unnecessary, burdensome, and ultimately harmful to hardworking Americans across the country.

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

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

499 at best stories that have been so twisted they do not resemble reality. And I am here and I welcome the chance to be here to 500 501 set the record straight in these areas. But let's have no illusions about what is really going on 502 Those who have attacked the EPA and attacked me are doing 503 504 so because they want to attack and derail the President's agenda 505 and undermine this administration's priorities. I am simply not going to let that happen. I look forward to your questions today 506 507 and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Pruitt follows:]

509

510

508

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair thanks the Administrator. I will start the series of questioning and I will recognize myself for 5 minutes for the first round.

We have obviously a lot of media presence here. I have been asked the last couple days what am I going to do, what am I going to say, and I said, well, I am going to talk policy and stewardship. So half my 5 minutes is going to be on a policy issue, and hopefully that will save some time for us to talk about some stewardship issues.

Since you last testified before the subcommittee, the White House has hosted a number of meetings, some of which have included you and other Cabinet officials, senators, and various stakeholders, to discuss changes in the Renewable Fuel Standard. As I alluded to in my opening statement, those potential administrative actions hang like the sword of Damocles over efforts on Capitol Hill to reach an enduring, legislative solution to the problems of that program.

Are any of these administrative changes imminent, or will you commit to allowing Congress time to work on a legislative solution?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think both are important and I do think there are some regulatory options that we can pursue. Many have talked about transparency as an example with respect to the trading platform and the RFS trading platform, how

long you can hold a RIN as an example, who can buy, who can sell RINs. There are those kinds of, I think, evaluations that we can engage from a regulatory perspective. And as you know there is also consideration about the RVP waiver and the E15 being allowed year around.

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

Mr. Shimkus. Well, let me just tell you from my perspective what happens as we are trying to get our disparate groups together is that every time someone gets hauled down to the White House the other side goes crazy. And then, you probably get to see the same thing, the other side gets hauled down and the other side goes crazy. And we are trying to get everybody in the room and that is the perspective that I come from.

The follow-up on this is what actions, if any, are you taking now to prepare for the Renewable Fuel Standard post 2022?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, as you know under the statute we have an

ability to reset those volume obligations and we are evaluating that. There is a cap of 15 billion for conventional presently. But another area Mr. Chairman that I know you have been interested in is high octane. And with respect to it was mentioned in some other comments about the CAFÉ standards, there needs to be a serious consideration of use pursuing as a country fuel choices and options to meet those CAFÉ standards and provide high octane as an option to the American people. I think there is a potential that will serve both the ag sector as well at the auto sector and consumers across this country that we could pursue together.

Mr. Shimkus. Well, thank you. Now I want to move to the administrative portion of my two questions. Obviously you have already alluded to and some of my colleagues have alluded to all the recent stories and issues and your willingness to set the record straight. So in my minute and 45 seconds left I want to give you the time to address those as you will.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in my opening comment, I want to address each of these respective issues and provide information and we will work with Congress both with Oversight as well as this committee to provide any and all information that helps answer those questions. Those have been a distraction to our agenda, I think the congressman mentioned that earlier, and that troubles me. Ultimately, as Administrator of the EPA, I have to take responsibility to make changes internal

to the Agency to get accountability in our processes to ensure that in each of these areas we get better results and that we show the American people that we are committed to being good stewards of taxpayer resources, staying true to our mission at the Agency, which I believe that we are and have, and I am committed to doing that. That is why I am here to talk to you about it today.

Mr. Shimkus. I thank the Administrator and I yield back my time and now turn to the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. Tonko, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Recently it came out that two EPA employees who came with you to Washington from Oklahoma were given significant raises over the White House's objection. When you were interviewed by Ed Henry on Fox News you claimed to have been unaware of those raises. At the time, Ed Henry asked you whether you intentionally went around the White House or whether you simply had no idea what your staff was up to.

The EPA Inspector General is looking into those raises and last week the IG released preliminary information showing that the forms to grant the raises were signed by your chief of staff, Mr. Ryan Jackson, who wrote that he was signing on your behalf. This is your opportunity to set the record straight. Did you, Administrator, authorize Mr. Jackson to sign those documents for you?

Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, those were delegated to Mr.

| 607 | Jackson and the Inspector General did reference that in his |
|-----|--|
| 608 | management alert and he recognized the authority. |
| 609 | Mr. Tonko. So you did authorize him then to sign them? |
| 610 | Mr. Pruitt. Those decisions, that decision was made by my |
| 611 | chief of staff. |
| 612 | Mr. Tonko. Yes or no, did you authorize him? |
| 613 | Mr. Pruitt. There are delegations giving him that |
| 614 | authority. |
| 615 | Mr. Tonko. So that is a yes. |
| 616 | Mr. Pruitt. The Inspector General recognized that, |
| 617 | Congressman. |
| 618 | Mr. Tonko. So you authorized Mr. Jackson to sign those |
| 619 | documents for you. In internal emails, Sarah Greenwalt, one of |
| 620 | the aides who received a substantial raise, stated that you were |
| 621 | aware of and supported the raises. Was that true? |
| 622 | Mr. Pruitt. I think with respect to the raises what is |
| 623 | important |
| 624 | Mr. Tonko. Was that true? |
| 625 | Mr. Pruitt. Congressman. |
| 626 | Mr. Tonko. I have 5 minutes so I have to move along. |
| 627 | Mr. Pruitt. I was not aware of the amount nor was I made |
| 628 | aware |
| 629 | Mr. Tonko. Not the amount, were you aware of the raises? |
| 630 | Mr. Pruitt. I was not aware of the amount nor was I aware |
| | |

of the bypassing or the PPO process not being respected.

Mr. Tonko. Well, then I am concerned that you have no idea of what is going on in your name at your agency especially on an issue already under IG investigation. You have spent this week claiming to champion transparency, but on Tuesday you blocked the press from attending an event where you announced a new proposal that will severely limit the Agency's use of public health studies in policymaking.

When internal emails came out about this new policy last week, they revealed that it had been developed entirely by political staff, seemingly without a robust outside stakeholder process, and once the press started covering those emails they were removed from the Agency's public FOIA portal. I do not know if you were personally involved in the decision to remove those emails, but it certainly was not transparent.

Mr. Administrator, you like to claim that you support the rule of law and acknowledge the limits of EPA's authority. Many of our environmental statutes are clear. EPA must use the best available science as a foundation of policymaking. This proposal would prevent that. Are you aware, yes or no, that Nancy Beck raised concerns that such a policy could also impact data that would be important to industry such as confidential business information? Yes or no.

Mr. Pruitt. This effort --

| 655 | Mr. Tonko. Yes or no. |
|-----|--|
| 656 | Mr. Pruitt. This effort, Congressman, was about ensuring |
| 657 | that |
| 658 | Mr. Tonko. Were you aware that |
| 659 | Mr. Pruitt at the Agency |
| 660 | Mr. Tonko. Were you aware that Nancy Beck raised the |
| 661 | concern? Were you aware? |
| 662 | Mr. Pruitt. As I indicated, Congressman, this effort is |
| 663 | actually a reflection of Congress's commitment to transparency |
| 664 | at the Agency. |
| 665 | Mr. Tonko. Sir, I need to move on. I take that as a yes. |
| 666 | To mitigate that concern it appears that the proposal has been |
| 667 | crafted so that you, the Administrator, has the discretion to |
| 668 | grant exemptions as you see fit without any transparency or |
| 669 | accountability for your decisions. For example, if EPA was |
| 670 | assessing the safety of a chemical, you alone would have the power |
| 671 | to selectively block public health studies that do not support |
| 672 | your political priorities and allow ones that favor your friends |
| 673 | in industry. Not only does this open the door to special |
| 674 | treatment for industry over the public health, but you could also |
| 675 | pit winners and losers amongst the industry types. |
| 676 | Do you think it would be hypocritical to exempt industry data |
| 677 | containing confidential business information from disclosure but |
| 678 | not personal health information from public health researchers? |
| | |

679 Would it be hypocritical? Yes or no? 680 Mr. Pruitt. I think that is a misstatement. Congressman, 681 I believe that what needs to be clear is that what actions we took 682 this week were to ensure that data and methodology were also 683 available to those that they are concerned about our rulemaking. 684 Mr. Tonko. You know, I believe it is hypocritical. So 685 moving on, given your track record how can the public trust your discretion to make fair decisions when it comes to those biases? 686 687 Mr. Pruitt. You know, Congressman, this was an effort to 688 ensure transparency. Because as we do rulemaking at the Agency 689 what is important --690 Based on your record should the public trust your Mr. Tonko. 691 decision-making here with the hypocrisies that would exist in the system you defined? 692 693 Mr. Pruitt. This is actually a support of transparency for 694 all rulemaking at the Agency. This is not an individual decision 695 that is made by the Administrator. This is programmatic offices 696 making decisions on rules --697 Mr. Tonko. Sir. 698 -- that are based upon transparent --699 Mr. Tonko. Sir, I think this boils down to an issue of trust 700 and you have developed a system where you are picking winners and 701 We pit the public against the industry or you are picking 702 favorites within the industry and I think there is a hypocritical

703 outcome to it all.

And with that Mr. Chair, I yield back.

Mr. Shimkus. I thank my colleague for staying within time.

And the chair recognizes the Chairman of the full committee,

Congressman Walden, for 5 minutes.

The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I mentioned in my opening statement there are many reviews currently going on at the EPA, in the Inspector General's Office, Government Accountability Office, and other congressional committees, about some of these concerns you are hearing about today, Mr. Administrator, and that have been raised in the media. So my question is pretty easy. Will you commit the EPA will provide this committee with all the documents and information EPA produces for those inquiries?

Mr. Pruitt. Absolutely.

The Chairman. Thank you. As I told you the last time you were here, this committee is charged by the House of Representatives with legislative and oversight responsibility for the bulk of the statutes that the EPA implements and we decide where the Agency's money can best be spent. Can you help me understand your guiding principles for determining legitimate uses of federal money by the EPA including whether you are using any kind of previous spending guidance to make these decisions?

Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, I believe that as we are making

727 decisions we have policy and quidelines at the Agency that drive 728 those decisions. Some of them are attributable to programmatic 729 offices, some of them are attributable to, you know, the science 730 part of our office. But yes, those guidelines govern our 731 decisions each and every day. 732 The Chairman. And are they similar to the guidelines that 733 governed your predecessor's decisions? 734 Mr. Pruitt. Yes. 735 The Chairman. In what ways? 736 Mr. Pruitt. Well, these are policies that predated our time 737 there at the Agency and so they have governed our, you know, from 738 travel to internal decision-making on allocation of dollars to 739 serve programmatic offices. So these are predated policies that 740 govern our actions every single day. 741 The Chairman. Let me ask you about the issue of science and 742 743 744

The Chairman. Let me ask you about the issue of science and transparency. I have had a lot of constituents over the years who have been very concerned about decisions in various agencies that get made by administrators or the bureaucracy and in some cases they can't get access to the underlying data that underpins the decisions. The proposal that you put forward this last week or so, how does that address that issue, are we going to get science that everybody gets a chance to see that can be replicated that maybe is peer-reviewed so we, all working off facts?

Mr. Pruitt. And actually this has been an interest of

745

746

747

748

749

34 751 As you know there has been proposed legislation to 752 address this very issue. 753 The Chairman. Yes, it has been. Mr. Pruitt. And this was a regulatory action that was taken 754 755 this week, a proposed rule that actually goes to the heart of 756 transparency as I was trying to share earlier. Because it 757 requires that -- and when we do rulemaking at the Agency we can't just simply publish the conclusions, the summaries of studies, 758 759 because what has happened historically is third parties have 760 provided studies or summaries, we have taken those conclusions, 761 used those as a basis of rulemaking but not published the data, 762 not published the methodology that actually supported the 763 conclusion. And so, those that are commenting on rules were

So this is an effort on our part to ensure that as we do science at the Agency whether it is internal at the EPA or whether we use third parties as far as their findings, data, methodology, and conclusion should all be a part of the package.

ill-equipped to be able to understand whether the conclusions were

The Chairman. So is what you are trying to do is make more information available or less information available?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes, absolutely more information available.

The Chairman. To the public. So you are going to require that every one of these decisions or whatever they are based on,

rightly concluded or not.

764

765

766

767

768

769

770

771

772

773

the data and the methodology as well as the conclusions are transparent and available to the public. Is that going to be on your website? How are we going to know this?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, it is actually a proposed rule,

Congressman. It is actually something that we are taking comment
on and I am sure there will be a wide array of comment on that
very proposal. But the objective once again is to ensure
transparency, reproducibility, with respect to the science that
we rely upon in making our decisions in rulemaking.

The Chairman. As you know, Mr. Administrator, last year, and then I think we actually passed it into law this year, this committee unanimously, I believe, here and in the House, rewrote America's Brownfields Legislation and we are working together to rewrite the Safe Drinking Water, clean Drinking Water Act as well and make additional grants available. What are you doing to help clean up these brownfields sites that litter our neighborhoods and our country?

Mr. Pruitt. You know, we just issued a series of grants across the country this week with respect to the Brownfields Program, and you are right. It has been a tremendous success reclaiming polluted areas across this country to allow communities to once again enjoy those areas. And so with the partnership of Congress, the increased omnibus, you know, provided additional monies there for us to enhance that program,

we are administering those grants and seeking to partner with communities all over the country to ensure that these areas are cleaned up and re-purposed and able to be enjoyed again by those communities.

The Chairman. And I just have a few seconds left. I want to follow up on what the chairman of the subcommittee talked about regarding the RFS and new fuel standards. I want you to know that Mr. Flores and Mr. Shimkus and others on this committee have put a lot of time in because it is a priority of mine and theirs to figure out going forward how we have a standard that works for those who grow corn, those who refine fuels, the auto industry, and the environment.

And I would hope this administration would look to our leadership in this effort as well as any independent actions or the fact that we are actually a co-equal branch and the House has some authority in this area as well as the Senate. Will you commit to that?

Mr. Pruitt. I think it is essential, as I shared with the chairman earlier, because at the end of the day certainty is very important in this area. And I think you see tremendous investment over the last --

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. We will make sure -- and I apologize. I just want to make sure that -- we have a lot of people lined up. We will have more time to talk about

823 | that.

The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shimkus. The chair thanks the Chairman and the chair now recognizes the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. Pallone, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know, I listened, Mr. Administrator, to your reasons why you haven't resigned and basically you said that you are staying because only you can carry out the President's mission. And I strongly disagree with that. I think your actions are an embarrassment to President Trump and distract from the EPA's ability to effectively carry out the President's mission and if I were the President I wouldn't want your help, I would just get rid of you. But I am not the President so let me move on.

It has been reported that you have even gone so far as to retaliate against EPA's employees, punishing those who questioned your spending and management, and sidelining those who attempted to advance important public health protections. So I wanted to ask again, yes or no, because we don't have a lot of time, it has been reported that at least five EPA employees were recently reassigned, demoted, or otherwise retaliated against after they raised concerns about your spending. Is that correct, yes or no?

Mr. Pruitt. I don't ever recall a conversation to that end.

Mr. Pallone. Well, I will take that as a yes. I was further

847 alarmed --848 Mr. Pruitt. It shouldn't be taken as a yes. 849 Mr. Pallone. -- that you removed the head of the EPA office 850 that found that you did not face direct death threats. 851 always been your practice to fire people who disagree with you? 852 Mr. Pruitt. I mean, Congressman, the Inspector General 853 himself has noted that the threats against me are unprecedented 854 855 Mr. Pallone. Well, you are not answering yes or no. So 856 again --857 Mr. Pruitt. -- with respect to the quantity and the type 858 of threats and is on the record saying so. 859 Mr. Pallone. Okay. Look, six staffers is a pattern, I think you need to start taking responsibility. But you say you 860 861 are going to take responsibility but you don't. I am very concerned by this troubling pattern of retaliation which is not 862 863 only potentially illegal but is also creating a hostile 864 environment that is expediting the exodus of valuable expertise In place of those dedicated public servants you 865 from the EPA. 866 are installing industry lobbyists. 867 Let's look at the case of Wendy Cleland-Hamnett, an expert who fought to finalize a ban on methylene chloride, a deadly 868 869 chemical used in paint strippers. The New York Times and other 870 media have reported that her efforts were opposed by Nancy Beck,

872 chemicals. Just last year, Nancy Beck was being paid by the 873 chemical industry to lobby against chemical regulations. that she is retired, Nancy Beck is running the chemical program 874 875 and the proposal to ban methylene chloride has been abandoned. 876 Yes or no, were you involved in the decision to abandon that 877 rulemaking or was that decision made by Nancy Beck? 878 Mr. Pruitt. The rulemaking has not been abandoned. 879 Actually there is a proposed rule --880 Mr. Pallone. Well, you say that but that is not accurate. 881 Do you know that manufacturers of methylene chloride paint 882 strippers have been aware of deaths linked to this use for more 883 than 28 years but continue to produce it? Yes or no. That is actually a solvent that we are 884 Mr. Pruitt. 885 considering under the --886 Okay. Obviously you don't want to admit what Mr. Pallone. 887 Despite all your scandals, the White House says you have 888 the President's support because you are implementing his 889 deregulatory agenda, but I think that agenda has real costs. In October 2017, right before EPA abandoned the rulemaking, Drew 890 891 Wynne, a 31 year old small business owner in South Carolina, died 892 while using methylene chloride. Drew's brother is here today and 893 I want to thank him for traveling here from South Carolina and 894 continuing to advocate for a ban of this deadly chemical.

the chemical industry lobbyist you put in charge of regulating

895 Were you or others at EPA aware of Drew Wynne's death when 896 the Agency abandoned the ban of this deadly chemical? Yes or no, 897 were you aware of his death? 898 I think it is important, Congressman, to know Mr. Pruitt. 899 that we have a proposed ban in place that is being considered and 900 we are taking comments on and we haven't finished that process. 901 Mr. Pallone. Well, obviously you are not going to admit whether you know about Drew's death. Unfortunately, in February 902 903 another 31 year old man, Joshua Atkins, died using a methylene 904 chloride paint stripper to refinish his bike. I learned about 905 Joshua from his mother Lauren who sent me a deeply touching letter. 906 And I would ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to put that 907 letter into the record, in which she states her hope that her son 908 will be the last to die from this chemical. 909 Mr. Shimkus. Can we make sure we see the letter? 910 Mr. Pallone. Yes. I will give it to you right now, Mr. 911 Chairman. 912 Again, Mr. Pruitt, your deregulatory agenda costs lives, 913 real people with names, with brothers, with mothers. You have 914 the power to finalize the ban of methylene chloride now and prevent 915 more deaths but you haven't done it. Do you have anything to say 916 to these families at this point? 917 Congressman, as I was trying to indicate 918 earlier there is a proposed ban in place that we took comment on

919 that we are reviewing presently. There has been no decision at 920 this time to not --Mr. Pallone. All right. Well, obviously you have nothing 921 922 to say to these families. Look, you say you are going to do 923 something but these chemicals are still on the shelves and they 924 make a mockery of Lautenberg's TSCA reform legislation that this 925 committee worked so hard on, including our chairman Mr. Shimkus, 926 and it makes a mockery of the EPA. You have the power immediately 927 to get this chemical off the shelves and you are not doing it and 928 you should do it. 929 And again, Mr. Shimkus, I appreciate your help with TSCA, 930 but he is not implementing TSCA so I am wondering if our efforts 931 were totally in vain. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 932 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair 933 thanks the gentleman. The chair now recognizes Chairman Emeritus 934 Congressman Barton from Texas for 5 minutes. 935 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I am honored to 936 have the EPA Administrator back before the committee. 937 Mr. Administrator, you are not the first person to be the 938 victim of, for lack of a better term, Washington politics. 939 got picked to be the EPA Administrator because of the service you 940 provided for the great state of Oklahoma in fighting some of the 941 Obama administration radical clean air policies. 942 recommended and I support the recommendation that you made to the

| 943 | President that we withdraw from the Paris climate change |
|-----|--|
| 944 | agreement. That is a decision that most of the stakeholders at |
| 945 | EPA violently oppose. |
| 946 | If you can't debate the policies in Washington, you attack |
| 947 | the personality and that is what is happening to you. Republicans |
| 948 | do it when it is a Democratic President. The Democrats do it when |
| 949 | it is a Republican President. And in my opinion, and it is just |
| 950 | my opinion, that is what is happening to you. |
| 951 | On your housing costs, were those approved, the contract, |
| 952 | before it was signed? Didn't you get an ethics review and didn't |
| 953 | that individual say it was acceptable? |
| 954 | Mr. Pruitt. There have been two ethics reviews, |
| 955 | Congressman. |
| 956 | Mr. Barton. I need quick answers because I want to ask you |
| 957 | |
| 958 | Mr. Pruitt. There have been two ethics reviews speaking to |
| 959 | the lease itself saying that it met market rates. |
| 960 | Mr. Barton. Okay. You have been attacked for flying first |
| 961 | class. Is that illegal? |
| 962 | Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, that was approved by the travel |
| 963 | office and the security team at the EPA. I have since made changes |
| 964 | to that. But that was |
| 965 | Mr. Barton. But it is not illegal. |
| 966 | Mr. Pruitt. It is not. |
| | .1 |

967 It may look bad but it is not illegal. Mr. Barton. 968 was an Energy secretary named Hazel O'Leary under the Clinton 969 administration. She leased party jets that were used by rock 970 Party jets, not one time but several times. Have you ever 971 rented a party jet? 972 Mr. Pruitt. No, Congressman. 973 Mr. Barton. You have not rented a party jet. Okay, that 974 Let's talk about this transparency issue. 975 understand it, your transparency proposal is that if they are 976 going to use the science to make a recommendation on an EPA regulation they have to actually report what the science is. 977 978 have to release the documents and the data sets and all of that. 979 Is that correct? That is exactly right, Congressman. 980 Mr. Pruitt. 981 Mr. Barton. Is there anything wrong with that? 982 I think it enhances transparency and the Mr. Pruitt. 983 confidence of the American people as we do rulemaking. I think it is an excellent idea and it is long 984 Mr. Barton. 985 overdue. In your budget --986 Will the gentleman suspend for a minute? 987 We have guests in the gallery. You are our guests. 988 some magic words that will then cause you to have to leave. Ι 989 do not want to say that. So if you would respect -- we were asked 990 for decorum. That is not being decorous, whatever the word is.

So let's just continue on with the testimony and we will move forward.

The chair recognizes the Chairman Emeritus.

Mr. Barton. Okay, thank you. On your transparency proposal if it is actually accepted, we will actually get to see what the science is behind the support for the regulation. Is that not correct?

Mr. Pruitt. It is. And I think what has been of note to me as I have been serving at the Agency is that there is a reliance at the Agency on many third-party studies. And as those studies are the support of our rulemaking, it is important to make sure that the methodology and data accompany those conclusions so that the American people can make informed decision about the rules and whether they actually are based upon sound science.

Mr. Barton. This is to get a little bit to the budget we are actually here to discuss, there is a program in your agency called Leaking Underground Storage Tanks, short in acronym is LUST. The money that goes into that fund is supposed to be used to clean up or prevent leaks from underground storage tanks. To your knowledge, is there anything under current law that prevents a state from using it for other purposes? In other words, the money is supposed to be used to clean up these underground storage tanks, but my understanding is very few states use it for that purpose.

1015 Mr. Pruitt. You know, Congressman, I am not aware of that 1016 happening but it is something that we would investigate and look 1017 into if you have some information about that happening in your state and elsewhere. 1018 Would you do that and --1019 Mr. Barton. 1020 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. The chair 1021 recognizes the gentleman from California, Dr. Ruiz, for 5 minutes. 1022 Thank you for your service. Mr. Barton. 1023 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Ruiz. 1024 Administrator Pruitt's ethical violations as the head of an 1025 agency with a mission to protect the public's health demonstrate 1026 a concerning lack of integrity and a pattern of the rich and 1027 powerful putting their rich and powerful friends and their own 1028 self-interest above the interest of the public's health and at 1029 the expense of the common good. Clean air to breathe and safe 1030 water to drink is not a privilege only for the rich and powerful 1031 but a right for everyone, and the role of a public servant is to 1032 serve and protect the public, in particular the public's health. 1033 However, the gross elimination of many public health 1034 protections are kickbacks to the rich lobbyists and corporation 1035 friends that have a real impact and I want to highlight one This week the EPA announced that it intends to limit 1036 example. 1037 the kind of scientific studies it will use in issuing new 1038 protections to only studies that make public the private,

personal, confidential information of the people who participate in those studies.

Revealing that info is a clear ethical violation of any reputable research institutional review board in the United States. The type of studies you want to exclude are the same kind of scientific studies that were used to prove that lead in pipes and paints harm children and that secondhand smoke is a dangerous carcinogen. We are talking about landmark studies such as the Harvard School of Public Health's six-city study which proved a connection between air pollution and early death back in 1993. That just by living in a city with poor air quality your average life expectancy was lower than those who didn't. This study later became the basis of fine particulate matter regulations in the Clean Air Act.

When you were here in December, you and I spoke about fine particle matter which, thanks to studies based on confidential patient health information, we now know is associated with premature death, asthma attacks, chronic bronchitis, decreased lung function, and respiratory diseases. You acknowledge these risks and agree that there is no safe level of fine particle pollution, but your new policy would block EPA from considering the studies that have shown these dangerous health implications.

So do you deny now that fine particle pollution has these health impacts and will these new regulations cause your agency

| 1063 | to disregard these sentinel studies? |
|------|---|
| 1064 | Mr. Pruitt. If they provide the data and methodology to the |
| 1065 | Agency and the findings it will be used. |
| 1066 | Mr. Ruiz. Well, that is a clear violation of ethical rules |
| 1067 | protecting patient confidentiality. |
| 1068 | Mr. Pruitt. Those can be redacted, Congressman. |
| 1069 | Mr. Ruiz. Who is protecting the subjects in those studies? |
| 1070 | So you have promised us a replacement rule for the Clean Power |
| 1071 | Plan. Will that replacement rule acknowledge the health impacts |
| 1072 | of fine particle pollution? |
| 1073 | Mr. Pruitt. We actually have been as you know a proposed |
| 1074 | rule in the marketplace on just that issue. |
| 1075 | Mr. Ruiz. Well, you know, I mentioned the risks of lead in |
| 1076 | drinking water. So with this new rule those risks were shown |
| 1077 | by epidemiological studies that protected the patient |
| 1078 | confidentiality and all the other intricacies of confidential |
| 1079 | information. Now your rule would lead to the idea that if it |
| 1080 | doesn't suit the manufacturers' intent that now those studies |
| 1081 | could be disregarded. |
| 1082 | So do you believe that mesothelioma can, or that asbestos |
| 1083 | causes mesothelioma? |
| 1084 | Mr. Pruitt. I do. But the confidential business |
| 1085 | information to which you refer along with personal information |
| 1086 | can be redacted. |
| | 1 |

Mr. Ruiz. So that information -- so you have been in office, you know, you have dismantled protections for the public's health and there is, and protections for children who suffer asthma, seniors with respiratory illnesses, and you demonstrated a disregard for true scientific study, the scientific process, and the confidentiality of people who want to participate and help further our collective knowledge to protect the public good.

You have done this to allow your rich and powerful corporate friends to create more pollution in order to increase profit at the expense of the common good. Again if children with asthma and seniors with COPD -- and I am an emergency physician. I participated in IRB boards. I know the importance of protecting the information in order to get more participants, and I have also treated children with asthma gasping for air or seniors at their last wits' end. When you remove these protections under the guise of a false transparency notion, then you are making life more difficult for everyday American families and this is disgraceful and the American people deserve better.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. The chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia for 5 minutes.

Mr. McKinley. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you,
Administrator, for coming before us. I think that was the first
policy question you got from the other side of the aisle,
observation.

And to the public, I think this has been a lot of a classic display of innuendo and McCarthyism that we are seeing too often here in Washington that unfortunately I think works against civility and respect for people in public office. I am hoping we would be able to stay on policy today as much as we could, but I can see some just can't resist the limelight, the opportunity to grandstand.

So having said all that I thank you for what you have done. You have been able to stay disciplined on these policies. I know in West Virginia the impact that it has had on Brownfields

Legislation of what you are doing on that I see the rollback of some of the regulatory reform that there is hope now. A lot of the people in the fossil fuel industry that they could see that deterioration in the past 8 years prior to that. There is some hope. We are seeing the economy start to rebound thanks to you and the administration of taking this fight on.

So I know that if I could, I know just as an example, here was an example that despite what has been said to the achievements that you have made that the EPA just awarded \$1.9 million to research in drinking water having to do with Flint, that research in Flint. People are ignoring the progress that we are making and they are trying to make this another attack on President Trump, and unfortunately there are a lot of people that are going to go along with that.

So if we could, if I could get back to one of the things that has disturbed me some with some of the events over the last numbers of years was we had a good friend in Leslie Lampton who passed away last week. Lampton has Ergon Refinery located in Mississippi but they have the only refinery in West Virginia. It is a small, kind of a boutique operation at 23,000 barrels. I know the definition of a small refinery is 75,000 barrels, so they are a third of the size. But yet, so they are struggling meeting all of the qualifications, all the requirements of a major refinery.

Is there something that we could work together or something to help out these small refineries so that they can compete?

Because they can't handle the RINs, they don't have a market for that with them. So is there something that we could be doing to help out these boutique refineries?

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

So it is really in everyone's best interest to get more clarity and confidence in how this RIN trading platform and relief

1159 It is going to benefit the ethanol industry, needs to occur. 1160 benefit the ag sector, and I think benefit those that are suffering 1161 with the RIN obligations. And so it is our hope that we can chart 1162 a path forward with Congress to achieve those kinds of outcomes. 1163 Mr. McKinley. Okay. Mr. Administrator, for numbers of 1164 years we were working to try to get resolved something for it was 1165 sitting out here for 30 to 40 years was the coal ash issue and 1166 we got that taken care of 2 years ago. But my question then back 1167 to you as the Administrator is are there states that have opted 1168 not to put together their own program and turn it over to the EPA, 1169 or can you help us, like give me an update on where we are with 1170 some of the state implementation? 1171 Mr. Pruitt. We have provided guidance to the states with 1172 respect to developing their own programs and very few states have 1173 actually done that to your question. And we are working with 1174 those state partners to equip and educate them on the option by 1175 I think it is important that they pursue providing the guidance. it and I think it is important they pursue it in a timely way, 1176 1177 and it hasn't taken place yet. 1178 Mr. McKinley. Have any states chosen not to put together 1179 their own program? 1180 Mr. Pruitt. I just think it is early. It is nascent in the 1181 process and I think it is just very few early adopter states so 1182 far and that is the reason we are working hard to educate and inform those states.

Mr. McKinley. Mr. Administrator, thank you for handling all these issues and I hope that we can stay on policy and talk about some of the progress that has been made because I think it has been good for the environment. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. Pruitt. Thank you.

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

Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do want to ask a couple questions about the Superfund program, particularly about your friend Mr. Albert Kelly who you put in charge of the program despite his past. He was scheduled to appear before the committee in January but he backed out at the last minute citing travel obligations. I know my colleagues on both sides of the aisle were disappointed in that, but Mr. Kelly sent a letter for the record that he would be willing to answer any and all of our questions regarding his lifetime ban from the banking industry and the illegal activities that led up to that.

It is now more than 3 months later, we have gotten no information from Mr. Kelly. We are told that political leadership has been preventing him from speaking with us and if that is true that is certainly disappointing. 2 weeks ago you were interviewed on Fox News by Ed Henry and he asked you several

| 1207 | questions about Mr. Kelly. In the interview you said that the |
|------|---|
| 1208 | details of the settlement with the FDIC were private and that none |
| 1209 | of us really know what happened. |
| 1210 | So my question is, if Mr. Kelly is happy to share the details |
| 1211 | of his lifetime banking ban as a matter of transparency is he not |
| 1212 | telling us the truth or are you stopping him from doing that? |
| 1213 | Mr. Pruitt. I think Mr. Kelly if he is willing to share that |
| 1214 | with you he should do that. |
| 1215 | Mr. Peters. Terrific. |
| 1216 | Mr. Pruitt. And I would encourage him to do so. |
| 1217 | Mr. Peters. And because we do think that it is an important |
| 1218 | issue of transparency I am glad to hear that. |
| 1219 | The FDIC ban is not the only concern about Mr. Kelly. It |
| 1220 | has been widely reported that his family abuts a Superfund |
| 1221 | National Priorities List site. He is the head of the Superfund |
| 1222 | program, creating at least a perception of a conflict of interest |
| 1223 | in that he might be favoring the site that is next to his property. |
| 1224 | You have mentioned that one of your goals, one of your values is |
| 1225 | that you are committed to good stewardship of taxpayer resources. |
| 1226 | Has this financial conflict been reviewed by EPA ethics |
| 1227 | officials and, if so, were they provided with all the necessary |
| 1228 | information to conduct that review? |
| 1229 | Mr. Pruitt. I don't have knowledge about that, Congressman, |
| 1230 | if that has happened or not. |

| 1231 | Mr. Peters. All right. I certainly would ask that that be |
|------|--|
| 1232 | done. When you came to testify before this subcommittee in |
| 1233 | December you claimed that you had to remove scientists from EPA's |
| 1234 | Science Advisory Board because of, quote, the appearance of a lack |
| 1235 | of independence. John Konkus, your deputy associate |
| 1236 | administrator for the Office of Public Affairs who is tasked with |
| 1237 | reviewing millions of dollars of grants for EPA, was approved to |
| 1238 | provide media consulting advice to unnamed clients, likely |
| 1239 | including his prior clients from his Republican-affiliated |
| 1240 | consulting firm. Were you aware that Mr. Konkus was continuing |
| 1241 | to work as a media consultant for outside clients? |
| 1242 | Mr. Pruitt. I am aware that the ethics officials at the |
| 1243 | Agency approved that. That is what I am aware of. |
| 1244 | Mr. Peters. Don't you think this creates an appearance of |
| 1245 | a lack of independence? |
| 1246 | Mr. Pruitt. The ethics officials didn't believe that. |
| 1247 | Mr. Peters. Do you have an opinion personally about that? |
| 1248 | Mr. Pruitt. I don't know anything about the contract. I |
| 1249 | just know that the ethics officials approved that transaction. |
| 1250 | Mr. Peters. It just seems to me that if he is working for |
| 1251 | people outside the Agency with his fingers inside the Agency that |
| 1252 | that could be a lack of independence, and I will just offer that |
| 1253 | as my own observation then. |
| 1254 | You brought in Jeff Sands directly from Syngenta which was |

1255 facing a very large fine from EPA for failing to protect its 1256 workers from a dangerous pesticide, chlorpyrifos. During his 1257 brief tenure at EPA this fine was reduced from \$4.9 million to 1258 Were you personally involved in this decision to 1259 reduce this fine? 1260 Mr. Pruitt. It is my understanding that Mr. Sands' 1261 involvement at the Agency occurred after the decision in March 1262 of last year with respect to chlorpyrifos --1263 Okay. Without respect to the timing then, were Mr. Peters. 1264 you personally involved then in the decision to reduce this fine? 1265 Mr. Pruitt. I was not. 1266 And I guess, I think I would suggest it also Mr. Peters. 1267 creates at least the appearance of bias and independence. 1268 And now it has come out that your head of security, who was 1269 promoted to that role after you fired his predecessor for questioning your security spending, did outside investigative 1270 1271 work during the 2016 presidential election for America Media 1272 Incorporated, the publisher of National Enquirer. That includes 1273 the period when AMI purchased and killed a story about President 1274 Trump having an affair with a Playboy playmate. Do you think that 1275 that outside work at least creates the appearance of a lack of 1276 bias? 1277 It is my understanding that is being reviewed. Mr. Pruitt.

And I was not aware of that outside contract and it is being

| 1279 | reviewed. |
|------|---|
| 1280 | Mr. Peters. Okay. I guess again I would say you are not |
| 1281 | answering the question, I think it creates at least the appearance |
| 1282 | of bias and we would like to see attention to that. |
| 1283 | Finally, I guess, just to follow up on the first question, |
| 1284 | are you willing to produce Mr. Kelly to answer the questions before |
| 1285 | this committee? |
| 1286 | Mr. Pruitt. I am not standing in the way of Mr. Kelly |
| 1287 | providing information to this committee or any other committee |
| 1288 | and that is a decision that he can make and provide that |
| 1289 | information. |
| 1290 | Mr. Peters. In the interest of transparency would you be |
| 1291 | willing to direct him to come and answer those questions? |
| 1292 | Mr. Pruitt. I don't think I have that authority. I would |
| 1293 | encourage him to do so. |
| 1294 | Mr. Peters. If you have that authority would you be willing |
| 1295 | to exercise it? |
| 1296 | Mr. Pruitt. I would encourage him to do so. |
| 1297 | Mr. Peters. I will take that as a no. |
| 1298 | I will yield back. |
| 1299 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair |
| 1300 | now recognizes the gentlelady from Tennessee for 5 minutes, |
| 1301 | Congresswoman Blackburn. |
| 1302 | Mrs. Blackburn. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |

And Mr. Administrator, thank you for being here. We do have questions about the budget. And we are always interested in ways that we can stop federal overreach and that is something that is so important to my constituents in Tennessee and something that we hear about a good bit and they want the EPA to kind of get off their back many times when they are manufacturers and when they are farmers.

And as a matter of fact, talking with some of my farmers at Mule Day in Columbia, Tennessee, they were talking about the WOTUS rule and I want to ask you about that because they say that they have to move heaven before they can move earth and so they want to get the EPA off their farms. And they are very grateful that we have had the delay in the WOTUS rule and it is important to them, it is important to manufacturers. They feel like they can move forward and do something and they are not fighting with this rule.

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

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I will address a couple things,

Congresswoman, in response to your question. First, the decision

on repeal as well as the replacement to the 2015 rule will all occur in 2018. We will be done with that process this year. As you know and you made reference to that, the compliance dates have been extended but we actually have two other rules in the marketplace. One is to rescind the 2015 rule and then a proposal will be coming out next month with respect to the replacement that will be inspired by Justice Scalia and I believe the intent of the Clean Water Act with respect to the definition of the Water of the United States.

Mrs. Blackburn. Okay, thank you. Let's talk about fuel economy standards. We have auto manufacturers in Tennessee and in Franklin and we have Nissan, the plants over in Smyrna. We have GM, which is in my district down in Spring Hill, you have Volkswagen over in Chattanooga. One of the things they talk a lot about are the fuel economy standards and the cost per car that trying to go to these new economy standards would do, and you have talked about adjusting the standards.

So there again I want you to talk a little bit about where we are when it comes to adjusting those standards and then what you see as the cost of implementing and then the cost of compliance.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, Congresswoman, as you indicate we recently issued a midterm evaluation that occurred in April of this year and we determined that the standards that have been set

were too ambitious and didn't meet the facts and data that we currently have at present. So we started or will be starting very soon a rulemaking process along with DOT to reevaluate those standards.

I think what is important about the CAFÉ standards is we ought to endeavor as a country to set standards for lower emissions on cars that people actually want to buy, you know, and I think what has happened for a number of years is that we have created these arbitrary levels that has put a certain sector of the cars in the marketplace that no one is purchasing which means they stay in older vehicles which actually defeats the purpose of the very act.

So we are working with DOT in collaboration interagency to address that and that proposed rule will be coming out very, very soon with DOT.

Mrs. Blackburn. Okay. That sounds great. I think you are exactly right on that. And we hear that not only from manufacturers but from the dealers that the economy standards have pushed forward vehicles that people don't want to purchase many times and so they are staying in the car longer or they buy a bigger car that is heavier that they feel like is going to be a safer vehicle for them.

So I appreciate you being here today and I will yield back my 30 seconds.

Mr. Shimkus. The chairman thanks the gentlelady. The

chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Green, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to, Mr. Administrator, I want to thank the EPA for a recent announcement of an agreement was brokered between International Paper and the McGinnis Industrial Maintenance Corporation which are the responsible parties for the site cleanup at San Jacinto docks and waste pits in East Harris County in Texas. Over the past 10 years, Congressman Poe and I have shared that area, although now it is in Congressman Babin's district. Our district lines change pretty often in Texas, anytime a federal court decides it.

So we have been working on it for 10 years and I want to thank you for that. The reporting on the agreement stated that right now the remediation process is expected to take about 29 months. Do you know or can you say how certain is that timeline? Because having watched other Superfund cleanup sites, once you get into it you always find other problems. So.

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I feel very confident at the timing on that, Congressman. Region 6 there in Texas and headquarters, the partnership that existed there working with the local community is exactly how this should work. There was a temporary solution that had been put in place at San Jacinto and it threatened the health of citizens in that area and this is a permanent solution

that will be provided within the time period you described and at a cost of \$115 million.

Mr. Green. Well, and I know that is expensive. But again this area is developing and for years we have had signs up at the San Jacinto River and the Upper Galveston Bay about expectant mothers and children shouldn't eat the crabs or the fish, but when I go out there I don't see anybody that is not crabbing or fishing. So it is really important to get it completely cleaned up so it can be restored.

It is also an area where we park a lot of our barges in the Houston Ship Channel and recently those barges break loose when there is a storm or a flood and they will break that cap, that temporary cap that they have. And EPA has been really good on the job, the regional office in Dallas, to make sure they, you know, they keep that pollution at the docks and from continuing to come out.

Let me go to our --

Mr. Pruitt. If I may, Congressman, I think with the hurricanes that came through last year there was significant concern about those temporary measures being displaced which was really what hastened a solution with respect to a permanent solution.

Mr. Green. Yes. Hurricane Ike actually broke the temporary dike but that was coming from the Gulf. Our problem

last year was the flooding coming downstream that hurt that and also, like I said, barges came loose from their mooring and ran into it.

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

The law provides flexibility when it comes to small refineries, however, the press reports that EPA has been given as many as 25 waivers including some that refineries are not experiencing hardship and some may not be that small. The smallest I have in my area is a hundred thousand barrels a day. The other ones have two quarter of a million every day. There is lack of transparency in the small refinery waiver process and we understand and respect confidential business information, but the EPA is a federal government agency and secrecy is not something that I think the EPA ought to be worried about and it gives appearance of partiality and unfairness.

Do you know how many applications for waivers did the Agency

1447 receive in 2016 and '17 compliance years for these waivers? 1448 Mr. Pruitt. Well, it runs about a year behind, Congressman. 1449 The applications we got in '17 relate to the 2016 obligations and 1450 as I recall they were somewhere in the mid-20s that we received. 1451 We received more than that this year for the 2017. But what is 1452 really driving this in a lot of respects, I mentioned this earlier, 1453 is just the RIN prices, you know, dropping to 40 cents, up to 85 1454 cents, and the rest. And so you just see a lot of pressure on 1455 those small refineries particularly because of these escalating 1456 RIN prices and the instability of the market. 1457 Well, I have said it many times in this committee 1458 over the last 10 years, the chair and I have a difference from 1459 southern Illinois to East Houston on the RIN issue. Has the 1460 Agency granted any waivers to facilities that output exceeds 75,000 barrels a day? 1461 1462 Mr. Pruitt. We look at it on a facility by facility basis 1463 and the statute says that it is 75,000 barrels or less. 1464 is objectively determined in that regard. 1465 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. The chair 1466 now recognizes the gentleman from Texas again, another one, for 1467 5 minutes, Mr. Olson. 1468 I thank the chairman and Mr. Pruitt, welcome. Mr. Olson. 1469 I wish your second appearance before this committee was under much 1470 different circumstances. As you know there has been many press

reports about problems at the EPA under your watch. These problems can't be solved by Congress and this committee. That is not our role. The solution is between you and President Donald Trump. You work at his pleasure and that is pure and simple.

But today, right now, you are America's EPA Administrator and my home district of Texas 22 needs you to work hard for our district. We are still trying to recover from Hurricane Harvey. We also have a Clean Air Act that actually works with local officials, local governments, to make our air cleaner instead of pursuing goals that can be never be achieved with technology that doesn't exist.

On Harvey I have to publicly thank you for two things. First of all, your EPA helped my home county of Fort Bend break through this whole log jam of regulations to allow us to start dredging our flooded bayous, our flooded waterways, quickly, and get that stuff taken care of. You did that sir. Thank you so much for letting my home county get moving forward.

Also, I want to echo my comments from Senator Green, and by the way this may be the only bipartisan thing you hear in this committee today, but it is true. I want to thank you for all the hard work you did to fast track efforts to use the Superfund to clean up the San Jacinto Waste Pits. As you know, Hurricane Harvey displaced the protective caps. We don't know how much dioxin, cancer-causing dioxin exploded out of there. You stepped

up like that with a plan to fix that and that will be fixed sometime as you mentioned within the next year or so at the latest. So thank you, thank you, thank you for that.

My first question is about ozone and air quality. This committee has heard over and over about how the impacts of ozone and pollution some of this happens outside of our control, yet for some reason we have to regulate that. This ozone comes from as far away as China or maybe as close in Texas as forest fires in Bastrop County a couple years ago. These uncontrolled sources, which EPA calls them, can create chaos for compliance with their rules by local governments. They are just frustrated, frustrated, frustrated.

Our President recently asked you to respond faster to states' petitions for relief under exceptional events and international emissions provisions of the Clean Air Act. For 8 years those were never used before. Now you have a great weapon to help us out. How do you comply with this new request from the President? Can you give this committee progress through efforts to make sure that actually exceptional events and international emissions are complied with and taken into account with the Clean Air Act issues?

Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, thanks for the question. It is a very important question. And I think with exceptional events I think there is probably more latitude we have, but you mentioned something else that I think is extremely important and that is

the international transport, air transport of pollution and ozone. We have nonattainment areas all over this country that are being caused by what is occurring in Asia. There has been much effort, much work done by industry and states and citizens across the country to lower emissions with ozone and we have made tremendous success.

But some of the problems we have are caused by others as you have indicated, particularly in the international arena. So we need to find answers there. It may be something we need to come back to Congress and ask for your assistance to address on that particular front. Exceptional events, I think, are a little bit different. I think it is more factually driven than the other issue, but nonetheless it is a very important issue that we need to address.

Mr. Olson. One final question, very briefly. We have heard over and over about burdens placed on states from regulation after regulation after regulation. Last administration would save the same life three times with three different laws, different regulations. That puts a huge bite into some local governments and local people trying to comply with the federal laws.

Do you have the resources you need in the Office of Air and Radiation to issue guidance to make sure working with states that we count one life and make these things actually viable?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I mean as we came in to this, as I came

1543 in to this position we had 700 state implementation plans, SIPs, 1544 where states have invested money and resources to actually provide 1545 a plan on how to improve air quality and they were sitting on a 1546 We have moved on 350 of those. I mentioned that in my shelf. 1547 opening statement. But we need to focus on those priorities 1548 partnering with states and the first place to start is to work 1549 with them on those state implementation plans. 1550 The gentleman's time is expired. Mr. Shimkus. The chair 1551 recognizes the gentlelady from Colorado, Ms. DeGette, for 5 1552 minutes. 1553 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. DeGette. 1554 Administrator Pruitt, when you were in front of this 1555 committee in December we discussed the installation of a 1556 soundproof privacy booth in the Administrator's office, or the 1557 SCIF, at a cost of over \$40,000. At that time you told me that 1558 your view was that the expenditure was appropriate despite the 1559 fact there were two other SCIFs at the EPA. Is that correct? 1560 This is actually not a SCIF. Mr. Pruitt. 1561 Ms. DeGette. Okay. Well, whatever it is, the soundproof 1562 booth, you expressed your view that it was appropriate, correct? 1563 Yes or no. 1564 Mr. Pruitt. I didn't express that \$43,000 was appropriate.

my question.

1565

1566

Yes or no. Okay, you are not going to answer

Did you know at that time that this expenditure

| 1567 | violated Section 710 of the Financial Services and General |
|------|--|
| 1568 | Government Appropriations Act and the Antideficiency Act? Yes |
| 1569 | or no, sir. |
| 1570 | Mr. Pruitt. It is actually the opinion of the Office of |
| 1571 | General Counsel at the Agency that that is not the case. |
| 1572 | Ms. DeGette. So you are not going to answer that question |
| 1573 | either. Do you know whether any one of your staff knew that that |
| 1574 | expenditure violated these two laws? Yes or no, sir. |
| 1575 | Mr. Pruitt. The OGC again has indicated that their opinion |
| 1576 | is it is not a violation. |
| 1577 | Ms. DeGette. So you are not going to answer that question. |
| 1578 | If we can, please give the witness a copy of the April 16th, |
| 1579 | 2018 letter. Are you familiar with that letter from the GAO, Mr. |
| 1580 | Administrator? Yes or no. |
| 1581 | Mr. Pruitt. I am familiar with the GAO's decision, yes. |
| 1582 | Ms. DeGette. Thank you. And in that decision |
| 1583 | Mr. Shimkus. Will the gentlelady suspend for a minute? Can |
| 1584 | we see a copy of that? |
| 1585 | Ms. DeGette. Certainly. I would be happy to present what |
| 1586 | is asked unanimous consent that it be placed in the record. |
| 1587 | Mr. Shimkus. After we look at it we probably will. And |
| 1588 | while we are waiting we are going to I think we are ready to |
| 1589 | accept that other letter that you asked to be submitted. Without |
| 1590 | objection, so ordered. |

| 1591 | [The information follows:] |
|------|--|
| 1592 | |
| 1593 | *********COMMITTEE INSERT 4******* |

| 1594 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady may continue. |
|------|---|
| 1595 | Ms. DeGette. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. |
| 1596 | Now the conclusion of this was that these two laws were |
| 1597 | violated. Is that correct? |
| 1598 | Mr. Pruitt. Their conclusion is that those statutory |
| 1599 | requirements were not followed by the Agency. |
| 1600 | Ms. DeGette. Yes. Now did you know about that at the time? |
| 1601 | Mr. Pruitt. I did not. |
| 1602 | Ms. DeGette. Did your staff know about that at the time? |
| 1603 | Mr. Pruitt. About what, Congresswoman? |
| 1604 | Ms. DeGette. About these two laws that were supposed to be |
| 1605 | complied with before the expenditure happened, yes or no. |
| 1606 | Mr. Pruitt. As I indicated, the Office of General Counsel, |
| 1607 | career individuals at the Agency advised |
| 1608 | Ms. DeGette. No, I am sorry. You can't filibuster, sir. |
| 1609 | Did you know or did your staff know? |
| 1610 | Mr. Pruitt. I am not filibustering, Congresswoman. I am |
| 1611 | trying to answer your question. |
| 1612 | Ms. DeGette. Okay. Well, let me ask you this. The EPA has |
| 1613 | the ability to impose penalties for this illegal activity. Will |
| 1614 | you or your staff be subject to these penalties, yes or no? |
| 1615 | Mr. Pruitt. We are investigating this internally with |
| 1616 | appropriate individuals both here as well as the Inspector |
| 1617 | General. |
| | |

| 1618 | Ms. DeGette. Well, you don't know. All right, my next |
|------|---|
| 1619 | question, sir, is would you agree that public officials should |
| 1620 | be held to the highest standards of ethical conduct? |
| 1621 | Mr. Pruitt. I believe that, yes. |
| 1622 | Ms. DeGette. Yes. Now in that vein I want to ask you about |
| 1623 | two troubling financial housing transactions that you have been |
| 1624 | involved with as a state then a federal elected official. In |
| 1625 | 2003, you were an Oklahoma state senator with a state salary of |
| 1626 | \$38,400, correct? |
| 1627 | Mr. Pruitt. And also an attorney with a law practice. |
| 1628 | Ms. DeGette. Yes, correct? |
| 1629 | Mr. Pruitt. And also an attorney with a law practice. |
| 1630 | Ms. DeGette. Okay. Now you lived in a second home near the |
| 1631 | state capital purchased by a shell company, Capital House LLC, |
| 1632 | from a lobbyist, Marsha Lindsey, correct? |
| 1633 | Mr. Pruitt. It was not a shell company. |
| 1634 | Ms. DeGette. Okay. But it was an LLC, Capital House, |
| 1635 | correct? |
| 1636 | Mr. Pruitt. Which is normally how you buy real estate in |
| 1637 | Oklahoma. |
| 1638 | Ms. DeGette. You know, yes or no would work. |
| 1639 | Mr. Pruitt. I am seeking to answer your question, |
| 1640 | Congresswoman. |
| 1641 | Ms. DeGette. Okay. Now what was your financial investment |
| | |

| 1642 | in Capital House, LLC? |
|------|---|
| 1643 | Mr. Pruitt. It was one-sixth of the purchase price as I |
| 1644 | recall. |
| 1645 | Ms. DeGette. And so what, do you remember the amount? |
| 1646 | Mr. Pruitt. I do not. I did not negotiate the purchase |
| 1647 | price. |
| 1648 | Ms. DeGette. So you actually put that amount into the LLC. |
| 1649 | Is that right? |
| 1650 | Mr. Pruitt. That was the portion that I was responsible for, |
| 1651 | yes. |
| 1652 | Ms. DeGette. And did you actually pay that amount into the |
| 1653 | LLC? |
| 1654 | Mr. Pruitt. I did. I did. |
| 1655 | Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Now it has been reported that |
| 1656 | another lawmaker rented a room in that home and paid rent to you |
| 1657 | although you never listed your share in the shell company or that |
| 1658 | rent on your financial disclosures; is that correct? |
| 1659 | Mr. Pruitt. I don't ever recall that. No. |
| 1660 | Ms. DeGette. Okay. Was that rental income distributed |
| 1661 | among the owners of the shell company in the proportion that you |
| 1662 | contributed to the company? |
| 1663 | Mr. Pruitt. Kls were issued to each of the individual |
| 1664 | members. Those were reported as income through our tax filings |
| 1665 | and so all income was reported. |
| | |

| 1666 | Ms. DeGette. Did you pay taxes on that income? |
|------|---|
| 1667 | Mr. Pruitt. We did. |
| 1668 | Ms. DeGette. Can we get that information, sir? |
| 1669 | Mr. Pruitt. I can provide you K1 |
| 1670 | Ms. DeGette. Did you personally pay taxes on your income |
| 1671 | from that rental? |
| 1672 | Mr. Pruitt. I can provide you the K1. |
| 1673 | Ms. DeGette. That would be great. Did you pay taxes on that |
| 1674 | income? |
| 1675 | Mr. Pruitt. As I indicated, I received a K1 |
| 1676 | Ms. DeGette. I know you received a K1. Did you pay taxes |
| 1677 | on that income? |
| 1678 | Mr. Pruitt. That was provided to my accountant in our |
| 1679 | filing. |
| 1680 | Ms. DeGette. So you are not going to answer that question |
| 1681 | either. |
| 1682 | Mr. Pruitt. I am answering the question, Congresswoman. |
| 1683 | Ms. DeGette. Yes, okay. Did you pay taxes on the income |
| 1684 | that you got for your share? |
| 1685 | Mr. Pruitt. Congresswoman, as you know, you provide |
| 1686 | information to your accountant, they determine what you pay. |
| 1687 | Ms. DeGette. So you are not going to answer that question. |
| 1688 | Now I have some other questions about your D.C. condo but I am |
| 1689 | out of time. And I just want to say to my colleagues on the other |
| | i l |

| 1690 | side of the aisle and also to you, I am not doing this to hassle |
|------|--|
| 1691 | you. I am doing this because as elected officials and appointed |
| 1692 | officials we have the public trust. Everything we do has to be |
| 1693 | to the highest ethical standard as you just agreed with me. And |
| 1694 | when we have these transactions it brings disrespect on us as |
| 1695 | public officials |
| 1696 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time |
| 1697 | Ms. DeGette and as the job we do. |
| 1698 | Mr. Shimkus has expired. |
| 1699 | Ms. DeGette. So I am just going to continue this and I would |
| 1700 | hope you would be forthcoming with this committee. Thank you. |
| 1701 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired. Your |
| 1702 | unanimous consent request will be respected and we will put your |
| 1703 | letter, the GAO letter, into the record. |
| 1704 | [The information follows:] |
| 1705 | |
| 1706 | ************************************** |

Mr. Shimkus. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Johnson, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman, you know, I served for 26-1/2 years in the United States Air Force, and I do believe that public officials have a standard of conduct that should be beyond reproach, but so should Members of Congress. And, you know, I think it is shameful today that this hearing has turned into a personal attack hearing and a shameful attempt to denigrate the work that is being done at the EPA and with this administration and make this a personal attack rather than focus on what we are here to talk about which is the budget and the functioning and the policy work being done at the EPA.

So I am going to redirect my questioning to you, Mr. Pruitt. Under the provision, under the previous administration the EPA put severe squeezes on job opportunities and businesses in Eastern and Southeastern Ohio which, by the way, we didn't make personal attacks when that happened, we talked about policy at the time. And this has had, you know, our district has an abundance of fossil energy resources and energy opportunities.

Today we have an EPA that recognizes the importance of those jobs and is willing to work with the states like Ohio to provide a healthy balance between jobs and environmental regulations. That approach has made a real difference in my state and in my district and I applaud those efforts at restoring sensibility.

Along those lines I would like to talk a bit about New Source Review and the Agency's work to date on some of the issues surrounding New Source Review.

In February, this committee held a hearing exploring the challenges that New Source Review standards pose for our energy and infrastructure investments and opportunities. We learned that many companies avoid carrying out projects to improve existing facilities because they are afraid of being targeted by an EPA enforcement action for having incorrectly interpreted New Source Review requirements. I have been encouraged to see the EPA's recently released guidance memos clarifying certain NSR program requirements and policy.

So, Mr. Pruitt, from your perspective what is the goal of these NSR guidance memos and what impact are they having?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, it is one of the greatest issues that I think we are dealing with at the Agency to address that which companies want to do across the country which is invest, invest in capital infrastructure to improve the reduction of emissions. And so what we want to do is provide clarity. You mentioned a couple of memo guidances we provided. One is a once in, always in approach that we took to this issue along with the project netting approach that was a second step.

So we are engaged in those kinds of initial steps, but overall we are looking at a comprehensive rule that will address New Source

Review in order to provide certainty and clarity to those across the country that as they make investments to improve outcomes as far as emission reductions that they are not going to face new permitting requirements under the Clean Air Act.

Mr. Johnson. Yes. Do you think the NSR program can be further reformed so that we continue to protect air quality while removing unnecessary burdens placed on industry?

Mr. Pruitt. I mean I do. I think, you know, the Clean Air Act was last amended in 1990, 28 years ago, and so I think there are provisions of the Clean Air Act that should be looked at and that is one.

Mr. Johnson. In regards to the Clean Air Act, how is the EPA striving to provide more flexibility and deference to state agencies?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, as mentioned earlier, we are providing guidance in certain and many programs encouraging states to be active partners there. But one of the things that I think is most essential with respect to air quality is just the utilization of state improvement plans and us being responsive, responding to those Departments of Environmental Quality, Departments of Natural Resources, whatever the agency may be, to really work with them in close partnership to adopt those plans and approve those plans in a timely way. It really sends a bad message when states take those steps, invest, and then don't get a response from the

1779 agency for years and air quality suffers as well. 1780 Mr. Johnson. Well, I have some other questions, but I am 1781 running out of time. 1782 Lastly, I know that EPA has expressed interest in finding 1783 a resolution to some of the concerns regarding EPA's current brick 1784 MACT rule which was issued in 2015. Would you commit to working 1785 with me and this committee in providing further information on 1786 this work and any potential possibilities? Compliance dates are 1787 right around the corner and it is important to provide this 1788 industry with some common-sense regulatory certainty. 1789 Mr. Pruitt. Yes, Congressman, absolutely. 1790 Mr. Johnson. Okay, thank you. 1791 And Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1792 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. 1793 now recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. McNerney, for 1794 5 minutes. 1795 I thank the chairman. Mr. McNerney. 1796 Administrator Pruitt, since becoming EPA Administrator your 1797 public calendar is filled with meetings with oil and gas 1798 companies, trade associations and lobbyists, but not with 1799 environmental groups or public health groups. It seems that deep 1800 pockets are a prerequisite to getting a spot on your calendar. 1801 Mr. Pruitt, isn't it true that you and your affiliated political 1802 organizations received nearly \$4 million in campaign

1803 contributions from fossil fuel interests? 1804 Mr. Pruitt. Congressman, I haven't looked at those numbers 1805 in some time, so I am not sure. 1806 Mr. McNerney. Well, I can assure you that it is. 1807 an example of pay-to-play, on June 5th, 2017, you announced that 1808 the EPA halted implementation of the methane rule. This was an 1809 attempt to retroactively delay the rule's requirements on oil and 1810 gas industry for 90 days. A few weeks prior to that on May 24th, 1811 2017, you spoke to the American Exploration and Production 1812 Council. 1813 Mr. Pruitt, was your June 5th actions made in response to 1814 a request by the American Exploration and Production Council or 1815 any of its individual members? 1816 Methane is something that we take very 1817 seriously and will regulate. In fact, we have proposals that we 1818 are considering now to regulate methane going forward as part of 1819 the VOC approach. And so methane is --1820 Mr. McNerney. So you aren't answering my question. You had 1821 a meeting --1822 Mr. Pruitt. The actions that were taken then were unrelated 1823 to any meetings or events. It was actions to provide certainty 1824 to those in the marketplace with respect to how we were going to 1825 approach methane. Mr. McNerney. Okay. Well, I ask this because Concho 1826

1827 Resources, an oil and gas exploration and production company is 1828 a member of the American Exploration and Production Council. 1829 Concho Resources also happens to be represented by the Washington, 1830 D.C. lobbying firm Williams & Jensen. You made these decisions on the methane rule that would directly benefit Williams & 1831 1832 Jensen's client while living in a Capitol Hill condo owned by the 1833 wife of a then Williams & Jensen lobbyist with a rent of \$50 a 1834 night. 1835 I wonder what the owners got or tried to get in return for 1836 their generosity. This is another example of pay-to-play. 1837 Arbitrarily delaying a rule is illegal and the DC Circuit Court 1838 found your actions to be in excess of statutory authority. 1839 Mr. Chairman, I have a statement from the American 1840 Association for the Advancement of Science on the EPA 1841 Administrator's plan to disallow the use of scientific evidence 1842 in decision-making, and I would like to submit this for the record. 1843 Mr. Shimkus. If the gentleman would pass it over to the 1844 chair so I can look at it. 1845 Mr. McNerney. Mr. Administrator, do you have confidence in 1846 the AAAS and the Union of Concerned Scientists in deciding what 1847 would be best practices for transparency and good science? 1848 Mr. Pruitt. I am sure their opinion is credible. 1849 Mr. McNernev. Thank you. Then how can you justify the 1850 proposed rule disallowing science that was supported by these

1851 agencies? 1852 Mr. Pruitt. Well, the actions that we take at the Agency 1853 are different than their responsibilities. We actually issue 1854 rules of general applicability that apply to people all over the 1855 country and we need to ensure that the science that we use that 1856 underpins those rules actually show methodology, data, and 1857 conclusions. 1858 Mr. McNerney. Science which disagrees with professional 1859 scientists that are practicing professional scientists. 1860 Mr. Pruitt, by reducing the CAFÉ standards you will both 1861 allow more pollution on American streets and make U.S. cars less 1862 competitive with overseas manufacturers. Yes or no, did the \$4 million that you received from the oil and gas industry influence 1863 1864 your decision? 1865 Mr. Pruitt. The decision we made on midterm evaluation was 1866 a decision based upon the record. 1867 Administrator Pruitt, I find it very Mr. McNerney. 1868 disturbing that you appear to personally benefit from many of your 1869 decisions and actions that will ultimately harm the people of this 1870 country, especially people who have little or no ability to defend 1871 themselves. 1872 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 1873 The gentleman yields back his time. The chair Mr. Shimkus. 1874 recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Flores -- we got a lot

of Texans here -- for 5 minutes.

Mr. Flores. That is right.

Administrator Pruitt, thank you for joining us today. Let me start by echoing Chairman Shimkus' comments regarding the Renewable Fuel Standard. While I am pleased that the Agency is beginning to look at its authorities after 2022, I would like to respectfully remind the EPA that administrative actions prior to that time are limited by statute. Accordingly, I request that the Agency work with Congress, particularly Chairman Shimkus, Mr. Welch, and me as we try to develop interim and long-term solutions, fuel solutions that are good for the environment and good for auto mileage, good for the American consumers, good for the agricultural and ethanol interest, and really good for all impacted stakeholders.

A few minutes ago, Mr. Ruiz was trying to defend the EPA's practice under the prior administration of using hidden science to develop policy solutions and you weren't given a chance in regard to your efforts to open that process up and become more transparent with scientific studies. Can you spend about 30 seconds describing what you are trying to do to make science inside the EPA more transparent, especially because it is paid for by the American taxpayer?

Mr. Pruitt. It seems to me that it is common sense that as we do rulemaking at the Agency, when we base it upon a record,

scientific conclusions that we should be able to see the data and methodology that actually caused those conclusions. That just makes common sense to me. That is the only change we are making. So any third-party study, and third-party study we are agnostic about who actually adopts the study, we are just simply saying to all third-party science they need to have methodology, data, and findings packaged together so that we can make an informed decision about the efficacy of their scientific findings.

Mr. Flores. Okay. So I think you and I both agree that the American people deserve to see that science. It shouldn't be hidden as it was hidden in the prior administration. So I thank you for your efforts to make that science more transparent.

Now to my questions, as the American people are well aware the EPA under the Obama administration abused environmental regulatory process by ignoring congressional statutes and by circumventing the U.S. Constitution. Fortunately, the federal court system stepped in to protect American families from this abuse of the rule of law. In this regard I have the following questions, one, I will go through the questions first and you all can respond supplementally if you would like to.

Can you provide this committee with a list of those overreaching and overturned regulations that were overturned by the court systems? Can you provide this committee with the economic cost of those overturned regulations, and can you also

inform the committee about EPA's actions, if any, to modify those regulations so those overreaching regulations to conform with the rule of law?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes, on all fronts.

Mr. Flores. Okay. And I would ask you to do that supplementally in the interest of time.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Michigan, Mrs. Dingell, for 5 minutes.

Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

At the time, you didn't seem aware of the details and that happens when things are, you have a lot of stuff, but I am hoping now that you have had more time to familiarize yourself and I would like to ask you some questions. It is not clear whether EPA has any idea how many sources might increase their emissions of hazardous air pollutants as a result of this policy change and I would like to ask you some yes or no questions.

Yes or no, did EPA determine which sources and how many would be covered by this policy change before releasing the January 25th guidance?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. There was a review of those issues, Congresswoman.

Mrs. Dingell. Yes or no, thank you.

Mr. Pruitt. And I would say to you that this was an incentive to companies to actually invest in emissions.

| 1971 | Mrs. Dingell. Okay, did you, yes or no, did EPA determine |
|------|---|
| 1972 | the location of these sources? |
| 1973 | Mr. Pruitt. That is something that I would have to I don't |
| 1974 | know about the locations. |
| 1975 | Mrs. Dingell. Please, for the record yes or no, did EPA |
| 1976 | provide that. Yes or no, did EPA assess the magnitude of |
| 1977 | hazardous air pollution that could increase as a result of the |
| 1978 | January 25th guidance? |
| 1979 | Mr. Pruitt. It is actually a benefit with respect to |
| 1980 | providing incentive as I indicated to those major emitters to get |
| 1981 | into another category. |
| 1982 | Mrs. Dingell. Yes or no. So |
| 1983 | Mr. Pruitt. I understand that they looked at that, yes. |
| 1984 | Mrs. Dingell. Has EPA initiated or completed any of the |
| 1985 | previously mentioned analyses since the release of January 25th |
| 1986 | guidance? |
| 1987 | Mr. Pruitt. The work that was done was in support of the |
| 1988 | guidance that was issued. |
| 1989 | Mrs. Dingell. It is also not clear whether EPA has looked |
| 1990 | at the potential health effects of this decision. Yes or no, did |
| 1991 | EPA conduct an analysis of the health effects including the |
| 1992 | potential increased risk of cancer of this decision before |
| 1993 | releasing the January 25th guidance memo? |
| 1994 | Mr. Pruitt. That is something we will have to provide and |
| | |

1996 Mrs. Dingell. Yes or no, did EPA conduct an analysis of the 1997 potential health effects of this policy on children, babies, or 1998 pregnant women before releasing the January 25th? 1999 That is something we will have to assess and 2000 provide. 2001 Mrs. Dingell. Yes or no, did EPA conduct an analysis of the 2002 potential health effects of this policy on older Americans for 2003 those with chronic health problems before releasing the January 2004 25th quidance? 2005 Mr. Pruitt. I hate to be redundant, but that is something 2006 we will have to assess and provide. 2007 Mrs. Dingell. Yes or no, did EPA conduct an analysis of the potential health effects of this policy on minority and low-income 2008 2009 communities before releasing the January 25th? 2010 Mr. Pruitt. I would answer the same way. 2011 Mrs. Dingell. In the absence of information from EPA, a 2012 number of independent groups have taken it upon themselves to 2013 analyze the potential toxic impacts this policy would have on 2014 communities near and downwind from major sources. 2015 that the chemical industry stands to benefit substantially from 2016 this loophole. Have you met with any industry representatives 2017 who requested the repeal of this once in, always in policy? 2018 Again this was a decision to provide incentive Mr. Pruitt.

1995

verify.

2019 to companies to invest to lower emissions. 2020 There is no incentives for pollution. Mrs. Dingell. 2021 going to conclude with one different subject because this is very 2022 You recently concluded the midterm evaluation important to me. 2023 of fuel economy standards for model years 2022 to '25. 2024 deep belief that the auto companies, their workers, and the 2025 consumer have benefited from having one national program for fuel 2026 economy and that it is critical to preserve that moving forward. 2027 The importance of these standards besides saving energy, reducing 2028 emissions, is the certainty that businesses need. I am deeply 2029 worried about reports that California doesn't matter to you. 2030 The gentlelady's time is expiring. Mr. Shimkus. 2031 Mrs. Dingell. All right. I just want to say it is my hope 2032 that we can have one national program moving forward. 2033 we work on it together, everybody wins. 2034 Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time is expired. 2035 We are going to accept for submission into the record the 2036 statement from the American Association for Advancement of 2037 Sciences. [The information follows:] 2038 2039

Mr. Shimkus. Just for our colleagues' note, the chief executive officer is a guy named Rush Holt who you will all remember.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Hudson, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Hudson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Pruitt, for being here today. I have two areas of questions I want to jump into with you. The first relates to the chemical GenX and the Cape Fear River back home in North Carolina. In your testimony you highlighted the importance of safe drinking water and the EPA's efforts to proactively protect source water as well as address contamination concerns. As I am sure you are aware, my state of North Carolina is facing growing concerns over the emerging contaminant GenX. I have been engaged with you on this issue several times in the past.

My concern is that we have a chemical that is spreading that we simply do not know enough about. I am worried that on the EPA's website you state that a management plan for PFOS, the related family of chemicals, won't be developed until the fall of 2018.

2 days ago I received a letter from the Office of Water addressing some but not all of our questions that I have asked about GenX.

I understand the EPA has posted comprehensive scientific literature related to GenX on its website, but EPA is also developing human health toxicity information on GenX to aid states

2064 and localities in setting or refining public health goals. 2065 I would just ask, sir, what information is EPA seeking that 2066 the literature has, does not already provide, and when will the 2067 results of the EPA's information development be available to the 2068 public? 2069 Mr. Pruitt. Yes, a very important issue and I have talked 2070 to the Governor there in North Carolina and it is something that 2071 I am aware of the issues in North Carolina. We will have a 2072 toxicity review by the summer. 2073 By the summer. Mr. Hudson. 2074 With respect to GenX. And as you know this is Mr. Pruitt. 2075 an iteration beyond PFOA and PFOS. GenX was a successive, you 2076 know, chemical. I am very concerned about its impact and we are 2077 accelerating that tox review and then we will look at further steps 2078 in the fall. But we have been in communications with North 2079 Carolina and the Governor particularly about that. 2080 Well, I appreciate the attention you Great. 2081 What were the updates to EPA's risk management of put on this. 2082 GenX based upon independent laboratory analysis of compounds 2083 found in the Cape Fear River water samples and what about those 2084 findings can you discuss now? 2085 With respect to the toxicity review or other Mr. Pruitt. 2086 studies, Congressman? 2087 Mr. Hudson. Well, there were independent laboratory

analyses of the compounds that was done.

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. That is part of the work that is being done to support the tox review that will occur this summer and then there will be additional standards set in the future. But what we are trying to do is work with those states like North Carolina that have an imminent concern and trying to provide them guidance as they adopt state responses as well.

Mr. Hudson. Okay. Well, then I don't know if you are able to make a conclusion yet, but was GenX used in a manner that was incompatible with the consent agreement under the Toxic Substances Control Act or are you in a position to determine that?

Mr. Pruitt. That is something I am not able to speak to at this point, but we can get you the information, Congressman.

Mr. Hudson. Great. Well, I appreciate the seriousness with which you have taken this and the work you are doing with our governor and also on this. So thank you for that.

Mr. Pruitt. Governor Cooper has been very, very concerned about it and very focused upon it and it is important that we address it with him and the state.

Mr. Hudson. Great, thank you. I would like to pivot now and discuss another area that you have highlighted as a priority for the Agency which is clean air. In the 47 years since the enactment of the Clean Air Act, the EPA has never taken an enforcement action against amateur racers who make modifications

| 2112 | to vehicles used exclusively on tracks for racing. Do you support |
|------|--|
| 2113 | this policy? |
| 2114 | Mr. Pruitt. The policy of taking no enforcement? |
| 2115 | Mr. Hudson. Yes, sir. |
| 2116 | Mr. Pruitt. I think it is wise, yes. |
| 2117 | Mr. Hudson. I appreciate that. In 2015 under the previous |
| 2118 | administration, the EPA slipped a few sentences into a 600-page |
| 2119 | unrelated rule that proposed to repeal this policy. And after |
| 2120 | a public outcry and a number of us raised concerns they backed |
| 2121 | off, but they sort of left some ambiguity there about the legality |
| 2122 | of this. Would you support legislation clarifying that vehicles |
| 2123 | can be modified for racing and that doing so does not violate the |
| 2124 | anti-tampering provisions in the Clean Air Act as long as those |
| 2125 | vehicles are not used on public roads or used exclusively for |
| 2126 | competition? |
| 2127 | Mr. Pruitt. It is always helpful to us to get congressional |
| 2128 | clarity on these issues, so absolutely. |
| 2129 | Mr. Hudson. Great. Well, I appreciate that. I appreciate |
| 2130 | the time you have given us here today and thank you for your focus |
| 2131 | on clean air and clean water, goals we all share. |
| 2132 | Mr. Pruitt. Thank you. |
| 2133 | Mr. Hudson. Thank you. |
| 2134 | With that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back. |
| 2135 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair |
| | |

now recognizes the gentlelady from California, Ms. Matsui, for 5 minutes.

Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Administrator Pruitt, it is widely reported at this point that most of your patrons and supporters are from the oil, gas, and coal industries. The regulations you have withdrawn, delayed, or weakened, rules on coal ash disposal, water pollution from coal-fired utilities, methane gas emissions from oil and gas operations, air pollution from glider trucks, formaldehyde emission standards, all translate into additional profits for those industries but negatively impact public health.

So it doesn't come much as a surprise that you have determined in the midterm evaluation that the stronger vehicle fuel efficiency standards are too stringent. I strongly disagree with this determination. There is a very robust record to support the need for stronger standards and the availability of technology to achieve them highlighted by the 1,200-page Technical Assessment Report issued by the EPA. Administrator Pruitt, you have stated many times that you intended to operate at the EPA on the basis of cooperative federalism and the rule of law. But when it comes to California and vehicle emission standards all of a sudden neither of these concepts seem to apply. You have made it clear that you do not favor California's waiver under which the state sets greenhouse gas emission standards for vehicles and

2160 you have stated that California should not have, quote, an 2161 outsized influence on vehicle standards. But this position is 2162 inconsistent with your preference for states' rights, and more 2163 importantly it is inconsistent with the law. 2164 California's special status with respect to vehicle emission 2165 regulation has been enshrined in federal law for over 50 years. 2166 Section 209(b) of the Clean Air Act states the Administrator 2167 shall, not may, shall grant a waiver to any state if the state, 2168 not the Agency, determines the state standards will be at least 2169 as protective of public health and welfare as the federal 2170 standards. 2171 The auto manufacturers have repeatedly said that they do not 2172 want the protracted legal fight that would inevitably occur if 2173 EPA moved to revoke California's waiver. But many of your public 2174 statements allude to the Agency moving in that direction. So I 2175 would ask you, does the Agency intend to initiate proceedings to 2176 revoke California's waiver, yes or no? 2177 Mr. Pruitt. Not at present. In fact, we work very closely 2178 with California officials on that issue. I have sent EPA 2179 representatives to California --2180 Ms. Matsui. So that is a no? 2181 -- to meet with CARB and Ms. Nichols. Mr. Pruitt. It is 2182 important that we work together to achieve, as was indicated 2183 earlier, a national standard.

2184 Ms. Matsui. Okay. So it is really not a yes or no. It is 2185 a --2186 Mr. Pruitt. Congresswoman, we are working very diligently 2187 and diplomatically with California --2188 Ms. Matsui. All right, okay. Okay. 2189 Mr. Pruitt. -- to find answers on this issue. 2190 Okay. Well, I believe the answer Ms. Matsui. Okay. 2191 should be a no because you said you have said you want a national 2192 program and you won't get this without California's agreement. 2193 The law requires you to set standards that protect public health 2194 California standards' does just that. 2195 agreed to a national program to enter into an agreement to 2196 accomplish that goal. If you challenge the waiver or 2197 significantly weaken the standards you are not following the rule 2198 of law. 2199 If you are, in fact, doing what you were appointed to do, 2200 what you said you were going to do, you must uphold the law and 2201 set protective standards. So far you have demonstrated little 2202 intention to do that. That is why the entire country needs 2203 California waiver to ensure that public health and the environment 2204 are protected even in the face of an Administrator who cares maybe 2205 more about repaying special interests than about safeguarding the 2206 public's interests. 2207 Now, Administrator Pruitt, I believe, to a question that you

| 2208 | answered from Mrs. Blackburn earlier, you said the EPA has data |
|------|---|
| 2209 | supporting your decision to revise emission standards for light |
| 2210 | duty vehicles. Will you commit to providing that data to both |
| 2211 | sides of the committee by the end of the day? And that is a yes |
| 2212 | or no. |
| 2213 | Mr. Pruitt. We actually have two responsibilities under |
| 2214 | this process. One is a midterm evaluation and then proposed |
| 2215 | rulemaking that will occur. And so we will provide the data to |
| 2216 | you that gave rise to the midterm evaluation. |
| 2217 | Ms. Matsui. Will you provide it at the end of the day, the |
| 2218 | day that you have |
| 2219 | Mr. Pruitt. I will instruct our team to get that together |
| 2220 | and get that to you as soon as possible. |
| 2221 | Ms. Matsui. End of the day, yes. |
| 2222 | Mr. Pruitt. I will instruct my team to get that and get that |
| 2223 | to you as soon as possible. |
| 2224 | Ms. Matsui. As soon as possible, hopefully within a week |
| 2225 | then? |
| 2226 | Mr. Pruitt. Well, we will get it to you as soon as possible, |
| 2227 | Congresswoman. |
| 2228 | Ms. Matsui. Okay. I will hold you to that, okay. |
| 2229 | Mr. Pruitt. It is my intent to do so, yes. |
| 2230 | Ms. Matsui. I will hold you to that. Okay, thank you, and |
| 2231 | I yield back. |
| | |

2232 Mr. Pruitt. Thank you.

Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady yields back her time. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. Cramer, for 5 minutes.

Mr. Cramer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Mr. Administrator, for lots of things, first of all, for being here.

And once again I never cease to be impressed with the incredible depth of knowledge you have on the details of so many things. It seems to me, however, the more details you know, the more some people demand and they expect you to know everything. And I have to say in my years both on this committee and on previous committees I have never had a Cabinet official that knew as much about the policies that your Agency is implementing as you have with yours. So thank you for that.

I also want to thank you for your incredible, not just an understanding of, but commitment to, cooperative federalism. It is something that has been lost in previous administrations, including by some of your critics that were predecessors to you, and the restoration of it is no small matter. And I want you to know on behalf of the people of North Dakota how very much we appreciate your approval of our state's application for primacy over class IV wells, which is our CO2 wells, so I think it was a clear demonstration of the policy.

I am also, I have to say I am somewhat struck by some of the

2256 accusations that have come at you today. For example, you were 2257 accused of picking winners and losers with your policies. 2258 I just have to ask, isn't the Clean Power Plan at its very core 2259 the picking of winners and losers by trying to regulate electric 2260 generation outside of the fence line? I mean isn't that a picking 2261 of winners and losers? 2262 Well, I mean the Agency, in response to that, 2263 Congressman, actually defined a best system of emission reduction 2264 under the statute as being able to coerce decisions being made 2265 at the local level on how you generate electricity. So I think 2266 by definition that was almost picking winners and losers. 2267 Mr. Cramer. You have also been accused of hypocrisy. 2268 have been accused of the lack of transparency by people who in 2269 the same breath are defending secret science as a means of carrying 2270 out their political philosophy, all the while accusing you of 2271 being the ideologue in the room. The irony is rich beyond rich 2272 with me. 2273 And I think what, if I may for a second. Mr. Pruitt. 2274 Mr. Cramer. Please. 2275 I think what is important with respect to the 2276 scientific transparency it doesn't apply to only certain studies. 2277 It applies to all third-party studies of every type. I mean many

members on this committee, I am sure, would be very concerned that

if API went out and did a study, didn't provide the methodology,

2278

2280 didn't provide the data, provided conclusions to the EPA and then 2281 the EPA acted on rulemaking with respect to methane or other 2282 issues, there would be tremendous concerns about that. 2283 So it applies to all third-party science irrespective of the 2284 It just simply says data, methodology, conclusions 2285 matter and the American people need to be able to consume that. 2286 Well, it seems to me and I appreciated the Mr. Cramer. 2287 inquiry earlier and maybe you could elaborate a little bit on how 2288 personal data can be protected and is protected. Nobody is asking 2289 for the names of every victim of every, you know, of every 2290 pollution source that has ever happened in the world or that has 2291 been sourced in any study. They are not asking for personal data, 2292 we are asking simply for the science to be revealed. I mean you can protect the personal data, right? 2293 2294 Mr. Pruitt. Both the personal data, Congressman, as well 2295 as confidential business information, both CBI and personal 2296 information can be redacted and can be addressed and still serve 2297 the purposes of the proposed rule. 2298 I have to say I think though of all of the Mr. Cramer. 2299 accusations today, it was interesting after about 4 minutes of 2300 defending the swamp one of their leaders said so much for draining 2301 the swamp. 2302 Mr. Administrator, I think the greatest sin that you have

committed, if any, is that you have actually done what President

Trump ran on, what he won on, and what he has commissioned you to do in finding some balance in both carrying out the mission of environmental protection while at the same time looking out for the economy and jobs creation. And I just again for the people in North Dakota I appreciate that so much.

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

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

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

2328 you are a major emitter and you invest and you actually reduce 2329 your pollution down to minor levels you can actually be rewarded 2330 for that and actually, I think, incentivized to do that. 2331 The gentleman's time has expired. Mr. Shimkus. The chair 2332 recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. Cardenas, for 5 2333 minutes. 2334 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for Mr. Cardenas.

Mr. Cardenas. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for calling this hearing and also I marked your words that you said that today hopefully we are going to be talking about policy and stewardship. So I hope that we can get that on the record as well on both of those fronts.

Mr. Pruitt, welcome to the people's House. The list of your failures is long and your wasteful spending is an embarrassment to government and very offensive to the taxpayers who pay all of our salaries. This administration is so packed with unethical behavior, but yet at the same time you have to understand that your power directly impacts health and well-being of vulnerable populations in this country -- seniors, our sick, and our disabled.

It is tempting to ask why you spent nearly 68,000 on hotels and travel from August through February, just in 5 months, and 50,000 on modifications to your office including a privacy booth that cost over \$43,000, and an oversized desk with ornate woodworking that cost over \$2,000, but we already know that some

2335

2336

2337

2338

2339

2340

2341

2342

2343

2344

2345

2346

2347

2348

2349

2350

2352 of these purchases were made in violation of federal laws. 2353 When you appeared before the subcommittee in December, this 2354 subcommittee, you said that your phone booth is used for 2355 classified conversations and sensitive conversations with the 2356 Has this \$43,000 phone booth, has it been certified White House. 2357 as a SCIF, and also so are you using it for classified 2358 conversations, is that appropriate? 2359 Mr. Pruitt. It has not been certified as a SCIF and it does 2360 provide protection on confidential communications. And I think 2361 it is important, Congressman, to know where this originated. 2362 did have a phone call that came in of a sensitive nature and I 2363 did not have access to secure communications. I gave direction 2364 to my staff to address that and out of that came a \$43,000 2365 expenditure that I did not approve. That is something that should 2366 not occur in the future. 2367 Mr. Cardenas. Okay, so you are not taking responsibility 2368 for the \$43,000 that was spent in your office, you are saying that 2369 staff did it without your knowledge? 2370 Mr. Pruitt. Career individuals at the Agency took that 2371 process through and signed off on it all the way through. 2372 Mr. Cardenas. Okay. So you were not involved in that is 2373 what you are saying? 2374 I was not in involved in the approval of the 2375 \$43,000 and if I had known about it, Congressman, I would have

2376 | refused it.

Mr. Cardenas. Okay. That seems a bit odd. If something happens in my office, especially to the degree of \$43,000, I know about it before, during, and after. But anyway let me get on to my next points. I am sure you can see the irony of this \$43,000 expenditure even though you are saying before the public that you are not taking responsibility for it.

EPA's budget is far from unlimited. When you commandeer public resources for your personal use other lifesaving agency activities do suffer. In another troubling example, Millan Hupp, an EPA appointee who came with you from Oklahoma and was recently awarded with a large raise over the White House's objections, reportedly went out to open houses in search for a condo for you. Mr. Pruitt, I hope you understand that using public employees for your private business is illegal. Turning now to your highly questionable condo lease from Vicki Hart, I find it highly concerning that you apparently never had an EPA ethics attorney review the lease before you signed it. Did you have an EPA ethics attorney look at that lease before you signed it?

Mr. Pruitt. On the other issue, Congressman, I want to address that I am not aware of any government time being used by Millan Hupp. She is a friend of both my wife and myself and has been for a number of years and she is a friend. And the activities

2399 || -

| 2400 | Mr. Cardenas. Okay. You stated for the record that you are |
|------|---|
| 2401 | not aware that she used her official time. Thank you very much. |
| 2402 | But did any of the attorneys at the EPA look at your lease before |
| 2403 | you signed it? |
| 2404 | Mr. Pruitt. The review that took place took place |
| 2405 | afterwards. |
| 2406 | Mr. Cardenas. Afterwards, okay. And what did they say |
| 2407 | about that lease afterwards when they reviewed it? |
| 2408 | Mr. Pruitt. They said that the rate paid was comparable to |
| 2409 | other, what I leased actually was comparable to other |
| 2410 | arrangements. |
| 2411 | Mr. Cardenas. Did they state that in writing or verbally? |
| 2412 | Mr. Pruitt. Actually in writing, in writing twice. |
| 2413 | Mr. Cardenas. In writing, okay, can you get a copy of that |
| 2414 | to the committee? |
| 2415 | Mr. Pruitt. I can get the ethics opinions to you, yes. |
| 2416 | Mr. Cardenas. Okay, thank you. It was also recently |
| 2417 | reported that as Attorney General of Oklahoma you reassigned an |
| 2418 | investigative staff of the office to be your personal driver and |
| 2419 | security team. Are those reports accurate? |
| 2420 | Mr. Pruitt. I am not aware of what you are referring to, |
| 2421 | Congressman. |
| 2422 | Mr. Cardenas. Okay. All right, to my next question, in an |
| 2423 | apparent attempt to rebut reports, your Agency published data in |

| 2424 | February claiming a large increase in penalties against |
|------|--|
| 2425 | polluters, but that data included the penalties assessed by the |
| 2426 | Obama administration. In fact, 90 percent of those numbers that |
| 2427 | you reported were actually assessed by the previous |
| 2428 | administration. Did you intentionally claim credit for the |
| 2429 | enforcement actions taken by the Obama administration to obscure |
| 2430 | your weak record on enforcement, yes or no? |
| 2431 | Mr. Pruitt. In fact, the Obama administration cut into |
| 2432 | agents at that office. We have increased the number of agents |
| 2433 | in that office. |
| 2434 | Mr. Cardenas. Thank you. On my time |
| 2435 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. |
| 2436 | Mr. Cardenas. I just want to show you a picture of the |
| 2437 | Mr. Shimkus. The chair recognizes the gentleman from |
| 2438 | Michigan. The gentleman |
| 2439 | Mr. Cardenas that I grew up in and that is the new |
| 2440 | picture here. |
| 2441 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman will suspend. His time is |
| 2442 | expired. The chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan |
| 2443 | for 5 minutes. |
| 2444 | Mr. Walberg. I thank the chairman. |
| 2445 | Mr. Cardenas. I yield. |
| 2446 | Mr. Walberg. And I would thank the Administrator for being |
| 2447 | here. I appreciate you taking the time to do |
| | |

this. It is important for us as we work in our relationship, the constitutional relationship that we have time with you. So thank you for being here and thank you for your policy efforts as you perform your functions.

Administrator Pruitt, the last time you were before this committee you told me then, I quote, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative is something that we should work together to make sure is achieving good outcomes and I think it has and we will continue that discussion as we head into 2018. I appreciate those words, but we have seen a lack of support for the GLRI.

Again in this fiscal year 2019 budget request, the GLRI was funded at 30 million by this administration. Obviously I was and am not okay with that level of funding and worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the Great Lakes Caucus in an effort to restore full funding, which we did, for that. And I certainly would love to stand on the banks of one of the Great Lakes in my district, Lake Erie, with you, and just have an opportunity to discuss further what is so important about 20 percent of the world's fresh water resources being there in the Great Lakes and what a job we have attempted to do as Great Lakes states to make that work for us.

Do you believe that 30 million is adequate funding for such a critical program?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, I commend what Congress has done to

2472 I think Congress restored that level to 300 address that. 2473 million, I think, in the omnibus. 2474 Mr. Walberg. 300 million. 2475 Mr. Pruitt. And I remain personally and as Administrator 2476 of the EPA committed to you to work --2477 Mr. Walberg. Will you make a request to the administration 2478 to work with us on that? 2479 Mr. Pruitt. I will continue to do that Congressman. 2480 Mr. Walberg. I would appreciate that because it is 2481 important and I think again it is something that we want to in 2482 the Great Lakes Region take care of that resource as good stewards 2483 and I believe you do as well. 2484 Mr. Pruitt. Well, the challenges there, the invasive 2485 species we know is an issue. We want to do all that we can. 2486 was actually in Region 5 earlier this week and obviously they are 2487 very focused on those efforts as well. I am hopeful that we can 2488 find better outcomes as we go forward on the funding levels. 2489 Mr. Walberg. Well, with that, with invasive species and 2490 with algae bloom, which has been significant, touching my 2491 district, across the line in Ohio as well, when we discussed last 2492 time you mentioned that there would be an interest -- and let me 2493 find -- you said it is something that we ought to do going forward 2494 and ensure that there is a partnership like that and specifically 2495 referring to Agriculture and Interior. Have you had an

2496 opportunity to talk with Sonny Perdue or Ryan Zinke about this 2497 issue of algae bloom and how to address it in the Great Lakes? 2498 Mr. Pruitt. The Secretary, Secretary Perdue and I have 2499 actually talked about issues with respect to geographical focal 2500 areas, but Ryan and I have not. And I think it is important, you 2501 know, as I indicated, for states like the Great Lakes Initiative 2502 you have states that have joined together partnering and 2503 collaborating with the federal government to achieve better 2504 outcomes and I think that is an example of true federalism. 2505 Mr. Walberg. Is there anything I can do to assist in 2506 bringing that coalition together? I would be delighted to stand 2507 on the banks of Lake Erie with you and Secretary Zinke. 2508 Mr. Pruitt. Well, yes. We ought to do that together with 2509 the other two individuals as well. 2510 Mr. Walberg. Okay, next topic is the constant threat of 2511 I believe we have an administration right now invasive species. 2512 that isn't committed to some of the shipping interests in Illinois 2513 and Indiana that there were before and I don't discredit that. 2514 But we have a water resource that could be impacted in many 2515 different ways recreationally, commercially as well, if Asian 2516 carp, one of those species were to get into the Great Lakes. Can you please provide an update on what your efforts have 2517 2518 been with the Army Corps of Engineers that have been dragging their

oars in the water for too long on this issue? Have you had any

2520 significant contact with them in moving this issue forward? 2521 I have had contact with Secretary Esper as well Mr. Pruitt. 2522 as R.D. James there at the Corps on a multitude of issues. I don't 2523 recall speaking about this particular issue, but I appreciate you 2524 making me aware of it and we will talk to them about their 2525 involvement. 2526 Mr. Walberg. Yes, if you could get on that. That is just 2527 so significant. And it is amazing right now though we have seen 2528 DNA that have come from carp in the Great Lakes, thus far we are 2529 not seeing the impact of the fish themselves. We can't have that 2530 If it happens there is no turning back, and this is an 2531 environmental protection issue. And so I hope that you will check 2532 into that further, and I certainly would like to check with your 2533 office. 2534 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. The chair 2535 recognizes the gentleman from Georgia for 5 minutes. 2536 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Carter. 2537 Thank you, Mr. Pruitt for being here. As you know, I have 2538 the honor and privilege of representing the 1st congressional 2539 district of Georgia which includes the entire coast of Georgia 2540 and it also includes the Savannah Harbor. The Savannah Harbor Expansion Project is a billion dollar project, arguably the most 2541

important economic development project in our state's history

next to the Interstate System. It supports the infrastructure

2542

and economic principles that were laid out by President Trump.

It is exactly that.

This is what he has been talking about when he has been talking investing in the infrastructure in our country. It is one of the most studied projects in the history of mankind.

We started this project in the late 1990s. Since that time, three ports in China have been started and completed, yet this is not completed yet. Back when you were here in December, I brought to your attention the Tier 4 emission standards that are being required for the harbor pilots and for their boats and the problem that it was causing us then. You understand that unless we can get those ships in and out of port, it does us no good to invest a billion dollars into this project. We have to have those harbor pilots and their vessels in order to get these ships in and out of port.

Now the Tier 4 emission standards, I spoke to you in December about those. This was after months of my staff and your staff going back and forth to discuss this. Since that time almost 5 months ago, I have had the harbor pilots come up to Washington at their own expense and their own time to meet with your staff. Your staff was completely unprepared. It was complete waste of time for the harbor pilots to be here. You gave me a commitment back in December that you would look into this. I need to know where we are at with this. This is extremely important for us.

| 2568 | Can you give me an idea of where we are at with this? |
|------|---|
| 2569 | Mr. Pruitt. First, Congressman, my apologies to you and |
| 2570 | your constituents if we weren't responsive. And that is the first |
| 2571 | I have heard of that and I will check on that very issue and my |
| 2572 | apologies there. |
| 2573 | Secondly, as I shared with you recently, we are actually |
| 2574 | sending representatives, I think, to California to meet with the |
| 2575 | architect on the construction of the vessels to determine whether |
| 2576 | there is a way to modify |
| 2577 | Mr. Carter. When will they be going to California? |
| 2578 | Mr. Pruitt. I think this month. I think it is actually this |
| 2579 | month. |
| 2580 | Mr. Carter. This month, April? |
| 2581 | Mr. Pruitt. May, I am sorry. It is happening in May. |
| 2582 | Mr. Carter. May, so next month. |
| 2583 | Mr. Pruitt. Yes. |
| 2584 | Mr. Carter. Can I have the commitment that we are going to |
| 2585 | get this fixed? Are you personally involved in this? Are you |
| 2586 | personally looking into this? |
| 2587 | Mr. Pruitt. I am now. |
| 2588 | Mr. Carter. You are now as of today. |
| 2589 | Mr. Pruitt. Yes. |
| 2590 | Mr. Carter. But you told me you were in December. |
| 2591 | Mr. Pruitt. Yes. My communication |

| 2592 | Mr. Carter. Now you are telling me today. I want to believe |
|------|--|
| 2593 | you. |
| 2594 | Mr. Pruitt. Yes. So my communications to the team in |
| 2595 | December were to take steps and apparently that has not been done. |
| 2596 | Mr. Carter. That has not been done. |
| 2597 | Mr. Pruitt. Yes. So I will be personally engaged on this |
| 2598 | going forward. |
| 2599 | Mr. Carter. I certainly hope so, because look, I want to |
| 2600 | help you, okay, because I want you to help me. This is extremely |
| 2601 | important. This is, as I said before, the largest economic |
| 2602 | development project in the state of Georgia since the Interstate |
| 2603 | System. We have got to have this done. If we don't have the bar |
| 2604 | policy, they don't have the vessels and the manufacturer is |
| 2605 | telling us that they cannot meet the Tier 4 emission standards |
| 2606 | and build these vessels that they need. |
| 2607 | Mr. Pruitt. I think it is also a competitive situation with |
| 2608 | other regulations outside of our agency that are causing a certain |
| 2609 | type of vessel along with the engine. So there is work to be done. |
| 2610 | Mr. Carter. I just need a commitment. Can I have a |
| 2611 | commitment from you that this will be resolved in 30 days? |
| 2612 | Mr. Pruitt. You have the commitment from me to get engaged |
| 2613 | on this issue with our Air Office to find answers. We will have |
| 2614 | answers |
| 2615 | Mr. Carter. Can I have a commitment from you that you will |
| | |

| 2616 | get this resolved as soon as you can? |
|------|---|
| 2617 | Mr. Pruitt. I will find answers to this within 30 days. |
| 2618 | Mr. Carter. Okay. I can't stress to you how important this |
| 2619 | is. Also, the Tier 4 emission standards are causing problems with |
| 2620 | generators. They are not able to build the large one megawatt |
| 2621 | generators. And keep in mind now I said I was representing the |
| 2622 | entire coast of Georgia. We have hurricanes in Georgia, |
| 2623 | therefore we need generators. In fact, in one 11-month period |
| 2624 | we had two hurricanes. They cannot make these. Will you commit |
| 2625 | to reviewing the Tier 4 standards to see if they are practical |
| 2626 | and if they are rational? |
| 2627 | Mr. Pruitt. Yes. I will engage in conversations around |
| 2628 | this issue with our Air Office to see what the options are. |
| 2629 | Mr. Carter. The last thing I want to ask you about is |
| 2630 | biobutanol. It is my understanding that you have |
| 2631 | Mr. Pruitt. About what, I am sorry? |
| 2632 | Mr. Carter. I am sorry? |
| 2633 | Mr. Pruitt. About what, I am sorry? |
| 2634 | Mr. Carter. Biobutanol. |
| 2635 | Mr. Pruitt. Okay. |
| 2636 | Mr. Carter. This is one of the biofuels that is an |
| 2637 | alternative fuel and it is my understanding that you have a comment |
| 2638 | period that is about to end at the end of April; is that correct? |
| 2639 | Mr. Pruitt. I can verify that. |

| | ll |
|------|---|
| 2640 | Mr. Carter. Okay. Well, please verify that because as you |
| 2641 | know the ethanol additives cause a lot of deterioration to marine |
| 2642 | engines. Biobutanol as I understand it is much better, much more |
| 2643 | compatible for marine engines and we need that to come to market. |
| 2644 | When this comment period is up I hope that you will act on it. |
| 2645 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is |
| 2646 | Mr. Pruitt. Pathway for advanced categories under the RFS, |
| 2647 | is that what you are referring to? |
| 2648 | Mr. Carter. Yes. |
| 2649 | Mr. Pruitt. Okay. |
| 2650 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. |
| 2651 | Mr. Carter. Thank you, Mr. Chair. |
| 2652 | Mr. Shimkus. The chair recognizes the gentleman from |
| 2653 | Mississippi for 5 minutes, Mr. Harper. |
| 2654 | Mr. Harper. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 2655 | Administrator Pruitt, welcome. It appears that it has |
| 2656 | become a political blood sport to try to destroy anybody |
| 2657 | associated with the Trump administration, and I want to say thank |
| 2658 | you for what your Agency has done and the attention that they have |
| 2659 | given to the New Source Performance Standards for residential wood |
| 2660 | heaters. That was very helpful to some, you know, employers that |
| 2661 | were in real danger of not being able to meet a particular deadline |
| 2662 | and I appreciate the work that your Agency has done on that. |
| | i 1 |

And I also want to ask you a few questions and I need to ask

you about a series of media reports that I found particularly concerning. According to these reports at least five EPA officials have been reassigned, demoted, or requested to switch jobs because they raised concerns about your spending and management of the Agency. You know, you have already testified this morning that these actions were based on other reasons, but even the implication of retaliation can have an impact on the morale of EPA employees. Will you explain these allegations and tell us what steps EPA takes to investigate allegations brought forward by EPA employees?

Mr. Pruitt. First, there is no truth to the assertion that decisions have been made about reassignment or otherwise as far as employment status based upon the things that you reference. I am not aware of that ever happening and it is something I want to make very, very clear. The individuals, I don't know to whom you reference across the board, but the folks that I am aware of two of those individuals are SES individuals that are serving in other capacities. They are actually still employees of the Agency.

So I think that is important to note, but I just want to emphasize very, very clearly to you that there is no actions that we have taken that I am aware of related in any way to the issues you raise as far as reassignment or employment action based upon that.

2688 Mr. Harper. Can you assure me and the employees of EPA that 2689 all whistleblower complaints are taken seriously at EPA and that 2690 you will make your best efforts to ensure that whistleblowers are 2691 protected from any kind of retaliation? 2692 Mr. Pruitt. Absolutely, and I think that is how we get 2693 I think that is how we improve outcomes and processes. 2694 And this is not one of those situations, Congressman, in this 2695 situation, but absolutely, prospectively that is something that 2696 I can commit to you and will commit to you. 2697 Mr. Harper. You know, I have had some of my constituents raise an issue regarding oil spill response training and I am told 2698 2699 that the funding for certain training courses for federal and 2700 local responders involved in inland oil spill prevention and 2701 cleanup have been eliminated and that the EPA Environmental 2702 Response Team is no longer able to consistently make these courses With an increase in oil production across the country 2703 available. 2704 there remains a need for oil spill response training for local, 2705 state, and federal responders. 2706 Would you be willing to commit to looking into whether 2707 funding can and will be made available for what we believe is a 2708 very important training? 2709 Yes. Yes, Congressman, I agree with that. Mr. Pruitt. 2710 Over the last 6 years, EPA has used its

discretion to reduce and perhaps eliminate the effectiveness of

the on-site technical assistance appropriated by Congress to small and rural communities in my home state of Mississippi including terminating funding for my state's two full-time EPA funded circuit rider positions. My rural and small communities have told me numerous times, however, that this is the best and most helpful assistance with EPA water standards and unfunded mandates.

So to address this problem in 2015, Congress passed and the President signed a version of my bill, the Grassroots Rural and Small Community Water Systems Assistance Act, solely to stop this problem that was caused by EPA and still continues today. So this bill requires EPA to give preference to the technical assistance that small and rural communities find the most beneficial and effective.

So on April 11th of 2018, EPA announced the award of technical assistance grants. It was my hope that this announcement would have returned the two full-time circuit rider positions funded by EPA to Mississippi and the other states, yet I am told that there is less help with EPA mandates to small and rural communities. So did EPA conduct a review of what small communities find is the most beneficial and will you look into this for possible necessary correction?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. So those TAG grants are so important.

And when you reference small and rural communities, some of our

The chair

2736 water infrastructure we think about the dense markets as far as 2737 the age in infrastructure across the country but those rural 2738 communities also need tremendous assistance. So those TAG grants 2739 are something that should be a focus in that area that you raised 2740 and I will look into the status of that for you. 2741 Mr. Harper. Thank you very much for what you are doing for 2742 the country. 2743 The gentleman's time is expired. Mr. Shimkus. 2744 recognizes the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Rush, for 5 minutes. 2745 Administrator Pruitt, I must say unlike my Mr. Rush. 2746 colleagues, no, thank you, no, thank you, to the policies of the 2747 Environmental Protection Agency under your tenure. But in my 2748 home city of Chicago we are in the middle of a dire situation as 2749 reported in a recent Tribune article entitled, "Brain-damaging 2750 lead found in tap water in hundreds of homes tested across Chicago, 2751 results show, " and this article is written on April the 12th, 2018.

> I understand that EPA is currently considering revisions to the lead and copper rule. This rule was supposed to have been issued last year, but the Agency under your leadership has

> million, the maximum amount allowed in bottled water by the FDA.

The article went on to state that in the nearly 2,800 homes tested

between 2015 and to 2017, close to 70 percent were found to contain

elevated levels of lead. Additionally, three of every ten homes

tested contained lead concentration higher than 5 parts per

2752

2753

2754

2755

2756

2757

2758

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

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

Mr. Administrator, as you well know, even your own Agency has declared that there are no safe levels of lead for consumption. According to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, even consuming tiny amounts of lead can permanently damage the developing brain of children and contribute to kidney failure, heart disease, and other severe health problems. I also understand that this issue of replacing lead piping will require

billions of dollars to remediate this problem on a national level.

So I am curious to hear from you on ways that the EPA might provide financing and other mechanisms to help address this issue.

As you know, the administration's fiscal year 2019 budget proposed \$863 million on Drinking Water State Revolving Funds which is an \$81.2 million decrease from the fiscal year 2017 enacted levels. However, the most recent EPA Needs Survey estimates that it will cost over some \$472 billion for capital improvements between the years 2015 and 2034. I will be meeting, Mr. Administrator, with senior state officials in the near future to discuss these and other issues, but I would like to hear from you on what steps the EPA will be intending to address these critical issues which have of course --

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

Mr. Pruitt. If I may, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Shimkus. Just for a short minute.

Mr. Pruitt. There is no safe level of lead in our drinking water. It is something we need to act aggressively upon as an Agency and as a country. We have estimated it is about \$45 billion to replace the lead service lines across the country, and with WIFIA and the authority this Congress has given the EPA, I really believe that we can prioritize funding in the WIFIA program up to four billion a year in over a 10-year process, or thereabouts, achieve tremendous results.

2808 Mr. Shimkus. Okay, the gentleman's time is expired. The
2809 chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Griffith,
2810 for 5 minutes.

2811 Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Continuing along these lines, thank you, Administrator Pruitt.

And, Mr. Chairman, if we could submit for the record the article from the Roanoke Times from today, the article came out yesterday but it is in today's electronic clips, "Virginia Tech team gets EPA grant to engineer citizen-science water quality project."

As you will recall, in the previous administration there was a regional EPA administrator who looked the other way. The Flint, Michigan problem became a problem but it was exposed by Marc Edwards, the professor at Virginia Tech, because he went out there on his own dime with his own monies and started doing the studies that needed to be done. Now your EPA has granted his group \$1.9 million to have folks test their water and send it in so we can find out exactly where the hot spots are whether they be in Mr. Rush's district of Chicago or elsewhere.

And Professor Edwards says he calls this the largest engineering citizen-science project in American history. The 3-year grant will support his team and some other universities that are involved and he said that all the work we did with consumers over the years and the students at the Virginia Tech, this bottom-up, organic science phenomena it created a tidal wave

| 2832 | of understanding that couldn't be ignored. This is how science |
|------|---|
| 2833 | is supposed to work to me, Marc Edwards, Virginia Tech. If we |
| 2834 | could have that article put in the record by unanimous consent? |
| 2835 | Mr. Shimkus. The Democrats have looked at it and they have |
| 2836 | approved. Without objection, it is submitted for the record. |
| 2837 | [The information follows:] |
| 2838 | |
| 2839 | ************************************** |

Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much. Now I am going to switch
gears, but I couldn't help but think Mr. Rush's comments were so
timely for that.

All right, I am going to switch now to the final rule for
Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium

Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium and Heavy Duty Engines and Vehicles - Phase 2 that was approved in the prior administration. You all are taking some action in regard to one part of that which I want to talk about in a minute, but I first want to talk about trailers. And I asked these questions of the prior folks at the EPA and I don't know how they have authority to regulate trailers when the Clean Air Act clearly says that the term "motor vehicle" means any self-propelled motor vehicle designed for transporting persons or property on a street or a highway and a trailer is not self-propelled, nor is it a motor vehicle, nor does it have an engine. It might have a compressor if it is a refrigerator truck.

You would agree with me that this needs attention and that we need to make sure that trailers are not being declared by the EPA to be self-propelled motor vehicles, yes or no?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. We are in process --

Mr. Griffith. Thank you. I have to move on to the next one because I have a more complicated one. You are also in the process of looking at the situation in that same regulation related to gliders and to big trucks. And I have a problem because my

district has the Volvo North America truck manufacturing site, thousands of jobs, billions of dollars were spent to meet the new requirements. Now I would agree with you in that, that the law does not say the EPA can do what they did because they went after gliders and they didn't, they went after it and just said you basically can't do it, which they don't have authority to do because it is not a new motor vehicle engine which is defined in the code in similar sections to what I just read on the trailers, utility trailers in my district as well.

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

Don't you think that it would be appropriate to take a look at -- and all that is in the law, you have that authority. Take a look at it and see what can be worked out so that we don't have trucks that are just being overhauled by the glider companies that are decades old and nowhere near meeting the emission standards of the United States, but at the same recognizing they have a right

2888 to do that if the truck has not used up its useful life as defined 2889 already as 11 years and 120,000 miles. 2890 Mr. Pruitt. So that alternative is something that we 2891 haven't reviewed yet, but I appreciate you bringing it to my 2892 We have been focused upon the statutory analysis both 2893 for gliders and trailers, but this is something we need to add 2894 to the evaluation. 2895 And I just have to say what is interesting Mr. Griffith. 2896 is, is I think about 80 to 85 percent of what the previous 2897 administration wanted to accomplish could have been accomplished 2898 if they hadn't done sloppy legal work. I yield back. 2899 The gentleman yields back his time. Mr. Shimkus. The chair 2900 recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Duncan, for 5 2901 minutes. 2902 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Duncan. 2903 Administrator Pruitt, thank you for being here today and I 2904 apologize for the abrasiveness of some of my colleagues who would 2905 rather tarnish your character than really try to delve into the 2906 issues facing this great nation. 2907 I would like to spend a few minutes discussing the Obama 2908 administration's Waters of the U.S. rule, otherwise known as 2909 And I know Congresswoman Blackburn brought it up earlier, WOTUS. but I want to go into a little more detail. As you know, this 2910 2911 flawed regulation sought to expand federal control over 60 percent

of our country's streams, millions of acres of wetlands that were previously non-jurisdictional. It has allowed the EPA and the Army Corps to regulate almost every water from manmade conveyances to large rivers.

The rule has created an unnecessary confusion and suffering for farmers, ranchers, job creators, and private property owners, and in reality the regulations have done very little to benefit environmental stewardship. WOTUS is by far the largest issue for agriculture in South Carolina, and I know on your multistate action tour this past summer hosted by, I think, Super-Sod there in Anderson, you saw the real negative impact that WOTUS regulations had on farmers and local businesses.

These regulations are emblematic of the aggressive and unconstitutional overreach by the federal government under the Obama administration and the habitual undermining of state and local authority regarding environmental matters. It is our responsibility in Congress to use our lawmaking power to enact legislative and permanent fix.

Mr. Administrator, I appreciate your attention and efforts to curtail the WOTUS rules. We talked about that the last time you were in front of this committee about the President's executive order, and I just want to ask this question. I saw earlier this month that you issued a memo taking control of decision-making from the EPA's regional administrators on

important matters to streams and wetland jurisdictions. Can you elaborate on the intentions of this document and why you issued that memo?

Mr. Pruitt. Yes. There has been many decisions made at the regional level through delegation, as I was talking about earlier, utilizing that definition historically, you know, that 2015 decision and then even prior to that in 1986 and the 2008 guidance. And so we had inconsistency across the country with respect to what jurisdiction we had, and this was an effort to draw that back to make sure we had uniformity and how we review our responsibility on the Clean Water Act and make sure that every region is implementing that the way that they should.

Mr. Duncan. So why is this important to Waters of the U.S.?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, certainty is, certainty and clarity around the Waters of the United States rule is terribly important because, you know, if you have landowners across this country guessing about whether the EPA or the Corps of Engineers or any other agency at the federal government has jurisdiction over their decision, meaning that they have to seek a permit, then they don't want to find out years later that they should have got that permit and then face fines each day for those number of years. So clarity and certainty around where federal jurisdiction begins and ends really is at the heart of our efforts this year with respect to the Waters of the United States rule.

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

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

So that is something that we are going through that process, providing that clarity, and then those jurisdictional determinations will take effect or maybe change after that.

| 2984 | Mr. Duncan. Just the last question, during my time as a |
|------|---|
| 2985 | state legislator we had instances where areas were considered |
| 2986 | isolated wetlands and these were areas where logging loading decks |
| 2987 | were loaded, were situated, and they sat there for a while. Water |
| 2988 | settled, no wetland, no streams, but bulrushes popped up because |
| 2989 | water settled in there from where the equipment had set and all |
| 2990 | of a sudden this area was designated an isolated wetland and wasn't |
| 2991 | able to be replanted, wasn't able to be developed. |
| 2992 | Is there anything the EPA is doing to look at those isolated |
| 2993 | wetland issues like that? |
| 2994 | Mr. Pruitt. Yes, and also prior converted crop lands. I |
| 2995 | mean there are similar issues around that issue, so absolutely |
| 2996 | we are. |
| 2997 | Mr. Duncan. Okay, thank you. |
| 2998 | Mr. Chairman, I yield back. |
| 2999 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair |
| 3000 | recognizes the gentlelady from California, Ms. Eshoo, for 5 |
| 3001 | minutes. |
| 3002 | Ms. Eshoo. I thank the chairman for holding today's hearing |
| 3003 | and for extending the legislative courtesy for me to participate |
| 3004 | at your subcommittee which I am not a member of. I am very glad |
| 3005 | to be here. |
| 3006 | Administrator Pruitt, public officials and public office |
| 3007 | have a public trust to live up to. We are called to hold ourselves |

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

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

Mr. Pruitt. Let me say to you, Congresswoman.

Ms. Eshoo. Well, you can answer it yes or no. Do you have any remorse?

Mr. Pruitt. I echo your comments. I think that what you said is absolutely true about the importance of public trust --

| 3032 | Ms. Eshoo. No, I want you to answer me. I have sir, I |
|------|--|
| 3033 | have 2 minutes and 38 seconds. |
| 3034 | Mr. Pruitt and I endeavor to achieve to live in a way |
| 3035 | that respects that. |
| 3036 | Ms. Eshoo. Do you have any remorse? |
| 3037 | Mr. Pruitt. I think there are changes I have made already, |
| 3038 | the change from first class to coach travel. That is a change |
| 3039 | I have made. I learned about the pay raises. |
| 3040 | Ms. Eshoo. All right. Well, sir, you are not going to |
| 3041 | out-talk me. You are not going to out-talk me. You claim that |
| 3042 | Steven Hart, the lobbyist who owned the condominium where you paid |
| 3043 | below-market rent, never lobbied you. However, we now know this |
| 3044 | isn't true. Mr. Hart's firm disclosed that he met with you |
| 3045 | regarding cleanup of the Chesapeake Bay. Did you have any other |
| 3046 | official meetings with Mr. Hart, yes or no? |
| 3047 | Mr. Pruitt. The meeting that you referred to was not a |
| 3048 | meeting |
| 3049 | Ms. Eshoo. Did you have any other meetings with him? |
| 3050 | Mr. Pruitt it was with respect to an individual |
| 3051 | Ms. Eshoo. All right, I am moving on. Did you ever discuss |
| 3052 | Mr. Hart's clients or EPA business with him outside of official |
| 3053 | settings? |
| 3054 | Mr. Pruitt. There was no other meeting with Mr. Hart except |
| 3055 | for nonprofit. |
| | |

| 3056 | Ms. Eshoo. Do you have any other lobbyists or |
|------|--|
| 3057 | representatives of industries with business before the EPA |
| 3058 | provided you with similar personal favors that you haven't |
| 3059 | previously disclosed? |
| 3060 | Mr. Pruitt. Congresswoman, as I have indicated with respect |
| 3061 | to this situation with Mr. Hart and Mrs. Hart, the only event that |
| 3062 | took place was a meeting with a nonprofit Chesapeake Bay |
| 3063 | Ms. Eshoo. Are there any other instances in which you |
| 3064 | granted |
| 3065 | Mr. Pruitt and I am not aware of any other instances. |
| 3066 | Ms. Eshoo. Are there any other instances in which you |
| 3067 | granted access to donors or lobbyists to whom you owed personal |
| 3068 | favors? |
| 3069 | Mr. Pruitt. I am not aware of any instances. |
| 3070 | Ms. Eshoo. Your travel including regular upgrades to first |
| 3071 | class at the taxpayers' expense has cost over \$200,000 since you |
| 3072 | became Administrator. Are you reimbursing the taxpayer for any |
| 3073 | of that? |
| 3074 | Mr. Pruitt. We can provide you the analysis that occurred |
| 3075 | in June of last year with respect to what caused the change to |
| 3076 | first class. |
| 3077 | Ms. Eshoo. I don't need any analysis. I know what airline |
| 3078 | tickets cost. I fly across the country every week. |
| 3079 | Mr. Pruitt. And I have changed that recently. |

| 3080 | Ms. Eshoo. No, so what are you going to you didn't answer |
|------|---|
| 3081 | my question. I asked you if you were going to reimburse the |
| 3082 | taxpayers for the overage and this includes ten trips to Oklahoma |
| 3083 | as well. So are you going to reimburse or what are you going to |
| 3084 | do about it? |
| 3085 | Mr. Pruitt. The travel office and the security team |
| 3086 | determine where I sit on a plane and all trips that I have taken |
| 3087 | with respect to EPA dollars have been for official trips. |
| 3088 | Ms. Eshoo. Well, you know what. With all due respect I may |
| 3089 | be elected, but I am not a fool. That is really a lousy answer |
| 3090 | from someone that has a high position in the federal government. |
| 3091 | I mean this is not a dodge-question day. We ask these questions |
| 3092 | on behalf of our constituents and I don't really find you |
| 3093 | forthcoming. |
| 3094 | So the last few questions that I would like to ask with 5 |
| 3095 | seconds left is when you traveled to your home state |
| 3096 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired. |
| 3097 | Ms. Eshoo did you attend political fundraisers during |
| 3098 | any of these visits? |
| 3099 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time is expired. |
| 3100 | Ms. Eshoo. I would like an answer. |
| 3101 | Mr. Shimkus. The chair recognizes the gentleman from |
| 3102 | Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania? |
| 3103 | Mr. Costello. Thank you, Mr. Chair. |
| | |

3104 Mr. Pruitt, I have, I think the opprobrium that you generated 3105 on some of these spending decisions is actually warranted and I 3106 have reviewed your answers and I find some of them lacking or 3107 And I believe you have demonstrated, or you have insufficient. 3108 not demonstrated the requisite degree of good judgment required 3109 of an appointed executive branch official on some of these 3110 spending items and I would like to follow up on a couple of specific 3111 instances. 3112 It has been reported that EPA officials who have challenged 3113 3114 were not reassigned or demoted over the challenging of your

your spending decisions and who have been reassigned or demoted were not reassigned or demoted over the challenging of your spending decisions but they all had performance issues. Have in each of those instances, those performance issues, been documented prior to them being reassigned or demoted?

Mr. Pruitt. I am not sure to what you are referring as far as a conclusion that they had been performance related. I talked about this earlier. I am aware of two individuals being reassigned because they were in the SES category and that routinely happens in that category. I know of no instance where there were decisions made at the Agency based upon counts or otherwise on spending with respect to employment related decisions. I said that earlier and I say it again to you.

Mr. Costello. Are there instances where current EPA officials have objected to spending decisions that you have made

3115

3116

3117

3118

3119

3120

3121

3122

3123

3124

3125

3126

who still remain in their present positions?

Mr. Pruitt. I am not aware of any employment action taken with respect to anyone and spending related counsel. These individuals to whom you refer, I had limited interaction with them. They did not spend meaningful time with me with respect to spending and recommendations around spending. One of the individuals was the head of Advance. The most of the time I spent with him was in the field and not at headquarters. So there is really no factual connection whatsoever in employment status with those individuals and any counsel regarding spending.

Mr. Costello. Now the issues of the two close aides who used to work for you in Oklahoma and their pay raises, are you saying that you were not aware that those pay raises were provided to them until after the fact?

Mr. Pruitt. I was not aware of one of those individuals even seeking a pay raise. I was aware of another person going through the process, but I was not aware of the amount that was provided or the process that was utilized to evaluate that. And that is what I have spoken to historically.

Mr. Costello. The other issue that has received a lot of attention is the \$43,000 phone booth. And you are saying that at no time from the point between when you learned that it was \$13,000 to the time that it became \$43,000, you were never apprised of the additional cost related to that?

Mr. Pruitt. I was not aware if it, 13,000, 8,000, or 43,000. I gave a simple instruction to my leadership team to address secure communications in the office and then a process began and we have documentation we can provide you on that, Congressman. Career individuals were involved in that process from beginning to end and made the decision that you see in that with the \$43,000 allocation.

Mr. Costello. Now I tend to be very conscientious of those who have personal security related concerns. And I don't know who has said what to you or when, but I do think that there is a lot more to that than some people may realize in the general public.

Having said that, it has been reported that, I believe the IG has indicated or at least someone in the IG's Office has not found some of the personal security concerns that you have proffered in relation to the enhanced security that you have received to be either warranted or credible. Would you kindly provide a little bit more detail on why you think you need -- and I am just going to be very honest with you. When folks read about trips to Disneyland, professional basketball games, Rose Bowl, and the additional security detail related to that, that doesn't sit well with a lot of people.

Mr. Pruitt. So I can, Congressman, I can read directly from an Inspector General threat investigation and I can provide this

3176 There are several on here listed with respect to threats 3177 and I will just read you two. "The threats were directed toward 3178 her father. The threat stated, I hope your father dies soon, 3179 suffering as your mother watches in horror for hours on end." 3180 There is another entry, correspondence between the subject 3181 and individuals. "Pruitt, I am going to find you and put a bullet 3182 Don't think I am joking. I am planning this." between your eyes. 3183 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. 3184 Mr. Pruitt. So these are threats that the IG has documented. 3185 We can provide this to you. The IG has said that the threats 3186 against me as Administrator --3187 The gentleman --Mr. Shimkus. 3188 Mr. Pruitt. -- are unprecedented --3189 Mr. Shimkus. If the Administrator, if you will suspend, I 3190 think the point has been made. The gentleman's time has expired. 3191 The chair now recognizes the gentleman from New York. 3192 Thank you, Chairman Shimkus and Ranking Member 3193 Tonko. 3194 Mr. Pruitt, the person appointed to run the EPA needs to be 3195 someone who cares about protecting the health and safety of people 3196 all across the country, and until now both sides, both Presidents 3197 on both parties, we have had a pretty good track record with our 3198 But your time in office really has been EPA Administrators.

Your tenure has been stained by repeated abuses of

different.

public trust and violations of ethical guidelines, guidelines that are designed to ensure that the government's business is conducted with impartiality and integrity.

But what really bothers me perhaps even more on top of that your agency is willfully ignoring sound science and stripping the protections that keep millions of Americans safe. You are making our water less safe to drink and our air less safe to breathe. You are increasing our exposure to more dangerous chemicals and you are making our planet less healthy for our children and our grandchildren.

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

vehicle emission standards.

You proposed repeal of emission standards for heavy duty vehicles. You announced a plan to weaken emission standards for brick and tile manufacturers. You proposed a rule reducing air pollutants at sewage treatment plants. You have scrubbed the content of your website including the page devoted to explaining climate change. You have removed the word "science" from the mission statement of your Office of Science and Technology. You have dismissed 12 of the 18 members of the Board of Scientific Counselors.

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

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

nation's position as the global leader in developing the clean energy economy of the future. The move will only open the door for others to take our place.

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

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

Again, yesterday French President Macron reminded us that there is no planet B -- that is a quote -- but turn to our future.

And he said, quote, I am sure one day the United States will come

3272 back and join the Paris Agreement and I am sure we can work together 3273 to fulfill with you the ambitions of the global compact on the 3274 I certainly hope he is right for the sake of our environment. children and our grandchildren. 3275 3276 To me, an Administrator should be someone who cares about 3277 these things, not someone who is going to ruin these things. Not 3278 someone who is going to make our future more dangerous for our 3279 families. And that is what bothers me, because you are not doing 3280 3281 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. 3282 Mr. Engel. You are instead -- I am finishing, Mr. Chairman. 3283 You are instead --3284 Mr. Shimkus. Finish quickly. 3285 -- you are going against the tenets of what your 3286 job is supposed to do and that makes me very, very angry. 3287 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair 3288 recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey for 5 minutes, Mr. Lance. 3289 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, my thanks to you and Mr. Lance. 3290 the ranking member for allowing me to participate. I am a member 3291 of the committee, but not of this subcommittee. 3292 Administrator Pruitt, the EPA has a long and distinguished 3293 history established by President Nixon as you know better than 3294 I represent a district in northern New Jersey outside 3295 New York and we are concerned about some of the allegations

3296 regarding the overspending, and in particular the \$43,000 for the 3297 security of the phone booth. As you know, this has been 3298 criticized by the Government Accountability Office. The general 3299 counsel, Mr. Armstrong, said that you had a responsibility to 3300 notify lawmakers. You have indicated that you believe this is 3301 not part of renovations. 3302 Having said that, isn't there other secure locations within 3303 your Agency and why did we need to spend taxpayer funds to build 3304 a new secure place for making of telephone calls? 3305 Mr. Pruitt. First, on the GAO matter, we have in fact 3306 notified the GAO with respect to those issues and rightfully so 3307 based upon their determination. And I do want to say that the 3308 Office of General Counsel at the Agency, career individuals, 3309 interpreted the expenditure as not being within the guidelines 3310 of the statute and that is the reason the Agency acted as they 3311 did. And those were all individuals, career individuals, that 3312 were part of that process. 3313 The GAO disagrees with you, the General Counsel Mr. Lance. 3314 disagrees with you? 3315 Mr. Pruitt. That is right. But steps were taken to notify 3316 irrespective of that. 3317 I tend to agree with the GAO General Counsel. Mr. Lance. 3318 I want that on the record. Why did we need another SCIF or 3319 SCIF-like facility when there was already one at your Agency?

| 3320 | Mr. Pruitt. So it is not a SCIF and it was not intended to |
|------|---|
| 3321 | be. As I shared earlier, Congressman, in an earlier question, |
| 3322 | I simply requested for a secure communication, a secure line in |
| 3323 | my office based upon phone calls that occur that are confidential |
| 3324 | in nature. And so, based upon that instruction a process ensued |
| 3325 | where this investment took place. And that is |
| 3326 | Mr. Lance. Did any of your predecessors suggest that this |
| 3327 | be needed, Republican or Democratic? |
| 3328 | Mr. Pruitt. I am not sure, Congressman. |
| 3329 | Mr. Lance. Well, I think the answer is no. It is either |
| 3330 | a yes or a no. And I don't demand just a yes or no, you are willing |
| 3331 | to elaborate. But did any of your predecessors suggest this? |
| 3332 | Mr. Pruitt. I am not sure. |
| 3333 | Mr. Lance. And I am not a person here who requires a yes |
| 3334 | or no. I would like you to answer in detail, did any of your |
| 3335 | predecessors require that? |
| 3336 | Mr. Pruitt. I am just not aware of any requests of previous |
| 3337 | |
| 3338 | Mr. Lance. Well, I have the honor of representing a |
| 3339 | predecessor of yours, Christine Todd Whitman. She is a |
| 3340 | constituent of mine. She was the Administrator for the second |
| 3341 | President Bush, and she has indicated that she saw no need for |
| 3342 | such an enhanced telephone system when she was Administrator and |
| 3343 | there was secure communications then and she has indicated that |

she did not think this was appropriate. And respectfully, I do not think it is appropriate. And I think that there are already secure locations and I think it was a waste of funds.

Regarding a completely different issue, in a March 30th memo you stated, you signed a directive to give more authority to your office over environmental regulations for a project near regional waterways. It is my view that taking this authority may supplant the role of local representatives and experts, water quality boards. You have relied heavily and when you were Attorney General of Oklahoma on federalism and perhaps appropriately so for local and state control over suits against the EPA. Yet, it appears to me that your directive supplants local control and that it would give you as Administrator final decision-making authority over the protection of streams, ponds, and wetlands under the Clean Water Act.

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

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

3368 to the issues that you have described. And so this is an effort 3369 at the Agency to get uniformity and to get consistency across the 3370 Collaboration, consultation will continue both at the regions. 3371 regions and with the states. 3372 Thank you. I end my questioning by saying that Mr. Lance. 3373 I am concerned about what I believe is overspending. 3374 particularly concerned about the secure location. 3375 judgment that that was not needed and that is the judgment 3376 certainly of at least one of your predecessors, a constituent of 3377 mine, Christine Todd Whitman. 3378 And, Congressman, I agree with your statement. 3379 I believe that that was an amount of money that should not have 3380 been spent and was never authorized by myself. 3381 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time is expired. 3382 Mr. Lance. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 3383 Mr. Shimkus. The chair recognizes the gentlelady from 3384 Illinois, Ms. Schakowsky, for 5 minutes. 3385 Thank you. I would like to thank the chair Ms. Schakowsky. 3386 and ranking member for allowing me, a member of the committee but 3387 not this subcommittee, to be here today. 3388 There is a lot of interest, Secretary Pruitt, in your 3389 testimony. And I also have been troubled by certain behaviors. 3390 And it has been reported that your decision to abandon the planned 3391 fuel efficiency standards was heavily influenced by Samantha, is

3392 it Dravis or Dravis, one of the employees you brought with you 3393 from Oklahoma who is now under investigation for receiving a 3394 salary from taxpayers despite not coming to work for 3 months. 3395 You personally brought Ms. Dravis on the job at EPA when you became 3396 Administrator. Is that correct? 3397 Mr. Pruitt. She is not from Oklahoma, and yes, she came in 3398 upon the start of our administration. And are you referring to 3399 the midterm evaluation, the decision reached on the midterm 3400 evaluation? 3401 Ms. Schakowsky. I am going to continue with my questions 3402 and maybe I will get to that. She was hired using the same Safe 3403 Drinking Water Act authority that was used to give unapproved 3404 raises to other staff that you did bring from Oklahoma. Is that 3405 correct? 3406 Mr. Pruitt. I am not aware if she was hired under that Safe 3407 Drinking Water Act authority. There is authority on the Safe 3408 Drinking Water Act to administratively determine certain 3409 It is legal, authorized, it has been used by individuals. 3410 previous Administrators and it could have been used in that 3411 instance. I am just not aware. 3412 Ms. Schakowsky. How much was Samantha Dravis paid for the 3413 3 months during which she did not report to work? Well, I am not aware. 3414 Mr. Pruitt. There is a pending 3415 investigation, as you have indicated, review of that and I am not

3416 aware that she did or did not appear for work. So that is 3417 something that is being reviewed at this point. 3418 Ms. Schakowsky. Senator Carper has stated on the basis of 3419 information, I believe, from a whistleblower, has stated that he 3420 worked with you on a deal to preserve fuel efficiency standards. 3421 He has said that you abandoned that deal at the urging of Samantha 3422 Dravis. Did Samantha Dravis urge you to abandon the potential 3423 deal with Senator Carper? 3424 Mr. Pruitt. I am just not aware. I don't know if you are 3425 speaking of the midterm evaluation or another issue. 3426 don't, I am not sure what you are asking. 3427 Ms. Schakowsky. Well, regardless of what the source of the 3428 -- I mean these are pretty straightforward questions about her 3429 and the 3 months that she -- are you contesting that she did not 3430 work for 3 months? 3431 Mr. Pruitt. No, I am not speaking to that at all. I am not 3432 3433 Ms. Schakowsky. So I don't know what your point is about 3434 asking where it came from. I am asking if she worked for 3 months 3435 without any -- she did not work for 3 months, with pay. 3436 Mr. Pruitt. But your question was about fuel efficiency and 3437 I am not entirely sure what the question was with respect to her 3438 influence in that regard. So that is what I was trying to 3439 determine, what area you were talking about. I am not aware of

3440 3441 Ms. Schakowsky. Okay. 3442 Mr. Pruitt. I will just say it to you this way, I am not 3443 aware of any decision around fuel efficiency, CAFÉ or otherwise, 3444 was an influence in that way. 3445 Ms. Schakowsky. Are you aware that she was paid and did not 3446 work for 3 months? I am not aware of any, I know it is under review 3447 Mr. Pruitt. 3448 at this point and those facts will bear out. 3449 Ms. Schakowsky. I wanted to ask you also, I have a little 3450 time left, about your vehicles. At the same time that the EPA 3451 has moved to increase fuel costs for American households, you have reportedly asked taxpayers to cover the cost of a luxury SUV for 3452 3453 Is it true that as Administrator you upgraded from a 3454 Chevy Tahoe, which I know your predecessor used, to a Chevy Suburban with leather interior and other luxury features? 3455 3456 Mr. Pruitt. As I understand it, the decisions to add a 3457 vehicle to the fleet was something that was in process prior and 3458 they asked for input about the vehicle, that I did not give 3459 direction to start that process or end that process, they just 3460 asked for consultation. 3461 Ms. Schakowsky. It isn't the first time in public service 3462 that you have upgraded your official vehicle. As Oklahoma 3463 Attorney General you upgraded to a big, black SUV when your

| 3464 | predecessor used a sedan. Is that correct? |
|------|--|
| 3465 | Mr. Pruitt. The sedan was something that went out of service |
| 3466 | and we had to replace that with an SUV, yes. |
| 3467 | Ms. Schakowsky. You had to replace it with an SUV? |
| 3468 | Mr. Pruitt. There was a replacement that occurred because |
| 3469 | of the other one coming out of service. |
| 3470 | Ms. Schakowsky. So it is not just that it had to be replaced. |
| 3471 | It had to be replaced with a bigger, less fuel efficient and |
| 3472 | larger, more expensive car. So it just seems to me that this |
| 3473 | pattern that we have been hearing today of behavior |
| 3474 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time |
| 3475 | Ms. Schakowsky is very concerning. And I thank you |
| 3476 | for your answers. |
| 3477 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time is expired. The chair |
| 3478 | recognizes the gentleman from southwest Missouri, Mr. Long, for |
| 3479 | 5 minutes. |
| 3480 | Mr. Long. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, |
| 3481 | Administrator Pruitt, for being here today. And I think that it |
| 3482 | has been well established today that you have the most famous cone |
| 3483 | of silence since Agent 86. |
| 3484 | But that is not where my questioning is going to go today. |
| 3485 | I have a 30-year career, had a 30-year career as a real estate |
| 3486 | broker before I came here and part of being a real estate broker, |
| 3487 | it was very important to people the energy efficiency of their |
| | |

homes. And when they were looking for a new home they looked at that Energy Star certified program, things that complied with that. In your testimony you talk about the Energy Star program and how it helps businesses and consumers save money by reducing their energy use. The Energy Star program provides consumers with accurate information about what products and systems deliver high quality energy savings, as you know.

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

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

Congressman, has been extremely successful from the

public-private partnership and there is actually a rulemaking

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

to establish fees that will, you know, support that program. I

think the concern has been just the long-term stability and

viability of the program. So we are in the process now of

preparing for that and it is something we are committed to and

I think it has been very successful.

Mr. Long. Okay. I think that it is important to both the regulating community and the public that the government speak with one consistent voice. I know from experience, you talk to people,

3512 if they call an IRS office they may call 7 different days and get eight different answers and depending on which office they call. 3513 3514 What are your plans for ensuring the EPA's policy positions are 3515 implemented consistently across government including the EPA 3516 headquarters and the EPA regional offices in litigation and 3517 enforcement? And I was just using IRS as an example because that is somewhere a lot of people get a lot of different answers, so 3518 3519 for the EPA. 3520 It is a very important question because we have Mr. Pruitt. 3521 ten regions across the country and what we have seen from a 3522 compliance and assistance prospective, enforcement, permitting, 3523 many, many issues, a great inconsistency. And so we are in the 3524 process of going through a Lean program at the Agency evaluating 3525 metrics. 3526 I am sorry, what program? Mr. Long. 3527 It is a management program to ensure that we 3528 are committed to metrics. 3529 Mr. Long. What did you call it? What was the --3530 Mr. Pruitt. It is Lean. 3531 Lean, okay. Mr. Long. 3532 It is a private, but I have a person, a Mr. Pruitt. Yes. 3533 COO that is dedicated to ensuring that we are setting metrics objectives at each of the regions and that there is verticality, 3534 3535 uniformity from headquarters to the regions and across the country

to ensure on compliance, assistance, permitting, all these various issues that we don't see this dispersion and great variety.

Mr. Long. On these EPA proposed rule revisions which recognize the importance of the states overseeing the implementation of the program regulating coal combustion residuals, I believe that oversight is critical. Has your agency given more thought to adjusting deadlines imposed under the existing federal rules so the states have time to get their programs developed and approved by the EPA?

Mr. Pruitt. There has been consideration of that yes, and I think you make a great point about the timeline that states need to develop their own programs. We provide a guidance in that regard to the states, but they need time to adopt and implement those programs. And so both are very important trying to address the impending deadlines but also work with the states to achieve the startup of their programs.

Mr. Long. With Oklahoma being a neighbor to Missouri, I am sure that you know that electric power providers in Missouri rely on a balanced portfolio of energy inputs including a large amount of coal for our energy. Is it still your plan to undertake a timely repeal of the carbon regulations for power plants?

Mr. Pruitt. If you are referring to the Clean Power Plan of the previous administration, you know, that is in the

3560 marketplace today, yes. 3561 Okay. And those regulations were dependent on 3562 the last EPA's official finding that carbon endangers the 3563 Is EPA planning on revisiting that endangerment environment. finding also? 3564 3565 Mr. Pruitt. You know, our focus has been in the Clean Power 3566 Plan and addressing that from a rulemaking perspective. 3567 has been our focus today. 3568 Okay. And Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 3569 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair 3570 recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Butterfield, 3571 for 5 minutes. 3572 Mr. Butterfield. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. 3573 Mr. Administrator, I have been listening to your testimony 3574 here in the committee room, and back in my office I have been 3575 watching it very constantly on television. And I must tell you this is very disturbing what I am hearing today. 3576 One of the most 3577 alarming aspects that I have heard concerns your expenditures. 3578 I am going to call them your outlandish expenditures on security. 3579 And what is even more alarming to me is the fact that there 3580 has been an obvious practice of retaliation against EPA employees 3581 who question your spending. And you are a lawyer, I read your 3582 You have been a civil servant for many years and you have 3583 done a lot of great things. You must certainly know that

3584 whistleblower protections are essential to ensuring fairness and 3585 But according to press accounts, five EPA staff good government. 3586 members were fired or reassigned after questioning your spending 3587 or advising you that you need to notify Congress of expenditures 3588 Now the nonpartisan GAO office has now validated over \$5,000. 3589 those employees finding that you broke the law. That is not the 3590 Democrats or any other political group. That is the nonpartisan 3591 Government Accountability Office has now validated those 3592 employees, finding that you broke the law in failing to notify 3593 the Congress. Now do you intend to hold yourself or your staff 3594 accountable for this action? 3595 Mr. Pruitt. First, I want to say I know of no instances, 3596 Congressman, where a decision has been made on employment status 3597 related to spending or any recommendations regarding spending. 3598 I have said that earlier and I will say it again to you now. 3599 With respect to the accountability --

Mr. Butterfield. But my point is notifying Congress.

Mr. Pruitt. That is an issue that I have addressed already a couple of times here. Office of General Counsel, career individuals at the Agency advised those folks going through the expenditure process that they did not need to notify Congress. GAO came out recently and said otherwise. That notification has taken place. Those individuals, those career individuals that made the decision on that expenditure were following the advice

3600

3601

3602

3603

3604

3605

3606

The

3608 in counsel and the direction of what they knew to be right at the 3609 time. 3610 Mr. Butterfield. So it is your position that you had no 3611 responsibility to notify Congress of these expenditures? 3612 Mr. Pruitt. No, I believe that the decision has been 3613 remedied and it should have been done at the beginning. 3614 was not done and the question is as they made those decisions who 3615 guided that and it was career individuals at the Agency. 3616 Mr. Butterfield. I was further alarmed that the pattern was 3617 extended to the head of the Office of Homeland Security at EPA 3618 who signed off on a February memo finding that you did not face 3619 direct death threats. That person was removed from his role, I 3620 am told, the day that the Senate Democrats revealed the existence The timing of the move clearly suggests an effort 3621 3622 to intimidate, in my opinion, and to deter staff who might share 3623 their concerns with Congress. Any truth to that? 3624 And I think Donna Vizian at the office who heads 3625 our Human Resources area would say the contrary to that. 3626 reference I made earlier to a previous question about Inspector 3627 General and their actual recitations of threats I can provide to 3628 The person to whom you refer does not have all you, Congressman. 3629 the information with respect to the collection of threats. 3630 Mr. Butterfield. Let me take you to question 2, I am running 3631 out of time. Last month you moved to weaken protections from

toxic coal ash which poses serious risks to human health and the environment. I had a coal ash spill in my state of North Carolina and they are still mitigating that damage. The spill that occurred in Kingston, Tennessee caused 30 premature deaths, 200 serious illnesses among workers who cleaned up the spill.

Amazingly, you have proposed weakening the protections despite the hard science proving the dangers caused by the spills. This is unacceptable. Were you aware of these severe worker impacts when you proposed weakening the coal ash rule?

Mr. Pruitt. The specific examples that you refer to, no, I was not aware of those specific examples.

Mr. Butterfield. Last January you delayed the essential protections for farm workers from dangerous pesticides, including delaying protections for minors. That delay has now been thrown out. My staff says thrown out. You and I as lawyers, I guess we would call it something different, dismissed by the courts. Is that true or not true?

Mr. Pruitt. No, it is my understanding that there is a proposal to deal with those age requirements that are being considered but there has not been any final action on that. States, as you know, have age requirements as well and we are contemplating in that process whether those age requirements should be deferred to in this process. But I am not aware of it being final at this point, Congressman.

Mr. Butterfield. Well, let me thank you for your testimony. I have listened to as much as I could today and again I say I am very disappointed with your record at the Agency. It is not commensurate with your record over many, many years in other capacities and your lack of concern for workers is what concerns me most of all. You have wasted taxpayer money. You --

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

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

And thank you for allowing me to sit on this subcommittee. Of

course as you know I sit on the full committee.

Administrator Pruitt, I want to talk about the environmental review and approval process for local projects. With the significant portion of my constituents living on Florida's west coast, I am always concerned about hurricanes as you can understand as well as flooding. However, our area only has two evacuation routes to move residents inland during an emergency. To alleviate this problem, the Pasco County government initiated the Ridge Road Extension Project to create a third evacuation route, but you know they have been working on this since 1997. Can you believe that? Since 1997, for over 20 years, the county has been treading through regulations, filling out forms, and meeting with federal officials to get this public safety project

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

up and running. Okay, so we are talking about again a public safety project we need to save lives, God forbid we had a disaster.

So while they have met with some recent success, and I have been working to help them out, the project still has not received final approval. Administrator Pruitt, what has the Agency done under your leadership to streamline the review of projects particularly when they involve public safety where lives could be on the line, in this case they definitely are on the line, and is permitting improvements something that your EPA workforce assessment, are they addressing these issues?

Mr. Pruitt. It is absolutely a priority. In fact, we began an effort last year before we arrived at the Agency. They didn't know how long it took to actually go through the permitting process, in fact I asked that question upon arrival to give me an idea about the length that it took for permitting and they didn't know the answer. So we have evaluated that data. And I know this won't surprise you but it takes a long time. You have already cited your example.

And so by the end of 2018 we are making changes internal to the Agency. The decision that we make on permits up or down will occur within 6 months starting in January of '19. So that is the effort that we are engaged in. But as you know this is an interagency approach as well and we are collaborating with the Corps of Engineers around some of these issues in making sure that

3704 we have consistency in working with them. 3705 Mr. Bilirakis. Okay, so you say within 6 months beginning 3706 in 2019? 3707 Mr. Pruitt. At the end of this year we will have a plan in 3708 place to execute upon as we begin January of '19. 3709 Mr. Bilirakis. Okay. On the same point, the President 3710 released an infrastructure plan, of course as you know, which 3711 included sections on permitting improvement. One of the 3712 proposals is that one agency, one decision. Is that what you are 3713 referring to, environmental review structure? Another is 3714 allowing for localities to complete a single environmental review 3715 document for a project. Are these things that you could support? 3716 Mr. Pruitt. I do support and I think these are great 3717 recommendations that have been made as part of the infrastructure 3718 package the President and something I hope Congress adopts. 3719 whether it is adopted or not, we are advancing this 6-month review 3720 process internal to the Agency. 3721 Okay. As far as, you know, there are a lot Mr. Bilirakis. 3722 of local governments that can't afford to hire high priced 3723 consultants, as you know. So this is very, very important to them 3724 and they shouldn't be penalized because they can't afford to hire 3725 these high priced consultants. You know, in my area over the 3726 years they have spent a lot of money on this project and but I 3727 am sure that there are examples all over the country where it has 3728 taken many, many years. So I appreciate you working with me on 3729 this and hopefully we get approval soon. 3730 Mr. Pruitt. Thanks, Congressman. Mr. Bilirakis. 3731 I thank you very much and I yield back. 3732 The gentleman yields back his time. Mr. Shimkus. 3733 recognizes the gentlelady from Florida, Representative Castor, 3734 for 5 minutes. Well, thank you, Chairman Shimkus, for allowing 3735 3736 me to participate in the hearing today. 3737 Mr. Pruitt, your pattern of unethical conduct and conflicts 3738 of interest are now very well known, but I am very troubled by 3739 your failure to take personal responsibility for your actions. 3740 You simply dismissed all of the ethical lapses at the beginning 3741 of your testimony as troubling media reports so I think that is 3742 a failure in leadership. 3743 But the point I want to make today is that those costs, your 3744 wasteful spending, those costs pale in comparison to the damage 3745 you are doing to the health of American families and the assault 3746 on our clean air and clean water protections, our protections 3747 against dangerous chemicals and pesticides. Mr. Pallone 3748 highlighted the issue of the dangerous paint stripper, methylene 3749 chloride, at the beginning, that is known to have caused over 50 3750 deaths and yet the EPA under your administration now has, you say 3751 we are stalled, we don't have a final decision, but in essence

3752 you have turned a blind eye to those families.

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

But you have set a pattern here. America's pediatricians are outraged. Public health advocates are outraged and so am I, because we are talking about the development of brain in babies and children. We are talking about not just children that might be in farmlands, but they live and work or they live and play in those areas. There were a lot of kids in the audience today and parents who care about this a great deal. It is Take Your Child to Work Day. That was good to have them in here.

So my first question is why are corporate polluter profits more important to you than the health of families and children?

Mr. Pruitt. Well, on the issue that Ranking Member Pallone brought up and this issue that you have raised, I would ask you not to jump to conclusions that there is a final process there.

As you know, the previous administration --

Ms. Castor. But there is a pattern. There is a pattern.

And --

3776 Mr. Pruitt. I am trying to respond. 3777 Ms. Castor. And, you know, your actions belie what you say 3778 when your EPA scientists and public health advocates and 3779 pediatricians all say here is the ban and you come into office 3780 and time and time and time again you are siding with the special 3781 interests and not with the public. 3782 Mr. Pruitt. Yet that solvent that you are referring to is 3783 actually one of the ten priority chemicals that we are reviewing 3784 under TSCA that you authorized. And so we are --3785 Ms. Castor. You are right. And that was a recommendation 3786 that was the action of this committee and you have set the pattern. 3787 And, really, whatever you could say today, I think people need 3788 to look at your actions rather than your rhetoric. 3789 But in addition to your failure to take any responsibility, 3790 I have to say that I am disappointed in a lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that have let the Administrator 3791 3792 off the hook today by barely asking any tough questions. 3793 were a few exceptions and my hat is off to them. Maybe they are 3794 trying to save his job because they are worried if he doesn't 3795 perform well today he could be fired. 3796 Several congressional Republicans have already publicly 3797 called for your firing, but unfortunately not on this committee. 3798 Either way it is embarrassing that most of the Republicans refuse 3799 to take this committee's oversight responsibility seriously and

| 3800 | hold you accountable. They claim to have requested documents |
|------|--|
| 3801 | from the administration regarding Administrator Pruitt's |
| 3802 | misconduct and conflicts of interest, but there is no evidence |
| 3803 | of any investigation. |
| 3804 | Meanwhile, the Democrats on this committee, we have sent |
| 3805 | numerous inquiries to EPA, the Office of Inspector General, the |
| 3806 | GAO, the Office of Special Counsel, and some of those have borne |
| 3807 | out and you have been found in violation of the law. |
| 3808 | Unfortunately, we have yet to see any real effort from my |
| 3809 | colleagues on the other side of the aisle. |
| 3810 | So I have been keeping a list today as well, Mr. |
| 3811 | Administrator, of the unanswered questions because you often say |
| 3812 | it is not final, we are looking at this, the jury is out. But |
| 3813 | you failed to give direct responses on a number of questions. |
| 3814 | So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit this list for the |
| 3815 | record of the endless string of questions that Administrator |
| 3816 | Pruitt has not answered today. |
| 3817 | Mr. Shimkus. Let us look at that. Pass it over here, |
| 3818 | please. |
| 3819 | Ms. Castor. Will do. |
| 3820 | And finally close out by saying |
| 3821 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired. |
| 3822 | Ms. Castor Mr. Pruitt, you violated |
| 3823 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentlelady's time has expired. The chair |
| | |

recognizes the gentleman from Maryland for 5 minutes.

Mr. Sarbanes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for being here, Mr. Pruitt. I have been watching you during the hearing and you certainly have the bearing of a man who thinks he is untouchable. I don't know if that is true or not, but I would be careful of that because I don't think Americans go for that and in your position they just want you to protect their air. They want you to protect clean water and they want you to conserve the land.

As has been said by many of my colleagues, EPA under your tenure has been cloaked in secrecy and swamped with ongoing legal and ethical failures. You have refused to release detailed information from your calendar, often provide no advanced notice of where you are going to be, agency career staff we are told have been instructed not to take notes or carry their cell phones, and this level of secrecy has forced a lot of citizens to take the avenue of filing Freedom of Information Act requests. I understand that EPA political leadership has added a new layer of so-called awareness reviews to those requests which can delay the release of information to the public and also limit the amount of information redacted in the responses.

Are you aware that your political appointees are conducting these reviews before information is released to the public, yes or no?

3848 Mr. Pruitt. First, let me say that there has been no 3849 instruction not to take notes or to carry phones. That is simply 3850 fabricated. With respect to the process you are referring to, 3851 the FOIA process is governed by statute. 3852 Mr. Sarbanes. But you have set up these political 3853 appointees to do reviews, are you aware of that? 3854 The Office of General Counsel is conducting Mr. Pruitt. 3855 FOIA reviews. 3856 Okay, all right. You are not aware of that. Mr. Sarbanes. 3857 I am going to move on because as you know we are limited here. 3858 But if that was done that is a pretty clever move. 3859 you last year with concerns about Carl Icahn's role as special 3860 advisor on regulations, potential conflict of interest due to his 3861 financial holdings and outspoken positions on the Renewable Fuel 3862 Standards programs. So here we are a year later, the EPA's 3863 implementation of the RFS programs, specifically the small 3864 refinery waiver provision, is under fire from both farmers and 3865 refiners. My colleague Mr. Green raised the issue of secret waivers. 3866 3867 I want to build on that a little bit. I want to know about CVR 3868 Energy in which Carl Icahn owns a majority stake. Administrator 3869 Pruitt, you met with representatives from Carl Icahn's company, 3870 CVR Energy, in June of 2017. Is that correct?

Mr. Pruitt. If that is what the calendar represents.

3872 Okay. Did Carl Icahn's company apply for a Mr. Sarbanes. 3873 waiver from ethanol blending requirements for any of its refining 3874 facilities? 3875 Mr. Pruitt. I am unsure. 3876 Okay. We will look at the record for that. Mr. Sarbanes. 3877 And did Carl Icahn's company receive a waiver for any of its 3878 refining facilities? 3879 These exemptions are governed by statute as you Mr. Pruitt. 3880 know. 3881 Okay. Well, you are going to find that out Mr. Sarbanes. 3882 for us and we appreciate your following up because that is 3883 important to know because it raises serious questions about 3884 conflicts of interest. I have had the privilege of chairing here 3885 in the Congress the Democracy Reform Task Force. We have been 3886 trying to keep up with the ethical lapses of the Trump 3887 administration, which I will tell you is kind of a full-time job, 3888 and you certainly have been at the center of some of that focus. 3889 To date, five independent federal investigations have been 3890 initiated at this committee's request and more than eight 3891 independent federal reviews are currently underway with respect 3892 to your office. 3893 Yesterday, the Democracy Reform Task Force released another 3894 report in a series that is looking at failures and ethical lapses 3895 within the Trump administration. This one was detailing your

wasteful spending and favors for your friends. It put the interests of dirty polluters ahead of the American people. So this is now available for people to take a look at. It goes through the litany of ethical violations that have come to characterize and be the hallmark of your time in office.

You have really become, I mean it is sad to say it, but you have become in many respects, and you ought to take this to heart as somebody who holds an office in the public trust, you are wearing that mantle today that office of public trust as head of the EPA, something people care deeply about. If you are going to wear that mantle you have to exercise the office with attention to the public interest and not to private interest.

But, unfortunately, you have become the poster child for the abuse of public trust and this goes back a long way. You brought your way of approaching these public offices to the EPA and it has undermined the credibility of that organization. But it is a hallmark of the Trump administration and we are going to continue to demand answers and we are going to continue to hold you accountable in every hearing that you choose to be up here.

I give you credit for coming today, but we are going to continue to hold you accountable for the dereliction of duty that we see. With that I yield back my time.

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

| 3920 | Mr. Welch. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, you, |
|------|---|
| 3921 | with Mr. Flores and I have been working on ethanol. |
| 3922 | Mr. Pruitt, I have heard reports, read reports that as a |
| 3923 | result of the pressure on Midwest ag in response to the retaliatory |
| 3924 | tariffs by China that there is a move by some to increase ethanol |
| 3925 | usage. Can you comment on that very briefly? |
| 3926 | Mr. Pruitt. Well, are you referring to the RVP waiver? |
| 3927 | Mr. Welch. That is correct. |
| 3928 | Mr. Pruitt. Yes. We have been actively evaluating the |
| 3929 | legal authority under the statute to grant the RVP waiver for the |
| 3930 | last several months. And the reason it is taking some time, |
| 3931 | Congressman, is because |
| 3932 | Mr. Welch. I want to interrupt because actually what I am |
| 3933 | talking about, I appreciate the work on ethanol that my colleagues |
| 3934 | have done, but what is reported is that as a result of the tariffs |
| 3935 | that China is imposing on soybeans and grain that there is going |
| 3936 | to be a concession from the Trump administration to go to E15, |
| 3937 | so I will just leave it there. |
| 3938 | I do want to ask you some questions along the lines of how |
| 3939 | you have been running your department. Is it the case that any |
| 3940 | of your predecessors, Republican or Democrat, who have had the |
| 3941 | high responsibility as Administrator of the EPA have had a |
| 3942 | 20-person security detail? |
| 3943 | Mr. Pruitt. I am unaware of previous considerations in that |
| | |

| 3944 | regard. |
|------|--|
| 3945 | Mr. Welch. Is it not at all relevant to you what the |
| 3946 | precedents have been with Republican and Democratic |
| 3947 | administrators in the past? |
| 3948 | Mr. Pruitt. I am just not aware, Congressman, of processes |
| 3949 | prior to my time at the Agency on what was considered and what |
| 3950 | wasn't considered. |
| 3951 | Mr. Welch. All right. Did the taxpayers spend \$30,000 for |
| 3952 | a security detail to accompany you on the trip to Disneyland? |
| 3953 | Mr. Pruitt. I am unsure about that. I mean we took |
| 3954 | Mr. Welch. That is knowable. |
| 3955 | Mr. Pruitt. Yes. The records show that. |
| 3956 | Mr. Welch. All right. So you can determine this. It is |
| 3957 | not like secret stuff. |
| 3958 | Mr. Pruitt. The detail, the law enforcement make those |
| 3959 | determinations on what type of security should be provided, |
| 3960 | whether |
| 3961 | Mr. Welch. You know, I have been listening to a lot of the |
| 3962 | answers and the answers are somebody else knows it, and it really |
| 3963 | is starting to seem like there is something on your desk with a |
| 3964 | motto that says the buck stops nowhere, and you are the guy who |
| 3965 | is in charge. |
| 3966 | Mr. Pruitt. Yet, Congressman, I have made decisions to |
| 3967 | switch and make sure, make changes from first class back to coach. |

3968 I rescinded the pay raises to those individuals. 3969 Mr. Welch. No, I get it. 3970 Mr. Pruitt. In fact that has happened. 3971 Let me ask you just about this phone booth Mr. Welch. 3972 because it is a metaphor. Are you aware that at the EPA 3973 headquarters there are two secure facilities where private phone 3974 calls could be secure? 3975 And again I didn't request a SCIF. Mr. Pruitt. 3976 a secure communication that was not accessible to my office and 3977 3978 Mr. Welch. I understand that. But you are the boss. So 3979 you tell your folks that you want a secure way of communicating, 3980 reasonable request, they are going to accommodate it. The boss 3981 is the one who has to make certain that it is a reasonable 3982 imposition on taxpayers, or do you disagree with that? 3983 Mr. Pruitt. And in this instance the process failed. As 3984 I indicated in my opening statement, those processes will be 3985 changed going forward. 3986 Mr. Welch. Did you ask the question -- here is the question 3987 that I think a lot of people would ask, Republican or Democrat, 3988 how can I make a secure phone call, and the answer would be well, 3989 Mr. Pruitt, there happens to be two places in this building right 3990 close to your office where you can do that. Had you asked that 3991

| 3992 | Mr. Pruitt. They are not right close to my office. |
|------|--|
| 3993 | Mr. Welch. Pardon me? |
| 3994 | Mr. Pruitt. They are not right close to my office. |
| 3995 | Mr. Welch. Well, how often do you have to use your secret |
| 3996 | phone booth? |
| 3997 | Mr. Pruitt. It is for confidential communications and it |
| 3998 | is rare. |
| 3999 | Mr. Welch. Okay. So on those rare occasions is it too much |
| 4000 | to ask you to walk whatever distance it takes for you to get to |
| 4001 | that secure line? |
| 4002 | Mr. Pruitt. I guess it depends on the nature of the call |
| 4003 | and how urgent the call is. |
| 4004 | Mr. Welch. The point is that you have two locations that |
| 4005 | you can go to when you have to make those rare secure phone calls. |
| 4006 | This is taxpayer money. It is taxpayer money. Let me ask you |
| 4007 | this. Did you have installed or were there installed biometric |
| 4008 | locks on your office? |
| 4009 | Mr. Pruitt. There were problems with locks on two of the |
| 4010 | three doors and changes were made to those locks. No instruction |
| 4011 | was given for biometric locks, but that was a decision made by |
| 4012 | those individuals. |
| 4013 | Mr. Welch. So these things just happen. |
| 4014 | Mr. Pruitt. There was a process at the Agency in that regard |
| 4015 | and there was an evaluation. |
| | |

| 4016 | Mr. Welch. Well, what is a biometric lock? |
|------|--|
| 4017 | Mr. Pruitt. I am not entirely sure. |
| 4018 | Mr. Welch. So do you know, is it the case you don't know |
| 4019 | how to open your door? |
| 4020 | Mr. Pruitt. I just know how to put a code in. Excuse me? |
| 4021 | Mr. Welch. No, seriously. What is a biometric lock? |
| 4022 | Mr. Pruitt. I don't know. I just put a code in. |
| 4023 | Mr. Welch. A biometric lock, it responds as I understand |
| 4024 | it to like fingerprints or some other, your eyes, some physical |
| 4025 | characteristic. |
| 4026 | Mr. Pruitt. That is my understanding as well. |
| 4027 | Mr. Welch. All right, so you have them, right? |
| 4028 | Mr. Pruitt. Those are on, those have been added to the |
| 4029 | office, yes. |
| 4030 | Mr. Welch. Why? |
| 4031 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair |
| 4032 | recognizes the gentleman from Iowa for 5 minutes, Mr. Loebsack. |
| 4033 | Mr. Loebsack. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for |
| 4034 | allowing me to waive on to this subcommittee. I do appreciate |
| 4035 | that. |
| 4036 | Mr. Pruitt, I share a lot of the concerns my colleagues have |
| 4037 | voiced today on the ethics front, but I am actually here to talk |
| 4038 | about an issue that as you might imagine I am from Iowa so of utmost |
| 4039 | importance to my state, to my district. During your confirmation |
| | |

process you stated that you would work to uphold the Renewable Fuel Standard and over the last 2 years President Trump has pledged on numerous occasions to support the RFS, in fact time and time again he has pledged to support it. However, over the last several weeks, information has been revealed that makes me question that commitment as you might imagine.

Various reports have indicated that the EPA has granted so-called economic hardship exemptions to numerous refiners who appear to be neither small nor financially distressed. You know what the law says, it has to be 75,000 gallons or less to be granted that economic hardship waiver. I can tell you I have heard directly from my constituents, farmers and many others, and from farmers across the country who are extremely troubled by this action. And this comes at a particularly difficult time in farm country as you know when we have had low prices, we have seen farm income trending downward, and industry profits are soaring.

I am extremely disappointed in the action as you might imagine and the lack of transparency and accountability in the process is also unacceptable. Under section 211 of the Clean Air Act, the EPA administrator is required to reassign gallons that are waived under the small refinery exemption to other obligated parties. Because this entire waiver process has happened, really, without any transparency whatsoever, I am disappointed, my constituents are disappointed, and we really have no idea

| whether those gallons have been reassigned as required by law. |
|---|
| So my first question, Mr. Pruitt, yes or no, have you |
| reassigned these gallons as required by law? |
| Mr. Pruitt. It is my understanding that the process has |
| happened as it is supposed to under the statute. |
| Mr. Loebsack. Well, we are going to need that. And how do |
| you plan to reassign then the gallons you waive for going forward |
| for the 2019 RVO? |
| Mr. Pruitt. And I do think your question is very important |
| with respect to the volume obligation, Congressman. And when you |
| think about the commitment of this administration to the RFS, the |
| point of obligation was denied as you know. That was a big issue. |
| Mr. Loebsack. But that is not my point. I am talking about |
| the waivers. |
| Mr. Pruitt. No, I know. I understand. |
| Mr. Loebsack. And I would like to move on to my next question |
| if I could. Yes or no, do you intend to inform this committee |
| and the public about the details behind these waivers such as which |
| refiners received a waiver? |
| Mr. Pruitt. Subject to the confidential business |
| information or other information that would be the only thing that |
| would not be available. |
| II |
| Mr. Loebsack. Well, Mr. Pruitt, we just want to know who |
| |

| 4088 | why that would be considered confidential business information. |
|------|---|
| 4089 | Reports have indicated that 25 refiners received waivers from |
| 4090 | their obligations. Is that number accurate? |
| 4091 | Mr. Pruitt. That was actually in 2017, I think. The |
| 4092 | applications are still pending in 2018. |
| 4093 | Mr. Loebsack. What is the number at the moment? |
| 4094 | Mr. Pruitt. It is over that number for 2018, as I understand |
| 4095 | it. |
| 4096 | Mr. Loebsack. Did you discuss these exemptions with the |
| 4097 | White House? |
| 4098 | Mr. Pruitt. There is ongoing discussions with the White |
| 4099 | House on various issues around the RFS program. |
| 4100 | Mr. Loebsack. Who at the White House specifically was |
| 4101 | involved? |
| 4102 | Mr. Pruitt. I think the NEC in consultation with the Air |
| 4103 | Office. |
| 4104 | Mr. Loebsack. Did you brief the President on these waivers? |
| 4105 | Mr. Pruitt. Well, as I indicated this was a dialogue amongst |
| 4106 | staff members, NEC and Air Office, at our shop. So. |
| 4107 | Mr. Loebsack. Has anybody explained to the President the |
| 4108 | substantial impact that these waivers have on the ethanol |
| 4109 | industry? Some have estimated a billion gallons. |
| 4110 | Mr. Pruitt. I am sure it has come up in many discussions. |
| 4111 | Mr. Loebsack. And moving on, you told me and many others |

4112 that EPA is studying whether it has the legal authority to grant 4113 That was the last time that I waived on to this the RVP waiver. 4114 committee and we talked about that issue. And that seems like 4115 it is taking quite a while as you might imagine for many of us 4116 in corn country, and with the President's recent remarks which 4117 were referenced here about his interest in year-around E15, I am 4118 wondering what the holdup is on this at this point. 4119 Mr. Pruitt. It is just trying to ensure that the legal basis 4120 is solid because there will be litigation that will ensue. 4121 Mr. Loebsack. Well, do you plan to move forward and grant 4122 the RVP waiver and allow year-round sales of E15? 4123 Mr. Pruitt. I intend to finish that process very soon to 4124 make --Yes. Hopefully, the sooner the better 4125 Mr. Loebsack. 4126 because this is something that obviously is very important not 4127 only to my state and my district, many folks around the country. 4128 So we are looking forward to that. And of course refinery 4129 executives have called your action on the hardship waivers, to 4130 go back to that, quote, giving out trick or treat candy, unquote, 4131 to their industry. And I am here to tell you that farmers are 4132 very disappointed by this. They have been waiting for years for 4133 the E15 waiver year-around. 4134 And, Mr. Chairman, I think this program is in need of 4135 substantial oversight, the waiver program and certainly the E15

| 4136 | as well. And these actions I don't think can happen in secret. |
|------|---|
| 4137 | I know that was addressed earlier in this hearing. We need to |
| 4138 | make sure that these waivers are not abused as a financial windfall |
| 4139 | for special interests and I look forward to working with you, Mr. |
| 4140 | Chairman, on this further. And I yield back. Thank you very |
| 4141 | much. |
| 4142 | Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman yields back his time. The chair |
| 4143 | recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico, Mr. Lujan, for 5 |
| 4144 | minutes. |
| 4145 | Mr. Lujan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. |
| 4146 | Administrator Pruitt, you seem to view the EPA budget as a |
| 4147 | personal slush fund, redirecting resources to your personal |
| 4148 | travel that should go to environmental protection. During your |
| 4149 | tenure you have spent more than \$160,000 on travel in first class, |
| 4150 | on private jets, and on military craft. Public office is a public |
| 4151 | trust and I think flying coach is the least we can do to deserve |
| 4152 | that trust. |
| 4153 | My question for you is this. When you are paying for your |
| 4154 | own airfare with personal funds do you fly coach? |
| 4155 | Mr. Pruitt. I follow the security recommendations of my |
| 4156 | team when I pay for it personally as well. |
| 4157 | Mr. Lujan. Will you commit to reimbursing taxpayers for |
| 4158 | your luxury travel? |
| 4159 | Mr. Pruitt. You refer to it as luxury travel and the |
| | |

4160 \$160,000 that you refer to pales in comparison to the previous 4161 I think you are referring to international administrations. 4162 I took two international trips. Previous 4163 administrations took multiple trips and spent far more than that. 4164 These decisions about security detail, who attends and what they 4165 do to provide protection happened according to law enforcement 4166 recommendations and that is what I followed. 4167 It has been recently reported by EPA ethics Mr. Lujan. 4168 officials that on at least two personal trips you flew in coach 4169 on Southwest Airlines using a companion pass from Ken Wagner, your 4170 subordinate at the EPA. Clearly a plane ticket has more than 4171 nominal value. Are you aware that federal ethics rules prohibit 4172 you from accepting gifts from subordinates? 4173 And that is not represented accurately what you 4174 We actually flew like carpooling. We shared costs from 4175 Oklahoma --4176 Did Ken Wagner give you the boarding pass? 4177 Mr. Pruitt. There was no gift whatsoever. 4178 All right, well, I think that those ethics Mr. Lujan. 4179 officials will continue to look into that. 4180 Mr. Pruitt, your travel since becoming administrator has 4181 taken you to Morocco, Italy, and to luxury resorts around the 4182 We have even heard from Kevin, a political United States. 4183 appointee who worked in your office that you told staffers to,

quote, find me something to do, close quote, in order to schedule travel to your desired destinations. Unfortunately, it seems your desired destinations have rarely included low-income communities and communities of color facing serious environmental risks.

The biggest problem with the pay-to-play system is that those most at risk are also the most unable to pay for your attention and concern. Of your extensive travel spending how much would you say you spend visiting low-income communities and communities of color?

Mr. Pruitt. I wouldn't consider East Chicago, which I have made trips there, I was in Region 5 recently this week, and San Jacinto in Houston as indicated earlier. The trip to Italy was a G7 trip occurring a week after the Paris decision. I was there for 4 days around the G7. There is a free trade agreement that is in existence in Morocco and the ambassador of Morocco invited me to Morocco to negotiate the environmental chapter on that free trade agreement. Both of those things are very important to the scope of our duties at the EPA.

Mr. Lujan. Mr. Administrator, you have gone to great lengths to keep your calendar secret but what has come out is it is clear that most of your meetings and stakeholders have been with industry and not impacted communities. I think we can agree with that. Do you see the problem with granting greater access

4208 to polluting industries than impacted communities? 4209 I have met with stakeholders across the country Mr. Pruitt. 4210 on these issues, people that we regulate that their voices have 4211 not been heard for many years. Those farmers and ranchers that 4212 I have met with, they are our first environmentalists and first 4213 conservationists. 4214 Do you understand that you have a responsibility Mr. Lujan. 4215 to protect the health and environment of low-income, minority, 4216 tribal, and indigenous communities? 4217 Mr. Pruitt. Absolutely. 4218 Throughout your brief tenure as EPA 4219 Administrator you have directed significant policy changes made 4220 with disproportionately harm to low-income, minority, tribal, and 4221 indigenous communities. The repeal of the once in, always in 4222 policy mentioned by my colleague, Ms. Dingell, for example, the 4223 weakening of coal ash regulations is another. But Mr. Pruitt, 4224 today you repeatedly blamed your chief of staff, your chief 4225 counsel, career officials, and others. Yes or no, are you the 4226 EPA Administrator? 4227 I said that in my opening statement, 4228 And I didn't blame anyone. I just simply shared Congressman. 4229 facts with you as --4230 Mr. Lujan. Mr. Administrator, it is just a simple yes or 4231 no question, sir. Are you the EPA Administrator?

| 4232 | Mr. Pruitt. I said in my opening statement that I take |
|------|---|
| 4233 | responsibility. I have made changes historically and making |
| 4234 | changes going forward and I simply have not failed to take |
| 4235 | responsibility. I have simply recited the facts of what has |
| 4236 | occurred. |
| 4237 | Mr. Lujan. It is a simple question, Mr. Pruitt. Are you |
| 4238 | the EPA Administrator? |
| 4239 | Mr. Pruitt. Yes. |
| 4240 | Mr. Lujan. Just to be clear, do you run the EPA? |
| 4241 | Mr. Pruitt. I do. |
| 4242 | Mr. Lujan. Yes or no, are you responsible for the many, many |
| 4243 | scandals plaguing the EPA? |
| 4244 | Mr. Pruitt. I have responded to many of those questions here |
| 4245 | today with facts and information. |
| 4246 | Mr. Lujan. Are you able to answer that in yes or no? |
| 4247 | Mr. Pruitt. That is not a yes or no answer, Congressman. |
| 4248 | Mr. Lujan. It is pretty simple that it is a yes or no answer |
| 4249 | here. There is clear concern with what has been happening not |
| 4250 | just by the entire Congress. And I appreciate you being here |
| 4251 | today, but these questions need to be asked and answered. |
| 4252 | Mr. Pruitt. And we have answered them today. |
| 4253 | Mr. Lujan. And you are not the only one that has been doing |
| 4254 | these ugly things, these horrific things, these scandal-plagued |
| 4255 | things in this administration, and I hope this is one of many |

4257 of this and make sure taxpayers are made whole. 4258 Mr. Shimkus. The gentleman's time has expired. 4259 Seeing there are no further members wishing to ask questions 4260 I would like to thank our witness for being here today. 4261 we conclude I would like to ask unanimous consent to submit the 4262 following documents for the record, I just want to make sure I 4263 get them all in, letter to the chairman and ranking member from 4264 Lauren Atkins; report from GAO on EPA's use of fiscal year 2017 4265 appropriations; letter from the American Association for the 4266 Advancement of Science; Mr. Rush Holt; article from the Roanoke 4267 Times; questions from Ms. Castor; letter from the American 4268 Geophysical Union; letter from 985 scientists. In pursuant to committee rules, I remind members that they 4269 4270 have 10 business days to submit additional questions for the 4271 record and I ask that witnesses submit their questions within 10 4272 business days upon receipt of the questions. 4273 Without objection, the subcommittee is adjourned. 4274 [Whereupon, at 1:41 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

hearings that this committee will have so we can get to the bottom