



COMMITTEE ON
ENERGY & COMMERCE
RANKING MEMBER FRANK PALLONE, JR.

DEMOCRATS

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

June 15, 2015

CONTACT

Christine Brennan — (202) 225-5735

**Statement of Ranking Member Frank Pallone, Jr., as prepared for delivery
Committee on Energy and Commerce
Subcommittee on Energy and Power
Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade
Hearing on “EPA’s Proposed Ozone Rule: Potential Impacts on Manufacturing”**

Thank you, Chairmen Whitfield and Burgess and Ranking Members Rush and Schakowsky for holding this hearing on EPA’s proposed ozone standard. I also want to welcome all of our panelists.

We heard some great things about the importance of the proposed ozone rule last week from EPA Acting Assistant Administrator Janet McCabe. Under the proposed standard, we would see tremendous public health benefits. EPA’s new standard will avoid nearly one million asthma attacks, millions of missed school days, and thousands of premature deaths.

EPA estimates these benefits would range from \$13 to \$38 billion dollars annually—outweighing the costs by approximately 3-to-1. In addition, it is consistent with the law and scientific evidence.

The proposed ozone standard is part of a set of health-based air quality standards, which make up the foundation of the Clean Air Act. These standards are based on scientific evidence alone, and have been extremely effective in cleaning the air and protecting public health.

The current 75 parts per billion standard is weaker than the facts would allow. So, EPA has proposed, based on a complete review of the scientific evidence, to revise the standard to fall within 65 to 70 parts per billion as recommended.

I am sure today we will hear more about the costs than these benefits. Yet, a unanimous Supreme Court opinion, written by Justice Scalia, made it clear that EPA’s approach for determining a safe level of air pollution is correct, and cost may not be considered.

During today’s hearing, I urge everyone to keep in mind that the grossly inflated estimate of the rule’s projected costs fail to consider any of the benefits associated with reducing ozone

pollution. This ignores the real costs of poor air quality that are borne by those who breathe, especially children.

We will also be told that EPA's proposed standard will have dire consequences for economic growth. But the history of the Clean Air Act is one of exaggerated claims by industry that have never come true. In reality, the Act has produced public health benefits while supporting economic growth.

As I said last week, EPA's ozone standard is long overdue. And this rule will help put us on the path to reaching the goal of the Clean Air Act—clean air for all Americans. Thank you.

###