



**U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Energy and Commerce
Minority Staff**

**The Anti-Environment Record of the U.S. House of Representatives
112th Congress**

Final Summary of the 2011-2012 Congressional Session

Prepared for:

**Rep. Henry A. Waxman
Ranking Member
Committee on Energy
and Commerce**

**Senator Edward J. Markey
Former Ranking Member
Committee on Natural
Resources**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
I. Undermining the Clean Air Act.....	11
A. Vote to Repeal the Clean Air Act’s Health-Based Standards.....	11
B. Votes to Block Regulation of Emissions from Power Plants	12
C. Votes to Block Regulation of Emissions from Incinerators and Industrial Boilers.....	14
D. Votes to Block Regulation of Emissions from Cement Plants	16
E. Votes to Curtail Regulation of Emissions from Offshore Drilling Operations	18
F. Votes to Block Regulation of Particulate Emissions from Mines and Other Sources	19
II. Removing Protections for Public Lands, Fish, and Wildlife.....	22
A. Votes to Block Protection of Forests and Other Wilderness Areas	22
B. Votes to Block Protection of Salmon and Other Wildlife	22
C. Votes to Benefit Mining Companies.....	24
D. Votes to Undermine “Multiple Use” Principle for Public Lands.....	26
III. Blocking Efforts to Prevent Climate Change.....	27
A. Votes to Reject Scientific Findings.....	27
B. Votes to Block Action to Reduce Carbon Pollution	31
C. Votes to Block International Action on Climate Change.....	34
D. Votes to Block Adaptation Planning	35
IV. Undermining the Clean Water Act.....	36
A. Votes to Repeal EPA’s Authority to Set Water Quality Standards and Enforce Discharge Limits	36
B. Votes to Block Oversight of Mountaintop Removal and Other Types of Coal Mining.....	37
C. Votes to Block Protections for Wetlands and Tributaries	39
D. Votes to Block Other Pollution Protection Initiatives.....	40
E. Votes to Cut Water Quality Funding.....	41
V. Reducing Funding for Environmental Protection	42
A. H.R. 1, Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011	42
B. FY2012 Budget and Appropriations Bills	43
C. FY2013 Budget and Appropriations Bills	45
VI. Cutting Support for Clean Energy Technologies and Programs	46
A. Votes to Cut Funding for Clean Energy Programs	46
B. Votes to Block Energy Efficiency Standards.....	49
VII. Allowing Unsafe Disposal of Toxic Coal Ash	51
VIII. Obstructing the Regulatory Process	53
A. The Regulatory Accountability Act (H.R. 3010)	53
B. The REINS Act (H.R. 10)	54
C. The Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act (H.R. 527)	54
D. Red Tape Reduction and Small Business Job Creation Act.....	55
IX. Enriching the Oil and Gas Industry.....	56
A. Votes to Block or Limit Regulation of Oil and Gas Operations.....	56
B. Votes to Open New Offshore Areas to Oil and Gas Drilling.....	58
C. Votes to Open New Onshore Lands to Oil and Gas Drilling.....	60
D. Votes to Block Clean Energy Alternatives.....	60
E. Votes to Preserve Oil Industry Tax and Royalty Breaks	61
F. Votes to Curtail Review of the Keystone XL pipeline.....	62
X. Conclusion.....	65

Executive Summary

The House of Representatives in the 112th Congress was the most anti-environment House in the history of the institution. In 2011 and 2012, the House voted 317 times to undermine protection of the environment.

House Republicans repeatedly voted to undermine basic environmental protections that have existed for decades. They voted to block actions to prevent air pollution; to strip the Environmental Protection Agency of authority to enforce water pollution standards; to halt efforts to address climate change; to stop the Department of the Interior from identifying lands suitable for wilderness designations; to allow oil and gas development off the coasts of Florida, California, and other states opposed to offshore drilling; and to slash funding for the Department of Energy, including funding to support renewable energy and energy efficiency, by more than 80%.

The House of Representatives averaged almost one anti-environmental vote for every day the House was in session during the 112th Congress. Of the 1,300 legislative roll call votes taken in the House in the 112th Congress, 23% – almost one out of every four – were votes to undermine environmental protection. During these roll calls, 94% of Republican members voted for the anti-environment position, while 87% of Democratic members voted for the pro-environment position.

The Environmental Protection Agency was the most popular target of House Republicans. Of the 317 anti-environment votes, 145 targeted EPA; 81 targeted the Department of the Interior; and 55 targeted the Department of Energy.

This analysis, prepared at the request of Rep. Henry A. Waxman, Ranking Member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and Senator Edward J. Markey, formerly the Ranking Member of the Committee on Natural Resources, provides a summary of the 317 times that House Republicans voted to weaken environmental protections in the 112th Congress. Among these votes are:

- **95 votes to undermine Clean Air Act protections**, including votes to repeal the health-based standards that are the heart of the Clean Air Act and to block EPA regulation of toxic mercury and other harmful emissions from power plants, incinerators, industrial boilers, cement plants, and mining operations.
- **67 votes to weaken protection of public lands and wildlife**, including votes to halt reviews of public lands for possible wilderness designations and to remove protections for salmon, wolves, sea turtles, and other species.
- **53 votes to block action to address climate change**, including votes to overturn EPA's scientific findings that climate change endangers human health and welfare; to block EPA from regulating carbon pollution from power plants, oil refineries, and vehicles; to prevent the United States from participating in international climate negotiations; and even to cut funding for basic climate science.
- **38 votes to undermine Clean Water Act protections**, including votes to strip EPA of authority to set water quality standards and enforce limits on industrial discharges; to repeal

EPA's authority to stop mountaintop removal mining disposal; and to block EPA from protecting headwaters and wetlands that flow into navigable waters.

House Republicans also voted repeatedly to cut funding for environmental protection. House Republicans voted to reduce EPA's funding by 29% in 2011 and 18% in 2012. They voted for a budget that slashed funding for the Department of Energy, including funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency, by more than 80% by 2020. And they proposed cutting funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which acquires new lands for recreation and wildlife protection, by 78% this year alone.

Other notable anti-environment votes were votes to undercut EPA's authority to regulate the disposal of toxic coal ash and to erect barriers to promulgation of new regulations that protect health and the environment.

The oil and gas industry has been the largest beneficiary of the anti-environment votes in the House. During the 112th Congress, the House voted 134 times for anti-environmental policies that enrich the oil and gas industry, including 56 votes to weaken environmental, public health, and safety requirements applicable to oil companies; 46 votes to block or slow deployment of clean energy alternatives and vehicle efficiency standards; and 13 votes to short-circuit environmental review of the Keystone XL pipeline.¹

Often House Republicans bypassed regular order to expedite the repeal of environmental protections. An egregious example is the vote to repeal the health-based standards of the Clean Air Act. This fundamental change to the Act was never considered in hearings or marked up in committee, and the House allowed only five minutes of debate on the floor in opposition to the provision.

The rest of this executive summary provides a brief overview of the 317 anti-environmental votes taken by House Republicans. The body of the report provides more details about many of these votes.

Undermining the Clean Air Act

The Clean Air Act has been extraordinarily successful in reducing air pollution, protecting the health of American families, and supporting economic growth. Since President Nixon signed the original Clean Air Act into law in 1970, the Act has reduced air pollution by 68%. During this same period, the economy has grown by more than 200%, and the number of vehicle miles traveled has grown by 167%.² According to EPA, the Clean Air Act in 2010:

¹ In addition to voting to benefit the oil and gas industry on environmental matters, the House cast numerous votes to advance the industry's interests in other ways. Rep. Ed Markey found that Republicans in the House cast 148 votes for the benefit of the oil and gas industry between January 2011 and July 2012. Committee on Natural Resources, Democrats, *Big Oil Congress: The GOP Record* (online at <http://democrats.naturalresources.house.gov/big-oil-congress>).

² U.S. EPA, *Air Quality Trends, Comparison of Growth Areas and Emissions: 1970-2011* (online at www.epa.gov/airtrends/images/comparison70.jpg) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

saved over 160,000 lives; avoided more than 100,000 hospital visits; prevented millions of cases of respiratory problems, including bronchitis and asthma; enhanced productivity by preventing 13 million lost workdays; and kept kids healthy and in school, avoiding 3.2 million lost school days due to respiratory illness and other diseases caused or exacerbated by air pollution.³

The benefits of the Act have greatly outweighed its costs. By 2020, the net economic benefits of the Act are projected to reach \$2 trillion per year, a benefit to cost ratio of more than 30 to 1.⁴ Investments in pollution control also create jobs. The Institute for Clean Air Companies, which represents manufacturers of air pollution control equipment, estimates that over the last seven years, an EPA rule to curb interstate air pollution resulted in the creation of 200,000 jobs.⁵

Despite these proven benefits, House Republicans repeatedly sought to block EPA clean air protections and repeal provisions central to the success of the Act. In total, House Republicans voted 95 times to undermine implementation of the Act during the 112th Congress.

House Republicans voted to repeal the health-based standards that are the heart of the Clean Air Act. They voted to block EPA regulation of toxic mercury emissions from the largest source of mercury emissions in the United States (power plants) and other major sources (industrial boilers and cement plants). They voted to block EPA regulation of toxic emissions from solid waste incinerators. And they voted to weaken EPA's authority to reduce emissions from oil and gas drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf.

When Rep. Waxman offered an amendment to prevent delay in the regulation of solid waste incinerators and industrial boilers that are emitting mercury at levels harming brain development or causing learning disabilities in infants and children, House Republicans voted 228 to 2 to defeat the amendment. When he offered a similar amendment to prevent any delay in regulation of cement plants with mercury emissions that are harming children, House Republicans voted 234 to 6 to defeat the amendment.

House Republicans even voted to rescind EPA's regulation to reduce emissions of sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides from power plants that cause ozone and particulate matter violations in downwind states. This EPA rule will prevent up to 34,000 deaths, 15,000 heart attacks, 400,000 cases of aggravated asthma, and 1.8 million lost work days each year and produce health benefits of up to \$280 billion annually, outweighing its estimated annual costs by as much as 350 to 1.⁶

³ U.S. EPA, *Empirical Evidence Regarding the Effects of the Clean Air Act on Jobs and Economic Growth* (Feb. 8, 2011) at 2.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ *Id.* at 6.

⁶ U.S. EPA, *Fact Sheet: The Cross-State Air Pollution Rule: Reducing the Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone* (July 18, 2011).

Removing Protections for Public Lands, Fish, and Wildlife

America's public lands and national forests are a treasured source of open space and outdoor recreation. They contain scenic wonders and wilderness areas and provide crucial habitat to fish and wildlife, including endangered species. America's public lands and resources also supported two million jobs and generated \$363 billion in revenue in 2010.⁷ Yet House Republicans voted 67 times to weaken environmental protections on public lands during the 112th Congress.

House Republicans voted to undermine fundamental principles of federal land management and codify that energy production and mining on public lands should take priority over all other uses of those lands, including grazing, hunting, recreation, and conservation. House Republicans voted three times to stop the Secretary of the Interior from reviewing untrammeled public lands for possible wilderness designations. They voted to block implementation of a Bush Administration policy that restricts motorized vehicles from using hiking trails in national forests. And they voted on multiple occasions to remove protections for salmon, wolves, sea turtles, and other endangered species. House Republicans also voted to significantly curtail environmental review of proposed large-scale gold, silver, uranium and other mining operations on public lands and limit public participation in the mine permitting process.

Blocking Efforts to Prevent Climate Change

Climate change is a major threat to the health and welfare of the United States and the rest of the world. The threat is imminent and the potential consequences severe. In November 2011, the International Energy Agency reported:

We cannot afford to delay further action to tackle climate change if the long-term target of limiting the global average temperature increase to 2 degrees Celsius ... is to be achieved. ... If stringent new action is not forthcoming by 2017, the energy-related infrastructure then in place will generate all the CO₂ emissions allowed, ... leaving no room for additional power plants, factories, and other infrastructure unless they are zero-carbon.⁸

Despite the magnitude of the risks and the economic costs of delay, the House voted 53 times during the 112th Congress to block action to address the threat of climate change. House Republicans voted to overturn the scientific findings of the Environmental Protection Agency that climate change endangers human health and welfare. They voted to block EPA from regulating carbon pollution from large stationary sources such as power plants and oil refineries. They even voted to block EPA from working with the Department of Transportation and the automobile industry to develop harmonized greenhouse gas and fuel economy standards for vehicles.

In opposing EPA action to reduce carbon pollution, some members, such as Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Fred Upton (R-MI) and Energy and Power Subcommittee Chairman Ed Whitfield (R-KY), argued that "unilateral" action by the United States could put

⁷ Department of the Interior, *The Department of the Interior's Economic Contributions* (June 21, 2011) at i.

⁸ International Energy Agency, *World Energy Outlook 2011* (Nov. 2011) at 2 (Executive Summary).

domestic companies at a competitive disadvantage.⁹ Yet House Republicans, including Mr. Upton and Mr. Whitfield, voted to stop U.S. participation in international action to address climate change. House Republicans voted to block funding for the State Department's Special Envoy for Climate Change, who represents the United States in international climate negotiations, and to eliminate U.S. funding for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), which is the international body created "to provide the world with a clear scientific view on the current state of knowledge in climate change and its potential environmental and socio-economic impacts."¹⁰ They also voted to prohibit U.S. carriers from complying with European requirements to reduce carbon pollution on flights to Europe. The House Foreign Affairs Committee reported legislation that would bar U.S. funding for the Global Climate Change Initiative, which provides assistance to developing countries dealing with the impacts of climate change.

In other votes, the House voted to cut funding for climate science. In February 2011, House Republicans passed an appropriations bill for FY2011 that cut climate change funding by more than \$100 million. This bill cut funding for EPA's Global Change Research Program, which assesses the impacts of climate change on air and water quality, aquatic ecosystems, and human health in the United States. House Republicans also eliminated funding for EPA's Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program, which requires the largest sources of carbon pollution to disclose their annual emissions. In addition to cutting funding for EPA's work on climate change, the bill eliminated funding for work at other agencies, such as prohibiting the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) from establishing a climate service to provide reliable and authoritative climate data.

The House even voted to prevent federal agencies from spending money to prepare for the effects of climate change. House Republicans voted to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security from using any funds to participate in the Climate Change Adaptation Task Force, which is charged with improving the federal response to climate disasters. Similarly, House Republicans voted to block the Department of Agriculture from implementing its climate change adaptation program, even though climate change is reducing the yields of important food crops in the United States.

Undermining the Clean Water Act

In 1972, Congress enacted – with bipartisan support – the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, better known as the Clean Water Act. The goal of the Clean Water Act is to make all waterways safe for fishing and swimming. Before the Clean Water Act was enacted, water quality in

⁹ See Statement of Chairman Ed Whitfield, *Markup on H.R. 910, The Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011*, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 112th Cong. (Mar. 10, 2011) (saying "why should we act unilaterally and place our employers and our businesses in America in an unfair disadvantage to manufacturers in China and India?"); Statement of Chairman Fred Upton, *Markup on H.R. 910, The Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011*, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 112th Cong. (Mar. 10, 2011) (saying "EPA's regs unilaterally raise energy and operating cost on American manufacturers" and that nations like China "have no intention of burdening their industry with similar restrictions").

¹⁰ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, "Organization" (online at www.ipcc.ch/organization/organization.shtml) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

many rivers and streams was abysmal. The Cuyahoga River in Cleveland actually caught fire. Although many pollution challenges remain, the Clean Water Act has improved water quality significantly. Over the last 20 years, industrial polluters have reduced their direct discharge of 300 toxic chemicals into waterways by more than 70%.¹¹

Despite the benefits of the Clean Water Act, House Republicans voted 38 times during the 112th Congress to undermine key provisions of the Act. They voted to strip EPA of authority to set water quality standards or enforce discharge limits in states that fail to implement the Clean Water Act. They voted to repeal EPA's authority to prevent coal companies from using mountaintop removal mining. And they voted to deny EPA funding to protect wetlands and tributaries that flow into navigable waters. They even voted to block EPA from using the Clean Water Act to regulate the discharge of pesticides into rivers, lakes, and streams.

Reducing Funding for Environmental Protection

In addition to voting to weaken the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and other important environmental laws, House Republicans voted for several appropriations and budget bills that would cut funding for key programs at EPA, the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, and other agencies with responsibility for protecting the environment. These drastic budget cuts threaten the ability of each agency to enforce existing law, conduct scientific research, and implement initiatives designed to protect the environment and public health.

House Republicans voted to cut EPA's FY2011 budget by \$3 billion (29%) and proposed cutting it by \$1.5 billion (18%) in FY2012. The FY2012 Interior appropriations bill that House Republicans brought to the floor virtually eliminated the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which finances the acquisition of new lands for recreation and wildlife protection, cutting its funding by 78%. And the Ryan budget for FY2012, the ten-year fiscal blueprint adopted by House Republicans, cut funding for the Department of Energy, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and other energy programs by more than 80% by FY2020.

Cutting Support for Clean Energy Technologies and Programs

The United States needs an energy policy dedicated to promoting clean, renewable energy, increasing energy efficiency, and reducing dependence on oil, coal, and other fossil fuels. In September 2011, the American Energy Innovation Council – led by business executives such as Microsoft founder Bill Gates and General Electric CEO Jeff Immelt – urged the federal government to invest in clean energy technologies. Their report, *Catalyzing Ingenuity*, stated:

Innovation is the core of America's economic strength and future prosperity. New ideas ... are the key to fostering sustained economic growth, creating jobs in new industries, and continuing America's global leadership. ... [O]f all the sectors in the economy where innovation has a critical role to play, the energy sector stands out.

¹¹ U.S. EPA, Toxics Release Inventory. We looked only at the core chemicals reported in 1988 and compared the volume discharged directly to surface waters in 1988 (41.6 million pounds) with the volume discharged in 2010 (12.3 million pounds).

Ready access to reliable, affordable forms of energy is not only vital for the functioning of the larger economy, it is vital to people's everyday lives. It also significantly impacts the country's national security, environmental well-being and economic competitiveness.¹²

Despite the urgent need to fund and develop new energy technologies, House Republicans voted 57 times during the 112th Congress to oppose clean energy and energy efficiency initiatives. They voted to cut \$775 million (35%) from Department of Energy energy efficiency and renewable energy programs in FY2011, \$487 million (27%) from the same programs in FY2012, and an additional \$400 million (24%) in FY2013. And they voted to slash these and other programs run by the Department of Energy by over 80% by FY2020. At the same time, they voted to increase funding for fossil fuels such as coal and oil. They also voted to block DOE from implementing energy efficiency programs and new light bulb efficiency standards.

Allowing Unsafe Disposal of Toxic Coal Ash

On December 22, 2008, a Tennessee Valley Authority coal ash impoundment in Kingston, Tennessee, ruptured, releasing more than five million cubic yards of toxic sludge and blanketing the Emory River and 300 acres of surrounding land.¹³ As this episode demonstrated, improper disposal of the combustion wastes produced by coal-burning electric utilities can pose a threat to human health and safety. EPA considers 45 coal ash impoundments in 10 states as having "high hazard potential," which means that a failure in the impoundment is likely to cause loss of human life.¹⁴ Unsafe disposal of coal ash can also threaten drinking water by leaching arsenic and other toxic chemicals into drinking water from unlined surface impoundments.¹⁵

Despite these significant risks, House Republicans voted eight times to allow unsafe disposal of toxic coal ash. They voted to block EPA from regulating coal ash as a hazardous waste, to turn regulation of coal ash over to the states, and to defeat amendments that would have ensured that state programs protect human health and the environment. House Republicans voted to prevent EPA from enforcing the requirements of state coal ash programs if the state fails to do so, and they opposed an amendment to require existing impoundments to retrofit to meet modern safety standards.

¹² American Energy Innovation Council, *Catalyzing American Ingenuity: The Role of Government in Energy Innovation* (Sept. 2011).

¹³ U.S. EPA Region 4, *EPA's Response to the TVA Kingston Fossil Plant Fly Ash Release: Basic Information* (online at www.epa.gov/region4/kingston/basic.html) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

¹⁴ U.S. EPA, *Coal Combustion Residues (CCR)—Surface Impoundments with High Hazard Potential Ratings* (Aug. 2009) (online at www.epa.gov/osw/nonhaz/industrial/special/fossil/ccrs-fs/) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

¹⁵ RTI International, *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment of Coal Combustion Wastes (Draft)*, Prepared for U.S. EPA, Office of Solid Waste (Aug. 6, 2007).

Obstructing the Regulatory Process

House Republicans also voted to undermine environmental laws by passing legislation that would have made the issuance of new regulations more difficult, if not impossible. They brought to the floor and passed with unanimous Republican support several bills that would have required agencies to use time-consuming quasi-judicial procedures to issue major rules, added more than 60 new requirements to agency rulemaking, prevented new rules from going into effect unless approved by both the House and Senate, and subjected the rules to new judicial challenges, such as lawsuits contesting the agency's cost-benefit analysis.

Enriching the Oil and Gas Industry

The oil and gas industry has benefited more than any other sector from the Republican-controlled House of Representatives. During the 112th Congress, the House voted 134 times for anti-environmental policies that would advance the interests of the oil and gas industry at the expense of the environment, public health, and the taxpayer. Of the anti-environment votes cast by the House, 42% provided benefits to the oil and gas industry.

Rep. Ed Markey conducted a separate analysis of all votes—not just environmental votes—taken by the House to benefit the oil and gas industry. He found that Republicans in the House cast 148 votes and spent more than 96 hours debating giveaways to the oil industry on the House floor between January 2011 and July 2012.¹⁶

The House voted 56 times to weaken environmental, health, and safety requirements for oil company operations. These included 14 votes to block EPA from regulating carbon emissions from oil refineries and other sources and eight votes to curtail EPA's authority to regulate air pollution from oil and gas activities on the outer continental shelf. They also included 14 votes to weaken safety standards for offshore oil and gas drilling.

Oil and gas drilling can cause massive environmental damage if not well-regulated and safely operated. In April 2010, the explosion and blowout on the Deepwater Horizon oil rig drilling BP's Macondo well in the Gulf of Mexico killed 11 workers and ultimately released more than four million barrels of oil into the surrounding waters, polluting coastal beaches and closing prime fishing grounds. To address these risks, President Obama established a bipartisan National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill, which concluded that "decades of inadequate regulation" was one of the causes of the spill.¹⁷ The Department of the Interior also issued new rules strengthening requirements for safety equipment, well control systems, and blowout prevention practices on offshore oil and gas operations.

¹⁶ Committee on Natural Resources, Democrats, *Big Oil Congress: The GOP Record* (online at <http://democrats.naturalresources.house.gov/big-oil-congress>).

¹⁷ National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling, *Deep Water: The Gulf Oil Disaster and the Future of Offshore Drilling* (Jan. 2011) at 56.

During the 111th Congress, Democrats in the House of Representatives passed bipartisan legislation to address the lessons learned from the Deepwater Horizon accident.¹⁸ But in the 112th Congress, the House Republican majority voted repeatedly against stronger drilling safety standards. House Republicans voted to give safety regulators just 60 days to review complex offshore drilling applications. They also voted against new standards for blowout preventers and well casing and cementing.

While voting to weaken safety requirements, House Republicans also voted 14 times to open new lands and coastal waters to drilling, including the coastal waters off of Florida, California, New Jersey and the majority of the East Coast and sensitive fisheries and marine ecosystems, such as Georges Bank off the coast of New England and Alaska's Bristol Bay.

The House voted 46 times to defund or impede vehicle fuel efficiency and the development of clean energy alternatives that would compete with oil and gas. The House voted six times to preserve tax breaks and royalty loopholes that benefit the oil industry. The House even voted four times against closing a loophole that has allowed oil and gas companies to avoid paying billions of dollars in royalty payments on leases in the Gulf of Mexico and is projected to cost American taxpayers more than \$15 billion over the next decade in foregone revenue.

House Republicans also voted 13 times to curtail environmental review of the Keystone XL pipeline. TransCanada's proposed Keystone XL pipeline would transport up to 830,000 barrels per day of tar sands crude oil from Alberta, Canada, to refineries in the Gulf Coast. This pipeline, which would almost double the quantity of tar sands fuel currently imported to the United States, raises serious environmental concerns because of the risks of leaks and spills and its implications for climate change. Extracting oil from tar sands is significantly more energy-intensive than producing a barrel of conventional oil, resulting in substantially higher greenhouse gas emissions than conventional fuel.¹⁹

In July 2011, House Republicans passed H.R. 1938 to force the Obama Administration to make a decision on the Keystone XL permit by November 1, 2011, and to short-circuit the existing State Department review process. They voted against amendments to require TransCanada to demonstrate an ability to respond to a worst-case pipeline spill; to examine whether current pipeline safety regulations are sufficient to address the risks of transporting tar sands oil; and to require a study of the potential health impacts of air pollution from refineries that increase their processing of tar sands oil. House Republicans voted again in December 2011 to direct the President to approve or disapprove the Keystone XL pipeline within 60 days and without further environmental review.

¹⁸ H.R. 3534, the Consolidated Land, Energy, and Aquatic Resources (CLEAR) Act, passed the House by a vote of 209 to 193 on July 20, 2010.

¹⁹ Natural Resources Defense Council, *GHG Emission Factors for High Carbon Intensity Crude Oils* (Sept. 2010).

I. Undermining the Clean Air Act

A. Vote to Repeal the Clean Air Act's Health-Based Standards

Since 1970, the core of the Clean Air Act has been a set of standards called the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The NAAQS are “health-based” standards because they are set by EPA at a level adequate to protect public health, including the health of sensitive groups such as children and the elderly. Essentially, the NAAQS determine what level of air pollution is “safe” to breathe.

Under the Clean Air Act, economic costs come into play when EPA and the states develop deadlines and plans for achieving the health-based standards. EPA sets deadlines for compliance, which take into account costs and can vary according to difficulty of achieving the standards. The states take costs into account when they develop their plans to control air pollution and attain compliance with the standards. EPA takes costs into account when reviewing these state plans.

This approach has been extraordinarily successful in cleaning the air. EPA has set NAAQS for six air pollutants: ozone, nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), lead, and particulate matter (PM). Between 1980 and 2012, emissions of these six air pollutants dropped by 67%. During the same time period, the nation's gross domestic product increased 133%, vehicle miles traveled increased 92%, energy consumption increased 27%, and U.S. population grew by 38%.²⁰

In September 2011, Rep. Robert Latta (R-OH) offered an amendment on the House floor that would have rewritten 40 years of clean air policy by requiring EPA to consider industry costs when determining what level of air pollution is “safe.” Under the Latta amendment, NAAQS would have ceased to be health-based standards and would instead have been set in part based on economic costs to polluters. The Energy and Commerce Committee held no hearings on the Latta amendment and never considered the amendment in Committee. The House allowed only ten minutes of debate, divided equally between proponents and opponents, on this fundamental change to the Clean Air Act. The Latta amendment passed with only 11 Republicans voting in opposition.²¹

House Republicans included a similar provision in H.R. 4480, the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, again requiring EPA to determine what level of ozone pollution is “safe” based upon industry costs. Rep. Gene Green (D-TX) offered an amendment to strike this provision from the bill. The amendment failed 174-244.²² The bill passed on June 21, 2012.²³

²⁰ U.S. EPA, *Air Quality Trends, Comparison of Growth Areas and Emissions, 1980-2012* (online at www.epa.gov/airtrends/aqtrends.html#comparison) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

²¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.800, Latta Amendment No. 11 to H.R. 2401 (Sept. 23, 2011) (Roll Call No. 738).

²² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1298, Green Amendment to H.R. 4480 (June 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 395).

²³ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 4480 (June 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 410).

B. Votes to Block Regulation of Emissions from Power Plants

Power plants, especially old coal-burning power plants, are the single largest source of air pollution in the United States. They are the largest source of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions, the largest source of nitrogen oxide (NO_x) emissions, and the largest source of toxic mercury emissions. Regardless, House Republicans voted repeatedly to block EPA regulation of emissions from power plants.

Two EPA regulations have been the target of these Republican votes. On March 16, 2011, EPA proposed the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards (MATS) Rule to reduce power plant emissions of hazardous air pollutants, including mercury.²⁴ EPA finalized the rule on December 21, 2011.²⁵ This rule would reduce emissions of mercury, preventing 90% of the mercury in coal from being emitted into the air and cutting emissions of other toxic substances.²⁶ Mercury is a particular concern for women of childbearing age, infants, and children, because studies have linked mercury exposure to nervous system damage, which can impair children's ability to think and learn.²⁷ The rule will also reduce fine particle emissions, producing significant health benefits. According to EPA, this rule will prevent up to 11,000 premature deaths, 130,000 cases of aggravated asthma, and 540,000 days when people miss work each year.²⁸ Its annual health benefits are estimated at \$37 billion to \$90 billion per year compared with economic costs of \$9.6 billion.²⁹

On July 6, 2011, EPA finalized the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, which requires 27 states in the eastern, central, and southern U.S. to reduce sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxide emissions from power plants that cause ozone and particulate matter violations in downwind states.³⁰ EPA estimates that by 2014, the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule will reduce sulfur dioxide emissions in the 27-state region by 73% from 2005 levels and nitrogen oxides by 54% from 2005 levels.³¹ Each year, this rule will prevent up to 34,000 premature deaths, 400,000 cases of aggravated asthma, and 1.8

²⁴ U.S. EPA, *National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Coal and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units and Standards of Performance for Fossil-Fuel-Fired Electric Utility, Industrial-Commercial-Institutional, and Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units*, 76 Fed. Reg. 24976-25147 (May 3, 2011) (proposed rule).

²⁵ U.S. EPA, *National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Coal and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units and Standards of Performance for Fossil-Fuel-Fired Electric Utility, Industrial-Commercial-Institutional, and Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units*, 77 Fed. Reg. 9304-9513 (Feb. 16, 2012) (final rule) (hereinafter "Final Air Toxics Rule").

²⁶ U.S. EPA, *Fact Sheet: Mercury and Air Toxics Standards for Power Plants* (Dec. 21, 2011).

²⁷ National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, *Toxicological Effects of Methylmercury* (2000).

²⁸ U.S. EPA, *Fact Sheet: Mercury and Air Toxics Standards for Power Plants* (Dec. 21, 2011).

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ U.S. EPA, *Federal Implementation Plans: Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone and Correction of SIP Approvals; Final Rule*, 76 Fed. Reg. 48208 (Aug. 8, 2011).

³¹ U.S. EPA, *Fact Sheet, The Cross-State Air Pollution Rule: Reducing the Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter and Ozone* (July 18, 2011).

million days when people miss work or school due to illness.³² Its annual benefits are estimated at between \$120 billion and \$280 billion compared with its estimated annual costs of \$800 million.³³

Despite the overwhelming benefits of these two rules, House Republicans passed H.R. 2401, the Transparency in Regulatory Analysis of Impacts on the Nation (TRAIN) Act, to nullify them and make it difficult, if not impossible, for EPA to issue new standards that are protective of public health. In the case of the MATS Rule, the TRAIN Act would have required EPA to discard the rule, which had not been finalized at the time of the House's consideration of the bill. It also would have prohibited EPA from issuing a new rule for at least two years and barred enforcement for at least five more years, ensuring that no reductions in mercury emissions from power plants would be required for at least seven years. The bill also would have rewritten the standards that EPA must apply in any regulation reducing mercury and other toxic emissions from power plants, making them less protective of public health.³⁴

Throughout the debate, House Republicans argued that this rule is too expensive for industry and would cost jobs. In fact, EPA assessed the impacts of the MATS Rule on jobs and the economy, finding that more jobs will be created in the construction and air pollution control technology production field than may be lost as the result of compliance with this rule.³⁵

In the case of the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, the bill would have nullified the final rule issued in July 2011, prohibited EPA from issuing a new rule for at least five years, and barred enforcement for an additional three years, ensuring that no new SO₂ or NO_x emission reductions would be required for at least eight years. The bill also would have barred EPA from using air pollution modeling to determine when emissions from an upwind power plant cause pollution problems in a downwind state, a provision that EPA said could have blocked the agency from ever successfully issuing a new rule.

In addition to nullifying EPA's power plant regulations, the TRAIN Act would have established an interagency committee to assess the cumulative impacts of EPA regulations on the economy. House Republicans defeated several Democratic amendments to ensure that the analysis of EPA regulations mandated by the bill would have provided a balanced picture of both the costs

³² *Id.*

³³ *Id.*

³⁴ Since 1990, EPA has set numeric emissions limits under section 112 of the Clean Air Act on a pollutant-by-pollutant basis for more than 100 industrial source categories. This approach has been a major success, reducing emissions of carcinogens and other highly toxic chemicals by 1.7 million tons each year. H.R. 2401 would effectively rewrite section 112 for power plants to require EPA to select the regulatory option that is least burdensome to industry, even if another option is feasible, cost-effective, and offers better public health protections. The bill also abandons the proven pollutant-by-pollutant approach in favor of an untried methodology that would require EPA to make subjective decisions about whether emitting more mercury but less lead is better or worse for public health than the reverse. These statutory changes are unlikely to be workable and guarantee years of litigation.

³⁵ Final Air Toxics Rule at 9414.

and the benefits of EPA actions. Rep. Peter Welch (D-VT) introduced an amendment to ensure that the interagency committee would include members with health expertise, including the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control. This amendment also would have required the committee to examine the benefit of EPA rules on air quality, water quality, and public health, not just their economic costs. The Welch amendment failed with only seven Republicans voting in support.³⁶ House Republicans also opposed amendments to require the interagency committee to estimate the impacts of delaying the rules on the incidence of birth and developmental defects and infant mortality;³⁷ to study the impact of EPA regulations on clean energy jobs and companies that export clean energy technology;³⁸ and to identify new opportunities to boost domestic clean energy technology development and manufacturing.³⁹

The TRAIN Act passed on September 23, 2011, with only four Republicans voting in opposition.⁴⁰ House Republicans included a version of the TRAIN Act in the FY2012 funding bill for EPA reported by the Appropriations Committee and H.R. 3409, a package of anti-environment bills favoring the coal industry that passed the House on September 21, 2012.⁴¹ The TRAIN Act did not become law.

C. Votes to Block Regulation of Emissions from Incinerators and Industrial Boilers

After power plants, solid waste incinerators and industrial boilers are among the largest sources of mercury emissions in the United States. They also emit other hazardous air pollutants, such as cadmium, benzene, and dioxins. Acting under a court-ordered deadline, EPA promulgated standards in February 2011 to reduce toxic air pollutants from these sources. After considering additional comments from stakeholders, EPA proposed revisions to these rules on December 2, 2011 and finalized them on December 20, 2012. The revised rules will avert up to 8,100 premature deaths, 52,000 cases of aggravated asthma, and 5,100 heart attacks.⁴² EPA estimated that Americans will receive \$13 to \$29 in health benefits for every dollar spent to meet the new standards.⁴³

³⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.790, Welch Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 2401 (Sept. 23, 2011) (Roll Call No. 728).

³⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.793, Capps Amendment No. 4 to H.R. 2401 (Sept. 23, 2011) (Roll Call No. 731).

³⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.791, McNerney Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 2401 (Sept. 23, 2011) (Roll Call No. 729).

³⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.797, Connolly Amendment No. 8 to H.R. 2401 (Sept. 23, 2011) (Roll Call No. 735).

⁴⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 2401 (Sept. 23, 2011) (Roll Call No. 741).

⁴¹ Section 462 of H.R. 2584 (112th Cong.); U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 3409 (Sept. 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 603).

⁴² U.S. EPA, *Fact Sheet: Adjustments for Major and Area Source Boilers and Certain Incinerators, Summary Overview* (Dec. 21, 2012).

⁴³ *Id.*

Rep. Morgan Griffith (R-VA) introduced H.R. 2250, the EPA Regulatory Relief Act, to nullify the boiler and incinerator rules and to prohibit EPA from finalizing new standards for at least 15 months after enactment. The bill would have prohibited EPA from requiring facilities to comply with any new standards for at least an additional five years and set no final compliance deadline, allowing for indefinite delay. In addition, the legislation would have changed the standards that EPA must apply in any future regulation reducing mercury and other toxic emissions from incinerators and boilers, making them less protective of public health.⁴⁴

During the debate on H.R. 2250, Rep. Waxman offered an amendment to prevent any delay in reducing toxic mercury emissions from waste incinerators and industrial boilers at large chemical and manufacturing facilities if such emissions are harming brain development or causing learning disabilities in infants or children. This amendment was defeated, with Republican members voting 228 to 2 in opposition.⁴⁵

House Republicans rejected similar amendments preventing delays in reducing toxic emissions from incinerators and boilers that are causing respiratory and cardiovascular illnesses and deaths, including cases of heart attacks, asthma attacks, and bronchitis,⁴⁶ or that are increasing the risk of cancer.⁴⁷ Only one Republican supported an amendment to prevent delays in reducing these toxic emissions from incinerators located within five miles of a nursing home, assisted living facility, or hospital.⁴⁸

Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-IL) proposed adding a congressional finding stating that mercury released into the ambient air from incinerators and boilers is a potent neurotoxin that can damage the development of an infant's brain. The National Academy of Sciences has stated that prenatal mercury exposure has "the potential to cause irreversible damage to the developing central nervous system."⁴⁹ The House defeated this amendment, with only two Republicans voting in support.⁵⁰

Rep. Mike Doyle (D-PA) offered an amendment to limit the compliance deadline to five years at most, which is two years more than the three-year deadline in current law. Rep. Doyle

⁴⁴ H.R. 2250 would effectively rewrite sections 112 (for boilers) and 129 (for incinerators). See *supra* note 34.

⁴⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.820, Waxman Amendment No. 9 to H.R. 2250 (Oct. 6, 2011) (Roll Call No. 766).

⁴⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.826, Connolly Amendment No. 18 to H.R. 2250 (Oct. 11, 2011) (Roll Call No. 773).

⁴⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.827, Markey Amendment No. 7 to H.R. 2250 (Oct. 11, 2011) (Roll Call No. 774).

⁴⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Motion to Recommit H.R. 2250 (Oct. 13, 2011) (Roll Call No. 790).

⁴⁹ National Academy of Sciences, *Toxicological Effects of Methylmercury* (2000) at 17.

⁵⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.829, Schakowsky Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 2250 (Oct. 11, 2011) (Roll Call No. 776).

stated that “depending on who the administrator is at the time these rules are finalized, compliance could be required in 5 years, in 10 years, in 50 years, in 105 years. That’s just unacceptable.”⁵¹ This amendment failed, with no Republicans supporting the amendment.⁵²

H.R. 2250 passed on October 13, 2011, without any Republican opposition but did not become law.⁵³

D. Votes to Block Regulation of Emissions from Cement Plants

Along with power plants, solid waste incinerators, and industrial boilers, cement plants are one of the largest sources of mercury emissions in the United States. They also emit other hazardous air pollutants, such as lead, cadmium, benzene, and dioxins.

On August 6, 2010, EPA finalized new rules to reduce emissions of toxic air pollutants from cement kilns. These rules also will reduce emissions of pollutants that cause ozone and fine particle pollution, preventing up to 2,500 premature deaths, 17,000 asthma attacks, and 130,000 days when people miss work each year.⁵⁴ EPA estimates that these rules will generate \$7 billion to \$18 billion in health benefits annually, compared with annual compliance costs of \$350 million, and create a net gain of up to 1,300 jobs.⁵⁵

In February 2011, during the debate on the FY2011 appropriations, Rep. John Carter (R-TX) offered an amendment to block EPA from spending any money to implement or enforce these new cement plant rules. Only seven Republicans voted against this proposal.⁵⁶ House Republicans included similar language blocking the cement rules in the FY2012 appropriations bill for EPA reported by the Appropriations Committee.⁵⁷

Rep. John Sullivan (R-OK) introduced H.R. 2681, the Cement Sector Regulatory Relief Act, to nullify the cement rules and prohibit EPA from finalizing new standards for at least 15 months after enactment. The bill also would have prohibited EPA from requiring facilities to comply with any new standards for at least an additional five years and set no final compliance deadline, allowing

⁵¹ Statement of Rep. Mike Doyle, *Congressional Record*, H6654 (Oct. 6, 2011).

⁵² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.824, Doyle Amendment No. 4 to H.R. 2250 (Oct. 6, 2011) (Roll Call No. 770).

⁵³ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 2250 (Oct. 13, 2011) (Roll Call No. 791).

⁵⁴ U.S. EPA, *Fact Sheet: Final Amendments to National Air Toxics Emission Standards and New Source Performance Standards for Portland Cement Manufacturing* (Aug. 9, 2010).

⁵⁵ *Id.*; U.S. EPA, *Regulatory Impact Analysis: Amendments to the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants and New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry* (Aug. 6, 2010).

⁵⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.88, Carter Amendment No. 165 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 17, 2011) (Roll Call No. 86).

⁵⁷ Section 448 of H.R. 2584 (112th Cong.).

for indefinite delay. In addition, the legislation would have changed the standards that EPA must apply in any future regulation reducing mercury and other toxic emissions from cement plants, making them less protective of public health.⁵⁸

During the debate on H.R. 2681, Rep. Waxman offered an amendment to prevent any delay in reducing toxic mercury emissions from cement plants that have emissions that are harming brain development or causing learning disabilities in infants or children. This amendment was defeated, with Republican members voting 234 to 6 against the amendment.⁵⁹

House Republicans rejected similar amendments preventing delays in reducing toxic emissions from cement plants that are causing respiratory and cardiovascular illnesses and deaths, including cases of heart attacks, asthma attacks, and bronchitis,⁶⁰ or that are increasing the risk of cancer.⁶¹ Only one Republican supported an amendment to prevent delays in reducing these toxic emissions from cement kilns located within five miles of a school, day care center, playground, or hospital.⁶²

Rep. Jan Schakowsky (D-IL) proposed adding a congressional finding to the bill stating that mercury released into the ambient air from cement kilns is a potent neurotoxin that can damage the development of an infant's brain. Rep. Waxman argued for including this finding because the science supports it and the House "can't wish that away. You can't vote it down and say that it's not true."⁶³ The House defeated this amendment, with Republicans voting 238 to 2 against the amendment.⁶⁴

Rep. Bill Keating (D-MA) offered an amendment to limit the compliance deadline for cement kilns to five years at most, which is two years more than the three-year deadline in current law. This amendment failed, with Republicans voting unanimously in opposition.⁶⁵

H.R. 2681 passed on October 6, 2011, with only two Republicans opposing final passage.⁶⁶ The bill did not become law.

⁵⁸ H.R. 2681 would effectively rewrite section 112 for cement plants. See *supra* note 34.

⁵⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.802, Waxman Amendment No. 11 to H.R. 2681 (Oct. 5, 2011) (Roll Call No. 747).

⁶⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.811, Connolly Amendment No. 18 to H.R. 2681 (Oct. 5, 2011) (Roll Call No. 756).

⁶¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.810, Quigley Amendment No. 8 to H.R. 2681 (Oct. 5, 2011) (Roll Call No. 755).

⁶² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Motion to Recommit H.R. 2681 (Oct. 6, 2011) (Roll Call No. 763).

⁶³ Statement of Rep. Henry Waxman, *Congressional Record*, H6593 (Oct. 5, 2011).

⁶⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.805, Schakowsky Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 2681 (Oct. 5, 2011) (Roll Call No. 750).

⁶⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.816, Keating Amendment No. 5 to H.R. 2681 (Oct. 6, 2011) (Roll Call No. 761).

E. Votes to Curtail Regulation of Emissions from Offshore Drilling Operations

Under the Clean Air Act, companies that want to conduct new exploratory drilling operations in the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) must obtain permits under the Clean Air Act if the operations will emit significant air pollution. Permit applicants and others can appeal a permit decision by EPA to the Environmental Appeals Board prior to any review by the courts. In 2010, Native Alaskans and environmental groups filed a successful appeal with the Board to overturn a permit issued by EPA to Shell for exploratory drilling in the Chukchi and Beaufort Seas off Alaska's coast.

During the debate over FY2011 appropriations, Rep. Don Young (R-AK) proposed to block the Appeals Board from using any funds to invalidate a permit issued by EPA for offshore drilling in the Arctic. Rep. Young said the Board was comprised of "bureaucrats who don't want to issue the permits."⁶⁷ Rep. Jim Moran (D-VA) said that the Board is an "impartial board that looks out for the regular citizen" and argued that it had identified flaws in EPA's analysis of Shell's impact on the health of Alaskan Native communities.⁶⁸ The House passed this amendment to the appropriations bill with only nine Republicans voting in opposition.⁶⁹

Rep. Cory Gardner (R-CO) then introduced H.R. 2021, the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act, which would have made significant revisions to Clean Air Act provisions relating to OCS activities. The bill would have limited EPA review of a permit application to six months; eliminated any appeal to the Board, forcing all appeals to be brought in federal court in Washington, DC; blocked EPA from requiring pollution reductions from support vessels, which often comprise the bulk of emissions from a drilling operation; and provided that the impact of emissions from OCS sources must be measured at the shoreline, where the emissions are diluted, rather than at the source, as current law provides.

Although House Republicans said the purpose of H.R. 2021 was to accelerate the permitting process in the Arctic Ocean, the bill was drafted so that it also applied to both the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. California, which has been regulating offshore oil and gas drilling for decades, warned that the bill "could have far-reaching unintended consequences on existing effective protections for public health in California," including protections that are more stringent than federal law.⁷⁰ Delaware stated that the "proposed constraints placed on states' rights and authorities will adversely affect our state's ability to protect public health and welfare from harmful effects of air

⁶⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 2681 (Oct. 6, 2011) (Roll Call No. 764).

⁶⁷ Statement of Rep. Don Young, *Congressional Record*, H1182 (Feb. 17, 2011).

⁶⁸ Statement of Rep. Jim Moran, *Congressional Record*, H1182 (Feb. 17, 2011).

⁶⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.96, Young Amendment No. 533 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 18, 2011) (Roll Call No. 94).

⁷⁰ Testimony of Brian Turner, California Air Resources Board, before the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, Committee on Energy and Commerce, *Hearing on the American Energy Initiative: Discussion Draft of H.R. _____, the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2011*, 112th Cong. (May 13, 2011).

pollution.”⁷¹ Despite these comments, House Republicans rejected an amendment from Reps. Lois Capps (D-CA), John Carney (D-DE), and Kathy Castor (D-FL) to allow states to set more protective standards for offshore drilling. Only ten Republicans voted in support of the states’ rights amendment.⁷²

H.R. 2021 passed the House on June 22, 2011 with only two Republicans opposing the bill.⁷³ House Republicans included the bill in its entirety in the FY2012 appropriations bill for EPA reported by the Appropriations Committee.⁷⁴ In December 2011, Congress passed the Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY2012, which included a provision eliminating the authority of EPA to control air pollution from offshore drilling off the northern coast of Alaska and authorizing the Department of the Interior to address such pollution instead.⁷⁵

F. Votes to Block Regulation of Particulate Emissions from Mines and Other Sources

Under the Clean Air Act, EPA sets air quality standards for fine and coarse particulate matter pollution, which can trigger asthma attacks, heart attacks, and premature death. In 2011 and 2012, the agency was in the process of reviewing these standards to determine whether the scientific and medical evidence merited revising them.

House Republicans claimed that EPA intended to regulate “farm dust” as part of the agency’s review.⁷⁶ To prevent EPA from doing so, Rep. Kristi Noem (R-SD) offered an amendment in February to the FY2011 funding bill to block EPA from using any funds to modify the air quality standards for coarse particles. Only four Republicans opposed this amendment.⁷⁷

In October 2011, EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson informed Congress that she planned to propose retaining the existing standard for larger coarse particles, a standard that has been in place

⁷¹ Testimony of Ali Mirzakhilili, Director, Division of Air Quality, Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, before the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, Committee on Energy and Commerce, *Hearing on the American Energy Initiative: Discussion Draft of H.R. _____, the Jobs and Energy Permitting Act of 2011*, 112th Cong. (May 13, 2011).

⁷² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.488, Capps Amendment No. 8 to H.R. 2021 (June 22, 2011) (Roll Call No. 474).

⁷³ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 2021 (June 22, 2011) (Roll Call No. 478).

⁷⁴ Section 443 of H.R. 2584 (112th Cong.).

⁷⁵ Section 432, Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-74).

⁷⁶ For example, when Rep. Kristi Noem testified before the Committee on Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power on October 25, 2011, she stated: “One of the most overwhelming concerns that I hear about from farmers every day and ranchers back home is the overbearing regulations coming out of the EPA, including the regulation of farm dust.”

⁷⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.164, Noem Amendment No. 563 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 19, 2011) (Roll Call No. 140).

since 1987. Regardless, House Republicans brought to the floor the Farm Dust Regulation Prevention Act (H.R. 1633), which would have blocked EPA from revising the standard and exempted a class of pollution – called nuisance dust in the bill – from the entire Clean Air Act. The bill defined nuisance dust so broadly as to include both fine and coarse particle pollution from industrial sources such as metal and gravel mines, cement kilns, smelters, coal processing plants, and others.

Rep. Waxman offered an amendment to clarify that the bill’s exemption would not apply to particulate matter from mining activities, which can be laced with toxic metals such as lead and mercury. House Republicans opposed this amendment 232 to 2.⁷⁸ House Republicans also voted 232 to 1 against an amendment to ensure that EPA would retain authority to protect public health from particulate matter contaminated with arsenic and other heavy metals.⁷⁹ Only one Republican supported an amendment to ensure that EPA could act to reduce particle pollution if state and local regulations are not adequate to protect public health.⁸⁰

House Republicans voted unanimously to pass H.R. 1633 on December 8, 2011.⁸¹ The bill did not become law. On December 14, 2012, EPA announced that it was strengthening the national air quality standard for fine particles but retaining the existing standards for coarse particles.⁸²

G. Votes to Block Regulation of Pollution from Tailpipes and Oil Refineries

In June 2012, House Republicans considered a bill, H.R. 4480, the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, which would have blocked EPA from finalizing important air quality rules until at least six months after a new interagency committee submitted a final report on the cumulative impacts of numerous EPA programs. The bill could have delayed these rules indefinitely by overriding existing statutory deadlines for the rules and by failing to establish any new deadlines.

One EPA regulation that would have been blocked by the bill is EPA’s “Tier 3” vehicle emissions and fuel standards program to reduce pollution from motor vehicles. According to the National Association of Clean Air Agencies, Tier 3 standards that reduce the amount of sulfur in gasoline would be a highly cost-effective measure for meeting health-based air quality standards, avoiding the need for states and localities “to turn to other, more expensive, less cost-effective

⁷⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.905, Waxman Amendment No. 5 to H.R. 1633 (Dec. 8, 2011) (Roll Call No. 909).

⁷⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.904, Markey Amendment No. 4 to H.R. 1633 (Dec. 8, 2011) (Roll Call No. 908).

⁸⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.902, Christensen Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 1633 (Dec. 8, 2011) (Roll Call No. 907).

⁸¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 1633 (Dec. 8, 2011) (Roll Call No. 912).

⁸² U.S. EPA, *National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter*, 78 Fed. Reg. 3086-3287 (Jan. 15, 2013) (final rule).

measures” to meet air quality standards.⁸³ The bill also would have blocked EPA from issuing rules to reduce toxic air pollution from refineries, which can cause cancer, birth defects, and other serious health problems, as well as rules to reduce carbon pollution from new refineries, which contributes to climate change.

Rep. Waxman offered an amendment to H.R. 4480 to prevent any delay of EPA rules that prevent asthma attacks, heart attacks, cancer, birth defects, neurological damage, premature death, or other serious harms to human health. House Republicans voted 231-2 to defeat this measure.⁸⁴ The bill passed on June 21, 2012 but did not become law.⁸⁵

⁸³ Letter from Gina McCarthy, Assistant Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, to Rep. Ed Whitfield, Chairman, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, Committee on Energy and Commerce (Feb. 27, 2012).

⁸⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1296, Waxman Amendment to H.R. 4480 (June 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 393).

⁸⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 4480 (June 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 410).

II. Removing Protections for Public Lands, Fish, and Wildlife

A. Votes to Block Protection of Forests and Other Wilderness Areas

On December 23, 2010, Interior Secretary Ken Salazar directed the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to work with local communities to inventory public lands and designate certain lands with wilderness characteristics as “Wild Lands.”⁸⁶ Areas designated as Wild Lands would be open to more activities than wilderness areas but would be managed by BLM to preserve their wilderness characteristics while Congress considers whether to add them to the National Wilderness Preservation System.

The House Republicans included language in H.R. 1, the House Republican version of the FY2011 appropriations bill, to block funding for the Secretary’s order.⁸⁷ They also included this funding prohibition in the final funding bill that passed on April 14, 2011, to avert a government shutdown.⁸⁸ The appropriations bill for FY2012 for the Interior Department that House Republicans brought to the floor contained language continuing the prohibition on implementation of the Secretary’s order.⁸⁹ An effort by Rep. Jim Moran (D-VA) to strike this funding prohibition was defeated.⁹⁰

During consideration of H.R. 1, House Republicans also voted 219 to 18 to block the U.S. Forest Service from enforcing a policy to prevent ATVs and motor vehicles from using hiking and other trails on forest lands designated for non-motorized use.⁹¹ The Bush Administration had initiated this policy to manage previously uncontrolled off-road vehicle use in national forests.⁹²

B. Votes to Block Protection of Salmon and Other Wildlife

House Republicans have used funding bills to try to block efforts to preserve salmon and other wildlife. In H.R. 1, House Republicans included language to block implementation of two biological opinions intended to ensure the recovery of threatened and endangered salmon, steelhead, green sturgeon, and other species in the San Francisco Bay-Delta ecosystem.⁹³ The Republicans also

⁸⁶ U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, *Salazar, Abbey Restore Protections for America's Wild Lands* (Dec. 23, 2010).

⁸⁷ Section 1778 of H.R. 1 (112th Cong.).

⁸⁸ Section 1769 of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Pub. L. 112-10) (2011 CR) (112th Cong.).

⁸⁹ Section 124 of H.R. 2584 (112th Cong.).

⁹⁰ H.Amdt.753, Moran Amendment to H.R. 2584. This amendment was defeated by voice vote on July 27, 2011.

⁹¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.123, Herger Amendment No. 177 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 18, 2011) (Roll Call No. 113).

⁹² U.S. Forest Service, *Travel Management; Designated Routes and Areas for Motor Vehicle Use*, 70 Fed. Reg. 68264-68291 (Nov. 9, 2005) (final rule).

⁹³ Section 1475(a) of H.R. 1 (112th Cong.).

included language to prohibit implementation of the congressionally approved San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement, which Congress enacted to resolve decades of litigation and restore water flows and salmon to the San Joaquin River while minimizing water supply impacts to local farmers.⁹⁴ During floor consideration of H.R. 1, House Republicans voted 210 to 28 to block the Department of the Interior from completing a comprehensive environmental review of the impact of removing four dams on the Klamath River to restore salmon populations.⁹⁵ In February 2011, this bill passed with near unanimous Republican support.⁹⁶

H.R. 2354, the FY2012 Energy and Water appropriations bill, rescinded all funding for the San Joaquin River restoration agreement.⁹⁷ During floor consideration of the bill, Rep. Jeff Denham (R-CA) also offered an amendment to prohibit the National Marine Fisheries Service from using funds to restore the San Joaquin River and reintroduce the California Central Valley Spring Run Chinook salmon. Rep. Doc Hastings (R-WA) offered an amendment to block the Army Corps of Engineers from implementing and enforcing a shoreline management plan developed to protect salmon. These amendments were both adopted, and the bill passed the House in July 2011.⁹⁸

In February 2012, the House Republicans voted 236 to 1 to pass H.R. 1837, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Water Reliability Act.⁹⁹ This bill would have preempted California water use laws and unraveled the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement. The bill also would have deemed water projects in compliance with the Endangered Species Act if they operate in accordance with outdated standards set in the mid-1990s, which pre-date many conservation initiatives developed in the interim to protect the Chinook salmon. House Republicans defeated an amendment by Rep. Markey to require water projects to meet all state and federal laws using the best available science and two amendments by Rep. Jerry McNerney to protect water quality in California's Delta region.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁴ Section 1475(b) of H.R. 1 (112th Cong.).

⁹⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.121, McClintock Amendment No. 296 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 18, 2011) (Roll Call No. 111).

⁹⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 1 (Feb. 19, 2011) (Roll Call No. 147).

⁹⁷ Section 203 of H.R. 2354 (112th Cong.).

⁹⁸ H.Amdt.666 (Denham Amendment) and H.Amdt.657 (Hastings Amendment) to H.R. 2354 (112th Cong.). The amendments passed by voice vote on July 14, 2011. U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 2354 (July 15, 2011) (Roll Call No. 600).

⁹⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 1837, Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley Water Reliability Act (Feb. 29, 2012) (Roll Call No. 91).

¹⁰⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.964 to H.R. 1837 (Feb. 29, 2012) (Roll Call No. 89); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.959 to H.R. 1837 (Feb. 29, 2012) (Roll Call No. 84); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.960 to H.R. 1837 (Feb. 29, 2012) (Roll Call No. 85).

House Republicans voted again in May and June of 2012 to block funding for salmon reintroduction in the San Joaquin River.¹⁰¹

House Republicans also voted to relax protections for the gray wolf. H.R. 1 contained provisions directing the Secretary of the Interior to remove Endangered Species Act protections for the gray wolf in certain parts of the country.¹⁰² The final FY2011 funding bill that passed on April 14, 2011, contained a version of this rider, directing the Secretary to delist the gray wolf in Montana, Idaho, eastern Washington, eastern Oregon, and north-central Utah.¹⁰³ In July 2011, as part of the debate on the 2012 funding bill for the Department of the Interior, House Republicans voted 226 to 9 to block judicial review of any rule removing endangered species protections for gray wolves in Wyoming or the states to the west of the Great Lakes.¹⁰⁴

During the debate on the FY2013 appropriations bill for the Department of Commerce and other agencies, House Republicans voted to block funding for the National Ocean Policy, which President Obama established by executive order in July 2010 to coordinate and improve stewardship of the ocean, our coasts, and the Great Lakes.¹⁰⁵ House Republicans also voted to block NOAA from implementing a proposed rule to reduce sea turtle mortality in fishing nets.¹⁰⁶

C. Votes to Benefit Mining Companies

In October 2011, House Republicans brought H.R. 1904, the Southern Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act, to the floor. This bill directed the Department of Agriculture to convey 2,400 acres of federal lands to Resolution Copper, a joint venture of Australian-owned BHP-Billiton and British-owned Rio Tinto, in exchange for 5,300 acres in Arizona. The federal lands included in the exchange contained lands with significant cultural, religious, and historical value for several Native American communities.¹⁰⁷ The legislation would have blocked any environmental

¹⁰¹ H.Amdt.1091 to H.R. 5326, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, passed by voice vote on May 9, 2012. H.Amdt.1199 to H.R. 5325, the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, passed by voice vote on June 5, 2012.

¹⁰² Section 1713 of H.R. 1 (112th Cong.).

¹⁰³ Section 1713 of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Pub. L. 112-10) (2011 CR) (112th Cong.). See Congressional Research Service, *Gray Wolves Under the Endangered Species Act (ESA): Distinct Population Segments and Experimental Populations* (Nov. 1, 2011) at 19.

¹⁰⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.750, Dicks Amendment to H.R. 2584 (July 27, 2011) (Roll Call No. 659).

¹⁰⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1079 (May 9, 2012) (Roll Call No. 234).

¹⁰⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1080 (May 9, 2012) (Roll Call No. 236).

¹⁰⁷ Testimony of Shan Lewis, Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, Committee on Natural Resources, U.S. House of

review or consultation with affected tribes prior to completion of the land exchange. The bill passed with Republicans voting 228 to 8 in favor of the legislation.¹⁰⁸

H.R. 1904 would not have required Resolution Copper to provide traditional royalty payments in return for any copper extracted from the land. Rep. Ed Markey (D-MA) offered an amendment to require, as a condition of the land exchange, that Resolution Copper pay an 8% royalty to U.S. taxpayers on all minerals produced in commercial quantities from the federal land the company receives in the exchange. Only three House Republicans supported this amendment.¹⁰⁹

In July 2012, House Republicans passed H.R. 4402, the National Strategic and Critical Minerals Production Act. This bill would have truncated environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act for mining of “strategic and critical minerals” on federal lands and limited public participation in mine permitting decisions. The bill defined “strategic and critical minerals” so broadly as to cover large-scale mining for gold silver, uranium, and other hardrock minerals on public lands; minerals that are not remotely critical or strategic, such as sand, gravel, and clay; and even coal mining operations. Rep. Paul Tonko (D-NY) offered an amendment to narrow this definition to cover truly strategic and critical minerals, but House Republicans voted unanimously to defeat this amendment.¹¹⁰ Instead, at the behest of Rep. Don Young (R-AK), House Republicans voted to allow new mining in forests currently protected as roadless areas.¹¹¹

House Republicans also defeated an effort by Rep. Markey to require mining companies to pay a royalty of 12.5% of the value of hardrock minerals such as gold, silver, and uranium mined on federal lands. Under current law, mining companies pay no royalties on mine hardrock minerals extracted from federal lands. The revenue generated by the royalties would have been dedicated to cleaning up the more than 160,000 abandoned hardrock mines in the United States. House Republicans voted 230-3 to defeat this amendment.¹¹²

The bill passed on July 12, 2012, with all Republicans voting in support.¹¹³ It did not become law.

Representatives, *H.R. 1904: the Southeast Arizona Land Exchange and Conservation Act of 2011*, 112th Cong. (June 14, 2011).

¹⁰⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 1904 (Oct. 26, 2011) (Roll Call No. 809).

¹⁰⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.844, Markey Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 1904 (Oct. 26, 2011) (Roll Call No. 806).

¹¹⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1371, Tonko Amendment to H.R. 4401 (July 12, 2012) (Roll Call No. 462).

¹¹¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1374, Young Amendment to H.R. 4401 (July 12, 2012) (Roll Call No. 465).

¹¹² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1373, Markey Amendment to H.R. 4401 (July 12, 2012) (Roll Call No. 464).

¹¹³ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 4401 (July 12, 2012) (Roll Call No. 468).

D. Votes to Undermine “Multiple Use” Principle for Public Lands

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 establishes the principle of “multiple-use” for public lands, defined as “management of the public lands and their various resource values so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people.”¹¹⁴ The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is charged with balancing the various uses of public lands, including energy production, grazing, recreation, and preservation of lands of particular cultural or ecological value.

In July 2012, House Republicans brought H.R. 4402 to the floor. This bill would have elevated hardrock mining above other uses of public lands. Specifically, the bill stated that the “priority of the lead agency” would be to “maximize the development of the mineral resource.” Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-AZ) offered an amendment to protect hunting, fishing, grazing, and recreation on public lands by requiring proper environmental review of any mineral exploration or mining permit that might diminish opportunities for these activities. House Republicans voted 232-2 to defeat this amendment and passed the bill with unanimous Republican support.¹¹⁵

In June 2012, House Republicans considered H.R. 4480, the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, which packaged together numerous bills to weaken environmental regulations and open up new federal lands to oil and gas drilling. One section of the bill would have required the Secretary of the Interior to develop a “Quadrennial Federal Onshore Energy Production Strategy,” with the goal of increasing oil, natural gas, and coal production on onshore public lands. In effect, H.R. 4480 would have overturned the guiding principle of “multiple use” for onshore public lands and elevated energy production above hunting, fishing, recreation, grazing, conservation, and the many other ways that the American people enjoy these lands.

In addition, H.R. 4480 would have set an arbitrary requirement that the Department of the Interior offer for lease at least 25% of the onshore federal lands nominated by the industry every year for energy production. This requirement would have applied whether or not drilling in these areas would compromise other uses of the lands, such as hunting, fishing, livestock grazing, and recreation, or damage an area’s cultural or ecological value. This bill also would have required the BLM to continue “actively leasing” in areas where land use plans are being updated or revised to protect wildlife or other resource values, deal with a growing population, or incorporate a new recreational activity.

The bill passed on June 21, 2012 but did not become law.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ 43 U.S.C. 1702

¹¹⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1377, Grijalva Amendment to H.R. 4401 (July 12, 2012) (Roll Call No. 466); Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 4401 (July 12, 2012) (Roll Call No. 468).

¹¹⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 4480 (June 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 410).

III. Blocking Efforts to Prevent Climate Change

A. Votes to Reject Scientific Findings

In December 2009, EPA made a scientific finding that “elevated concentrations of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere may reasonably be anticipated to endanger the public health and to endanger the public welfare of current and future generations.”¹¹⁷ The world’s leading scientific organizations have all reached similar conclusions. In 2010, the National Academy of Sciences, the premier scientific organization in the United States, released a report reviewing what the scientific community has learned about climate change and its impacts. The Academy found: “Climate change is occurring, is caused largely by human activities, and poses significant risks for – and in many cases is already affecting – a broad range of human and natural systems.”¹¹⁸ The national academies of all of the world’s major economies (including China) issued a similar warning in 2009, saying that the “need for urgent action to address climate change is now indisputable.”¹¹⁹

Notwithstanding this scientific consensus that climate change is occurring and is a serious threat, the Republicans introduced a bill, H.R. 910, to overturn EPA’s scientific endangerment finding. That bill passed the House on April 7, 2011, with unanimous Republican support.¹²⁰ During the floor debate on H.R. 910, Rep. Henry Waxman (D-CA) offered an amendment that stated, “Congress accepts the scientific findings of the Environmental Protection Agency that climate change is occurring, is caused largely by human activities, and poses significant risks for public health and welfare.” All but one House Republican voted to reject these scientific findings.¹²¹

Many House Republicans explained their rejection of EPA’s scientific findings by stating their view that the science is “not settled.” On the Energy and Commerce Committee, at least 12 Republican members have made public statements indicating that they question or reject the scientific consensus on climate change:

¹¹⁷ U.S. EPA, *Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act*, 74 Fed. Reg. 66496-66546 (Dec. 15, 2009) (final rule).

¹¹⁸ National Research Council, *Advancing the Science of Climate Change* (2010).

¹¹⁹ *G8+5 Academies’ joint statement: Climate change and the transformation of energy technologies for a low carbon future*, Academia Brasileira de Ciências, Brazil; Indian National Science Academy, India; Academy of Science of South Africa, South Africa; Royal Society of Canada, Canada; Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Italy; Royal Society, United Kingdom; Chinese Academy of Sciences, China; Science Council of Japan, Japan; National Academy of Sciences, United States of America; Académie des Sciences, France; Academia Mexicana de Ciencias, Mexico; Deutsche Akademie der Naturforscher Leopoldina, Germany; Russian Academy of Sciences, Russia (May 2009) (online at www.nationalacademies.org/includes/G8+5energy-climate09.pdf).

¹²⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 910 (Apr. 7, 2011) (Roll Call No. 249).

¹²¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.245, Waxman Amendment No. 6 to H.R. 910 (Apr. 6, 2011) (Roll Call No. 236).

- Chairman Fred Upton (R-MI) stated that while he accepts that 2010 was one of the warmest years in the last decade, “I do not say that it is man-made.”¹²²
- Chairman Emeritus Joe Barton (R-TX) stated that “the science is not settled and the science is actually going the other way.”¹²³
- Rep. Ed Whitfield (R-KY), the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, called on Al Gore to “come clean about the real science surrounding climate change and let the American people come to their own conclusions on global warming.”¹²⁴
- Rep. John Shimkus (R-IL), the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, rejected the dire warnings of climate scientists and said the Earth “will end only when God declares it is time to be over. Man will not destroy this earth. This earth will not be destroyed by a flood.”¹²⁵
- Rep. John Sullivan (R-OK), vice-chair of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, stated, “I don’t think anyone could come to any conclusion whether it is real or not. Until we can see sound science that’s truthful, I don’t think anyone can make a decision based on that.”¹²⁶
- Rep. Michael Burgess (R-TX) stated that “no one knows” whether man is responsible for climate change. He said it is “just the height ofchutzpah for us to be claiming that man-made effects can change something as profound as the climate on this planet. The climate has changed over eons. Man has had nothing to do with it.”¹²⁷

¹²² *Conversations with the Chair: Energy and Commerce Chairman Fred Upton*, National Journal Live (Feb. 8, 2011). Mr. Upton’s 2011 statements on the science of climate change conflict with his earlier views. In 2009, when praising a Michigan wind project in a press release, Mr. Upton stated that climate change is “a serious problem that necessitates serious solutions.” *Upton bails KVCC wind energy program as Congress debates climate change bill*, River Country Journal (Apr. 24, 2009) (online at www.rivercountryjournal.com/?p=7369). This article is based on a news release from Rep. Fred Upton. This news release is no longer posted on Rep. Upton’s website.

¹²³ Statement of Chairman Emeritus Joe Barton, *Markup on H.R. 910, The Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011*, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 112th Cong. (Mar. 15, 2011).

¹²⁴ Office of Rep. Ed Whitfield, *Whitfield Blasts Use of False Science in Copenhagen* (Dec. 15, 2009) (press release).

¹²⁵ Statement of Rep. John Shimkus, *Preparing for Climate Change: Adaptation Politics and Programs*, Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 111th Cong. (Mar. 25, 2009).

¹²⁶ Statement of Rep. John Sullivan at a press conference organized by Rep. Joe Barton, Rep. Fred Upton, Rep. Shelley Moore Capito, Rep. John Sullivan, Rep. Marsha Blackburn, and Rep. Jim Sensenbrenner. United Nations Climate Change Conference, Copenhagen, Denmark (Dec. 18, 2009).

¹²⁷ Southern California Public Radio, *Patt Morrison: Things get hot for the EPA* (Mar. 9, 2011).

- Rep. Marsha Blackburn (R-TN) told reporters that she does not believe that the science behind climate change is “settled.”¹²⁸
- Rep. Steve Scalise (R-LA) said that the “debate on the causes of climate change are [*sic*] far from settled.”¹²⁹
- Rep. David McKinley (R-WV) stated that “anthropogenic global warming is still an issue that the scientists are still debating.”¹³⁰
- Rep. Morgan Griffith (R-VA) called it “reckless” to cut greenhouse gas emissions “in order to address a scientific theory — man-made global warming — that many scientists do not even believe is happening.”¹³¹
- Rep. Cory Gardner (R-CO) admitted that the climate is changing but said that he does not “believe humans are causing that change to the extent that’s been in the news.”¹³²
- Rep. Bill Cassidy (R-LA) said that the cause of climate change “could just be a shift on the axis.”¹³³

Several members of the House Committee on Natural Resources also have denied the science behind climate change. For example, Rep. Don Young (R-AK) called climate change the “biggest scam since Teapot Dome,” referring to 1920s bribery scandal.¹³⁴ Rep. Jeff Duncan (R-SC) has said that he does not agree that “man made global warming.”¹³⁵ Rep. Paul Broun (R-GA)

¹²⁸ Statement of Rep. Marsha Blackburn at a press conference organized by Rep. Joe Barton, Rep. Fred Upton, Rep. Shelley Moore Capito, Rep. John Sullivan, Rep. Marsha Blackburn, and Rep. Jim Sensenbrenner, United Nations Climate Change Conference, Copenhagen, Denmark (Dec. 18, 2009).

¹²⁹ Statement of Rep. Steve Scalise, *The American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009: Day 1*, Hearing Before the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 111th Cong. (Apr. 21, 2009).

¹³⁰ Statement of Rep. David McKinley, *H.R. ___, The Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011*, Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 112th Cong. (Feb. 9, 2011).

¹³¹ *10 to watch: GOP freshmen on energy*, Politico (Dec. 28, 2010) (online at www.politico.com/news/stories/1210/46778.html) (quoting Morgan Griffith’s campaign website).

¹³² *Energy bill polarizes candidates*, Fort Collins Coloradoan (Sept. 19, 2010).

¹³³ Statement of Rep. Bill Cassidy, *Markup of H.R. 910, The Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011*, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 112th Cong. (Mar. 15, 2011).

¹³⁴ KTVA Anchorage interview of Rep. Don Young (Feb. 18, 2010) (online at www.youtube.com/watch?v=NKcmjBBtxrs).

¹³⁵ Statement of Rep. Jeff Duncan, Committee on Natural Resources, U.S. House of Representatives, *Increased Electricity Costs for American Families and Small Businesses: The Potential Impacts of the Chu Memorandum*, 112th Cong. (Apr. 26, 2012).

declared that climate change is a “hoax” that has been “perpetrated out of the scientific community.”¹³⁶

At the same time that many House Republican members publicly assert that the science of climate change is not settled, they have voted to cut funding for climate research that could provide more insight into the pace and likely impacts of climate change.

In February 2011, the House passed H.R. 1, the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011, with near unanimous Republican support.¹³⁷ The Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee boasted that “the bill cuts climate change funding bill-wide by \$107 million, or 29%, from the fiscal year 2010 enacted level.”¹³⁸ This bill included significant cuts for EPA’s Global Change Research Program, which examines the potential consequences of global climate change on air and water quality, aquatic ecosystems, human health, and socioeconomic systems in the United States. The bill also included cuts for scientific endeavors at other agencies, including climate change research at the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service’s climate change monitoring system, and the U.S. Geological Survey’s Climate Effects Network, a consortium of research programs designed to collect and share data in order to identify climate-related impacts to ecosystems.¹³⁹

As part of the debate over appropriations for FY2011, the House Republicans voted 228 to 9 to eliminate funding for EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Reporting Program.¹⁴⁰ This program requires the largest sources of carbon pollution – such as power plants, refineries, and large factories – to report how much they pollute. Rep. Mike Pompeo (R-KS), the sponsor of this effort, claimed that this data serves as the “very foundation of the EPA’s effort to pursue its radical anti-jobs agenda” and that funding the registry would allow EPA to keep its “regulatory nose inside the job-destroying tent.”¹⁴¹ Rep. Jim Moran (D-VA) called this vote “part of an effort to ignore what scientists tell us is the most serious environmental problem of our time – climate change.”¹⁴²

¹³⁶ Statement of Rep. Paul Broun, *Congressional Record*, H7457 (June 26, 2009).

¹³⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 1 (Feb. 19, 2011) (Roll Call No. 147).

¹³⁸ U.S. House Appropriations Committee, *Summary: Fiscal Year 2011 Continuing Resolution* (Feb. 11, 2011) (online at http://republicans.appropriations.house.gov/_files/SummaryFiscalYear2011ContinuingResolutionCR.doc) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

¹³⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations, *FY2011 Continuing Resolution Reductions* (online at http://appropriations.house.gov/_files/ProgramCutsFY2011ContinuingResolution.pdf) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

¹⁴⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.47, Pompeo Amendment No. 84 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 16, 2011) (Roll Call No. 64).

¹⁴¹ Statement of Rep. Mike Pompeo, *Congressional Record*, H989 (Feb. 16, 2011).

¹⁴² Statement of Rep. Jim Moran, *Congressional Record*, H989 (Feb. 16, 2011).

The House Republicans also voted to prohibit NOAA from using any funds to establish a Climate Service.¹⁴³ The prohibition would block NOAA's plans to consolidate the management of its climate-related programs, labs, and data centers in a new Climate Service, with the goal of improving NOAA's ability to produce reliable short-term weather data and long-term climate data. This funding prohibition was included in the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, which was enacted into law.¹⁴⁴

In May 2012, House Republicans again approved several amendments to the appropriations bill for the Commerce Department to block basic climate change research and outreach programs. House Republicans voted 230 to 10 in support of Rep. Chip Cravaack's (R-MN) amendment to prohibit the National Science Foundation from implementing its climate change education program.¹⁴⁵ They also supported two amendments to cut funding for NOAA's climate research and its online climate portal, a compilation of the agency's climate-related data and resources.¹⁴⁶

B. Votes to Block Action to Reduce Carbon Pollution

In February 2011, all but three House Republicans voted to pass a budget for EPA that prohibited the agency from spending any funds to enforce or promulgate regulations related to climate change.¹⁴⁷ Specifically, the FY2011 funding bill prohibited EPA from using any funds for the purposes of "enforcing or promulgating any regulation ... or order, taking action relating to, or denying approval of state implementation plans or permits because of the emissions of greenhouse gases due to concerns regarding possible climate change."¹⁴⁸ This provision effectively blocks EPA from establishing federal standards for the two largest sources of carbon pollution, power plants and refineries. EPA proposed new source performance standards for power plants in March 2012.¹⁴⁹

During the debate on the FY2011 funding bill, Rep. Ted Poe (R-TX) offered an amendment with Rep. Joe Barton (R-TX) and Rep. John Carter (R-TX) to block EPA's greenhouse gas emissions regulations. This amendment replicated the language in the underlying bill as described above but, in the words of Rep. Poe, went "a step further, prohibiting the EPA from enforcing

¹⁴³ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.148, Hall Amendment No. 495 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 19, 2011) (Roll Call No. 127).

¹⁴⁴ Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012, Pub. L. No. 112-55.

¹⁴⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1088 to H.R. 5326 (May 9, 2012) (Roll Call No. 241).

¹⁴⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1045 to H.R. 5326 (May 8, 2012) (Roll Call No. 209); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1047 to H.R. 5326 (May 8, 2012) (Roll Call No. 210).

¹⁴⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 1 (Feb. 19, 2011) (Roll Call No. 147).

¹⁴⁸ Section 1746, H.R. 1, the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011.

¹⁴⁹ U.S. EPA, *Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions for New Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units*, 77 Fed. Reg. 22392 -22441 (Apr. 13, 2012) (proposed rule).

national regulation of greenhouse gases.”¹⁵⁰ Rep. Barton, speaking in support of the amendment, argued that carbon dioxide is “not a pollutant” and dismissed most climate science as a “theory.” He said there is “nobody in this country or anywhere in the world who has been harmed because of manmade CO₂.”¹⁵¹ Rep. Poe argued that “there is no evidence at all that it is manmade CO₂ that causes the climate to change.”¹⁵² The House passed this amendment with only two Republicans voting in opposition.¹⁵³

House Republicans included similar language in the FY2012 appropriations bill for EPA reported by the Appropriations Committee. This language would have precluded EPA from proposing or issuing any regulation regarding the emissions of greenhouse gases from stationary sources or new motor vehicles after model year 2016.¹⁵⁴

The House Republicans also introduced stand-alone legislation to achieve these objectives. On March 3, 2011, Energy and Commerce Committee Chairman Fred Upton (R-MI) introduced H.R. 910, the Energy Tax Prevention Act of 2011.¹⁵⁵ In addition to overturning EPA’s endangerment finding, the Upton bill would have broadly eliminated EPA’s authority to address emissions of greenhouse gases and the danger of climate change. The bill would have overturned the Supreme Court’s opinion finding that EPA has the authority to regulate greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act. It also would have prohibited EPA from requiring stationary sources such as power plants to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and achieving additional emissions reductions from mobile sources, including cars, planes, boats, and other vehicles. The bill even would have prohibited EPA from enforcing existing greenhouse gas reporting requirements to collect information on the largest sources of global warming pollution in the United States.

During the floor debate about the Upton bill, the House Republicans voted against several Democratic amendments to restore EPA’s authority to address climate change. Only one Republican supported an amendment offered by Rep. Jared Polis (D-CO) to allow the EPA Administrator to suspend the bill’s prohibitions if impacts from climate change affect public health.¹⁵⁶ Scientists at the U.S. Global Change Research Program have found that climate change “poses unique challenges to human health.”¹⁵⁷ In particular, they have concluded that “increases in

¹⁵⁰ Statement of Rep. Ted Poe, *Congressional Record*, H1186 (Feb. 17, 2011).

¹⁵¹ Statement of Rep. Joe Barton, *Congressional Record*, H1188-H1189 (Feb. 17, 2011).

¹⁵² Statement of Rep. Ted Poe, *Congressional Record*, H1189 (Feb. 17, 2011).

¹⁵³ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.101, Poe Amendment No. 466 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 18, 2011) (Roll Call No. 96).

¹⁵⁴ Sections 431 and 453 of H.R. 2584 (112th Cong.).

¹⁵⁵ For a full analysis of H.R. 910, see Memorandum from Ranking Members Henry Waxman and Bobby Rush to Democratic Members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power (Mar. 10, 2011) (online at <http://democrats.energycommerce.house.gov>).

¹⁵⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.247, Polis Amendment No. 8 to H.R. 910 (Apr. 6, 2011) (Roll Call No. 237).

¹⁵⁷ U.S. Global Change Research Program, *Global Climate Change Impacts in the United States* (June 2009) at 89.

the risk of illness and death related to extreme heat and heat waves are very likely” and that it will become “more challenging to meet air quality standards necessary to protect public health.”¹⁵⁸ During the debate, however, Rep. Michael Burgess (R-TX) stated that “greenhouse gases do not have a health impact.”¹⁵⁹

Rep. Ed Markey (D-MA) offered an amendment to allow EPA to take action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions if those actions also reduce demand for oil. Rep. Bobby Rush (D-IL) offered an amendment to delay implementation of the bill until EPA and the Department of Defense certify that the consequences of climate change, such as an increased severity and frequency of natural disasters, do not jeopardize U.S. security at home or abroad. These amendments also failed, with Republicans voting unanimously against them.¹⁶⁰

The Upton bill passed 255-172 on April 7, 2011, with unanimous Republican support.¹⁶¹ If the Upton bill had passed the Senate and been enacted into law, the bill could have blocked EPA and the Department of Transportation from working with the automobile industry and the state of California to develop harmonized greenhouse gas and fuel economy standards. These standards, which were proposed on November 16, 2011 and finalized on August 28, 2012, are projected to save four billion barrels of oil and avoid two billion metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions, while providing consumers with net savings of between \$3,400 and \$5,000 over the lifetime of each vehicle.¹⁶²

In September 2012, House Republicans included H.R. 910 in another bill, H.R. 3409, which packaged together several pieces of anti-environment legislation to benefit the coal industry. Republicans voted 221-5 against an amendment offered by Rep. Waxman to strike the language in the bill repealing EPA’s scientific finding that carbon pollution endangers the public health and welfare of current and future generations.¹⁶³ The bill passed by a vote of 233-175 on September 21, 2012 but did not become law.¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁸ *Id.* at 90, 92.

¹⁵⁹ Statement of Rep. Michael Burgess, *Congressional Record*, H2379 (Apr. 6, 2011).

¹⁶⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.248, Markey Amendment No. 9 to H.R. 910 (Apr. 6, 2011) (Roll Call No. 238); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.249, Rush Amendment No. 10 to H.R. 910 (Apr. 6, 2011) (Roll Call No. 239).

¹⁶¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 910 (Apr. 7, 2011) (Roll Call No. 249).

¹⁶² U.S. EPA and U.S. Department of Transportation, *EPA and NHTSA Set Standards to Reduce Greenhouse Gases and Improve Fuel Economy for Model Years 2017-2025 Cars and Light Trucks* (Aug. 2012) (fact sheet).

¹⁶³ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1485, Waxman Amendment to H.R. 3409 (Sept. 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 593).

¹⁶⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 3409 (Sept. 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 603).

C. Votes to Block International Action on Climate Change

In February 2011, House Republicans voted to prevent the State Department from using any funds to employ a Special Envoy for Climate Change, who represents the United States internationally in climate-related negotiations. Only one Republican voted against this proposal.¹⁶⁵ Only three House Republicans voted against a proposal to zero out the United States' contribution to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the world's leading authority on climate change science and the recipient of the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize.¹⁶⁶ Rep. Blaine Luetkemeyer (R-MO) stated on the House floor that the IPCC is "an entity that is fraught with waste and engaged in dubious science."¹⁶⁷ Rep. Waxman called this proposal to defund the work of the world's premier climate scientists the equivalent of "putting our heads in the sand."¹⁶⁸

In October 2011 and again in November 2012, the House voted to prohibit U.S. airlines from complying with European requirements to reduce carbon pollution on flights to Europe.¹⁶⁹ The European Union plans to require airlines flying to and from Europe to purchase carbon permits under the EU emissions trading scheme. The EU climate commissioner said that the European Union decided to include airlines in its emissions trading system after more than a decade of international talks failed to produce a plan to cut greenhouse gas emissions from this sector.¹⁷⁰ Rep. Markey spoke in opposition to this legislation, noting that the "Europeans are taking climate change seriously. We shouldn't undermine their efforts by legislating that our airlines break the law."¹⁷¹ A modified version of this bill became law on November 27, 2012.¹⁷²

At the Committee level, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs reported a funding bill for FY2012 that would zero out funding for both the IPCC and United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the international body charged with developing a global response to climate change.¹⁷³ Similarly, the

¹⁶⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.89, Scalise Amendment No. 204 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 17, 2011) (Roll Call No. 87).

¹⁶⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.154, Luetkemeyer Amendment No. 149 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 19, 2011) (Roll Call No. 132).

¹⁶⁷ Statement of Rep. Blaine Luetkemeyer, *Congressional Record*, H1315 (Feb. 18, 2011).

¹⁶⁸ Statement of Rep. Henry Waxman, *Congressional Record*, H1316 (Feb. 18, 2011).

¹⁶⁹ H.R. 2594, the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme Prohibition Act, passed by a voice vote on October 24, 2011. S. 1956, the European Union Emissions Trading Scheme Prohibition Act, passed by a voice vote on November 13, 2012.

¹⁷⁰ *UN Body Urges Europe to Omit Foreign Airlines From CO2 Curbs*, Bloomberg (Nov. 3, 2011).

¹⁷¹ Statement of Rep. Ed Markey, *Congressional Record*, H7000 (Oct. 24, 2011).

¹⁷² Public Law 112-200. The enacted version gave the Secretary of Transportation the authority to block American airlines from complying with the EU emissions trading requirements but did not require the Secretary to take this action.

¹⁷³ The Subcommittee marked up this bill on July 27, 2011. The Appropriations Committee did not hold a full committee markup on the legislation.

House Foreign Affairs Committee reported a bill that would bar U.S. funding for the Global Climate Change Initiative, which provides bilateral assistance to help developing countries address the effects of climate change.¹⁷⁴ The Committee's ranking member, Rep. Howard Berman, criticized the bill because "to rule out – for ideological reasons – an entire category of activities that are essential to the success of our overall development strategy is both shortsighted and wasteful."¹⁷⁵

D. Votes to Block Adaptation Planning

In June 2011, all but two Republicans voted to prohibit the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) from using any funds for the Climate Change Adaptation Task Force.¹⁷⁶ This interagency task force, which began meeting in the spring of 2009, has been examining how to respond to climate change impacts that are occurring already in the United States and how to prepare for future climate conditions. Rep. John Carter (R-TX) called this a "waste of time and resources" that should be devoted to "ensuring the safety of our homeland."¹⁷⁷ Rep. David Price (D-NC), speaking in opposition to this proposal, noted that DHS, in fact, has identified "specific climate change-related impacts on DHS missions. These include ... disaster response activities and the protection of critical infrastructure."¹⁷⁸

Also in June 2011, all but five House Republicans voted to prohibit the U.S. Department of Agriculture from using any funds to implement its climate change adaptation program.¹⁷⁹ Recent studies show climate change is already adversely affecting crop yields.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁴ Section 925, H.R. 2583 (112th Cong.).

¹⁷⁵ Dissenting Views, *Report to Accompany H.R. 2583* (112th Cong.) at 222.

¹⁷⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.378, Carter Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 2017 (June 2, 2011) (Roll Call No. 392).

¹⁷⁷ Statement of Rep. John Carter, *Congressional Record*, H3891 (June 1, 2011).

¹⁷⁸ Statement of Rep. David Price, *Congressional Record*, H3891 (June 1, 2011).

¹⁷⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.467, Scalise Amendment to H.R. 2112 (June 16, 2011) (Roll Call No. 448).

¹⁸⁰ See, e.g., David Lobell, Wolfram Schlenker and Justin Costa-Roberts, *Climate trends and Global Crop Production Since 1980*, Science (May 5, 2011) (finding that global wheat yields have dropped by more than 5% compared with what would have been expected without rising temperatures).

IV. Undermining the Clean Water Act

A. Votes to Repeal EPA's Authority to Set Water Quality Standards and Enforce Discharge Limits

The Clean Water Act uses two approaches to protect water quality. To reduce pollution from industrial and municipal sources, EPA sets technology-based pollution limits, which states implement through permit programs. To reduce pollution from other sources, like urban and farm runoff, states are required to set water quality standards based on the designated use for each water body and to ensure that these standards are achieved. If a state fails to set adequate water quality standards, the Clean Water Act directs EPA to act and set standards in lieu of the state.¹⁸¹

In December 2010, EPA issued standards setting numeric limits on the amount of nutrient pollution allowed in Florida's inland waters after determining that the state's standards were not sufficient to protect Florida's rivers, lakes, and coastal waters.¹⁸² EPA indicated that it would withdraw these federal standards if the state adopted scientifically sound standards for nutrient pollution.¹⁸³ In July 2011, EPA proposed additional water quality standards to protect the Florida Everglades from farm runoff.¹⁸⁴

In February 2011, House Republicans voted 221 to 17 to block EPA from using any funds to implement or enforce the standards issued by EPA to control nutrient pollution in Florida.¹⁸⁵ Rep. Thomas Rooney (R-FL) accused EPA of acting "dictatorial" by using its Clean Water Act authority to set water quality standards when the state fails to do so.¹⁸⁶ House Republicans added the same prohibition to EPA's funding bill for FY2012, which did not pass the House.¹⁸⁷

In May 2011, Rep. John Mica (R-FL), Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, introduced H.R. 2018, the Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act. This bill would have prevented EPA from revising weak state water quality standards or issuing new ones, unless the state concurs, even if the water quality standard is insufficient to protect human health or aquatic life. In addition, the bill would have stripped EPA of its authority to enforce discharge limits by prohibiting the agency from objecting to state discharge permits that fail to meet the requirements

¹⁸¹ Clean Water Act § 303 (b).

¹⁸² U.S. EPA, *Water Quality Standards for the State of Florida's Lakes and Flowing Waters*, 75 Fed. Reg. 75761-75807 (Dec. 6, 2010) (final rule).

¹⁸³ Letter from U.S. EPA to Florida Department of Environmental Protection (June 13, 2011).

¹⁸⁴ U.S. EPA, *Phosphorus Water Quality Standards for Florida Everglades*, 76 Fed. Reg. 38592-38597 (July 1, 2011) (proposed rule).

¹⁸⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.143, Rooney Amendment No. 13 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 18, 2011) (Roll Call No. 123).

¹⁸⁶ Statement of Rep. Thomas Rooney, *Congressional Record*, H1290 (Feb. 18, 2011).

¹⁸⁷ Section 452 of H.R. 2584 (112th Cong.).

of the Clean Water Act. According to EPA, this bill would “overturn almost 40 years of Federal legislation by preventing EPA from protecting public health and water quality.”¹⁸⁸

During consideration of H.R. 2018, House Republicans voted unanimously against an amendment to reinstate EPA’s ability to oversee state water quality programs and take action when state water quality standards are inadequate to protect public health and the environment.¹⁸⁹

They also voted against proposals to preserve EPA’s authority in unique circumstances. House Republicans opposed an amendment to the bill to preserve EPA authority over waterbodies that receive federal funds for restoration and related activities, such as the Chesapeake Bay, Great Lakes, and Puget Sound.¹⁹⁰ They also opposed a proposal to preserve EPA authority over waterbodies that EPA determines provide flood protection for communities, are valuable fish and wildlife habitats that benefit the economy, or are coastal recreational waters.¹⁹¹

On July 13, 2011, H.R. 2018 passed by a vote of 239-184, with 223 Republicans voting for the bill and only 13 against.¹⁹² The bill did not become law.

In September 2012, House Republicans included H.R. 2018 in another bill, H.R. 3409, which packaged together several pieces of anti-environment legislation to benefit the coal industry. The bill passed by a vote of 233-175 on September 21, 2012, but did not become law.¹⁹³

B. Votes to Block Oversight of Mountaintop Removal and Other Types of Coal Mining

Mountaintop removal coal mining is a surface mining practice common in Appalachia that involves the removal of mountaintops to expose coal seams and the disposal of the resulting mining “overburden” in adjacent valleys (known as valley fills). This practice can devastate water quality and the surrounding environment. Almost 2,000 miles of Appalachian headwater streams have been buried by mountaintop removal coal mining.¹⁹⁴

¹⁸⁸ U.S. EPA, *Technical Assessment of H.R. 2018*, as attached to a letter to the Honorable Tim Bishop from Arvin Ganesan, U.S. EPA (June 21, 2011).

¹⁸⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.629, Jackson-Lee Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 2018 (July 13, 2011) (Roll Call No. 565).

¹⁹⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.633, Connolly Amendment No. 6 to H.R. 2018 (July 13, 2011) (Roll Call No. 568).

¹⁹¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.635, Blumenauer Amendment No. 9 to H.R. 2018 (July 13, 2011) (Roll Call No. 569).

¹⁹² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 2018 (July 13, 2011) (Roll Call No. 573).

¹⁹³ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 3409 (Sept. 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 603).

¹⁹⁴ U.S. EPA, *EPA Issues Final Guidance to Protect Water Quality in Appalachian Communities from Impacts of Mountaintop Mining* (July 21, 2011) (press release).

EPA oversees mountaintop removal coal mining under the Clean Water Act. Mining companies must obtain a permit in order to dump overburden and mining waste into waterways. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers administers this program on a day-to-day basis, but EPA has the responsibility to review individual permit applications and has the authority to prohibit, deny, or restrict a valley fill if it will have an unacceptable adverse effect on the environment. EPA has used this veto authority sparingly and in only the most extreme cases. An example occurred on January 13, 2011, when EPA announced that it would halt the proposed disposal of mining waste in streams at the Mingo-Logan Coal Company's Spruce No. 1 coal mine in West Virginia, one of the largest surface coal mines ever proposed in central Appalachia. This mine would have dumped 110 million cubic yards of coal mine waste into nearby streams, burying more than six miles of high-quality streams in Logan County and causing permanent damage to the ecosystem.¹⁹⁵

In February 2011, during the debate on appropriations for FY2011, House Republicans voted 223 to 14 to block EPA from vetoing permit applications for mountaintop removal.¹⁹⁶ They also voted 227 to 10 to block EPA and other agencies from implementing EPA guidance on protecting water quality from mountaintop removal coal mining operations.¹⁹⁷ All but nine House Republicans voted to prevent the Office of Surface Mining in the Department of the Interior from developing, implementing, or enforcing any new rules to protect streams from mountaintop removal and other surface coal mining.¹⁹⁸ House Republicans included similar prohibitions in EPA's funding bill for FY2012 reported by the Appropriations Committee.¹⁹⁹

House Republicans also voted to remove EPA's authority to protect water quality from the hazards of coal mining as part of H.R. 2018, the Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act, which, as noted above, would have eliminated EPA's ability to enforce numerous Clean Water Act provisions. H.R. 2018 would have removed EPA's authority to veto a valley fill permit based on environmental concerns unless the state concurs with the veto. The bill also would have limited the time EPA, the

¹⁹⁵ U.S. EPA, *Final Determination of the Assistant Administrator for Water Pursuant to Section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act Concerning the Spruce No. 1 Mine, Logan County, WV*, 76 Fed. Reg. 3126-3128 (Jan. 19, 2011) (notice).

¹⁹⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.157, McKinley Amendment No. 216 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 19, 2011) (Roll Call No. 135).

¹⁹⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.151, Griffith Amendment No. 109 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 19, 2011) (Roll Call No. 129).

¹⁹⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.131, Johnson Amendment No. 498 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 18, 2011) (Roll Call No. 119). In 2008, the Bush administration revised existing stream buffer zone rules to make it easier for coal mining to occur in or within 100 feet of streams. Numerous parties challenged the validity of that rule in court, and others, such as the Union of Concerned Scientists, raised concerns that the Office of Surface Mining had distorted the scientific evidence about the environmental impact of mountaintop removal coal mining during the rulemaking.

¹⁹⁹ Sections 432 and 433 of H.R. 2584 (112th Cong.).

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and other agencies have to provide comments to the Army Corps of Engineers on the potential environmental impacts of a proposed valley fill operation.²⁰⁰

House Republicans included these provisions in H.R. 3409, a package of bills benefitting the coal industry. Republicans voted 227-2 against an amendment offered by Rep. Sheila Jackson-Lee (D-TX) to strike the language in the bill arbitrarily limiting the time EPA and other agencies have to comment on permit applications to dump mountaintop removal coal mining waste into waterways.²⁰¹ They passed an amendment offered by Rep. David McKinley (R-WV) stripping EPA of its authority to stop disposal of such waste into a waterway.²⁰²

H.R. 3409 also included provisions blocking the Secretary of the Interior from issuing any regulation under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) through the end of 2013, if the regulation would prohibit coal mining in any area, reduce employment in coal mines, or reduce coal production. This language would have blocked the Department of the Interior from issuing stronger standards to protect streams from surface coal mining impacts. It also would have prevented the agency from issuing other rules related to mine closures and reclamation, such as rules to control the use of coal ash as minefill and to ensure that mining companies takes steps to protect the environment if they temporarily cease operations at a mine.

H.R. 3409 bill passed the House by a vote of 233-175 on September 21, 2012, but did not become law.²⁰³

C. Votes to Block Protections for Wetlands and Tributaries

The Clean Water Act prohibits the discharge of any pollutant into “navigable waters” without a permit. A series of court decisions have called into question whether small streams, wetlands, tributaries, and other waterbodies that may not be navigable year-round are protected by this Clean Water Act prohibition. These smaller waterbodies and wetlands perform important functions. In the continental United States, 117 million people obtain some or all of their drinking water from public drinking water systems that rely at least in part on intermittent, ephemeral, or headwater streams.²⁰⁴ Wetlands provide habitat for plants and animals, serve as important breeding grounds for migratory birds, absorb floodwaters, and help protect water quality by filtering excess nutrients, sediments, and other pollutants before they reach rivers, lakes, and streams.

²⁰⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.R. 2018 (July 13, 2011) (Roll Call No. 573).

²⁰¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1490, Jackson-Lee Amendment to H.R. 3409 (Sept. 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 596).

²⁰² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1491, McKinley Amendment to H.R. 3409 (Sept. 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 597).

²⁰³ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 3409 (Sept. 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 603).

²⁰⁴ U.S. EPA, *Geographic Information Systems Analysis of the Surface Drinking Water Provided by Intermittent, Ephemeral and Headwater Streams in the U.S.* (July 2009).

On April 27, 2011, EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers issued draft guidance for determining whether a waterbody or wetland qualifies for protection under the Clean Water Act. This draft guidance proposed that tributaries, wetlands, and other waters with a “significant nexus” or “chemical, physical, or biological” connection to navigable and interstate waters qualify for protection under the law.²⁰⁵

H.R. 1, the FY2011 continuing resolution, included language precluding EPA from issuing or enforcing this guidance.²⁰⁶ The FY2012 Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill included similar language precluding the Army Corps of Engineers from using funds to finalize or enforce this guidance document.²⁰⁷ House Republicans defeated an amendment to allow EPA and the Army Corps to proceed with its plans to protect tributaries, wetlands, and other smaller waterways, with only nine Republicans supporting it.²⁰⁸ And in June 2012, House Republicans again brought to the floor an appropriations bill containing a rider to prevent the Army Corps of Engineers from issuing the guidance and again defeated an amendment to remove the rider.²⁰⁹

D. Votes to Block Other Pollution Protection Initiatives

House Republicans voted to limit EPA’s ability to prevent pesticide contamination of waterways. H.R. 872, the Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act, would have exempted the application of pesticides from any permitting requirements under the Clean Water Act.²¹⁰ Speaking in opposition to the bill, Rep. Tim Bishop (D-NY) said that the House was “rushing to judgment,” citing “ample evidence to suggest that we don’t know enough about pesticide impairment of water bodies...to determine whether or not it is prudent for us to make a permanent exemption to the Clean Water Act.”²¹¹ This bill passed on March 31, 2011.²¹² The House Appropriations Committee

²⁰⁵ U.S. EPA, *Draft Guidance on Identifying Waters Protected by the Clean Water Act* (Apr. 27, 2011).

²⁰⁶ Section 1747, H.R. 1 (112th Cong.).

²⁰⁷ Section 108, H.R. 2354 (112th Cong.).

²⁰⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.591, Moran Amendment to H.R. 2354 (July 12, 2011) (Roll Call No. 540).

²⁰⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1175 to H.R. 5325 (June 1, 2012) (Roll Call No. 308).

²¹⁰ This bill was designed to block a proposed rule that was finalized six months after the bill passed. On October 31, 2011, EPA issued a final general permit for the application of pesticides for the purposes of mosquito control, weed and algae control, animal pest control, and forest canopy pest control. A “general permit” covers a category of dischargers instead of an individual discharger. An operator that plans to discharge into a waterway must submit a notice of intent but does not need to obtain an individual permit. This permit requirement does not apply to pesticides used on agricultural crops or range lands.

²¹¹ Statement of Rep. Tim Bishop, *Congressional Record*, H2090 (Mar. 30, 2011).

²¹² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.R. 872 (Mar. 31, 2011) (Roll Call No. 206).

added this bill in its entirety to EPA's funding bill for FY2012 when it reported the legislation to the House.²¹³

House Republicans also voted to block pollution reduction plans for the Chesapeake Bay watershed, which suffers from high levels of nitrogen and phosphorus pollution from agricultural runoff, sewage treatment plants, and other sources, despite years of state efforts to reduce pollution.²¹⁴ In May 2009, President Obama issued an Executive Order instructing EPA to coordinate state and federal efforts to reduce pollutants entering the Bay and enforce compliance with established goals.²¹⁵ In September 2010, EPA and other federal agencies released an action plan outlining specific measures to restore and protect the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed.²¹⁶ In February 2011, however, House Republicans voted 222 to 15 to block EPA from using funds to implement this plan to protect the Chesapeake Bay watershed.²¹⁷ Rep. Jim Moran (D-VA) argued unsuccessfully that this provision would "unravel the current effort to finally put a limit on nutrient and sediment pollution in the Chesapeake Bay."²¹⁸

E. Votes to Cut Water Quality Funding

In February 2011, the House passed H.R. 1, the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011, with near unanimous Republican support.²¹⁹ This bill included large cuts to the Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, which provide states with grants to upgrade treatment plants and other infrastructure to ensure clean water. The bill reduced the Clean Water State Revolving Fund by 67% and the Drinking Water Fund by 40% over the previous year's levels.²²⁰ The FY2012 appropriations bill reported by the House Appropriations Committee cut the Clean Water Fund by 55% and the Drinking Water Fund by 14% below already-reduced 2011 levels.²²¹

²¹³ Section 503 of H.R. 2584 (112th Cong.).

²¹⁴ Chesapeake Bay Foundation, *Dead Zones: Nitrogen & Phosphorous* (online at www.cbf.org/how-we-save-the-bay/issues/dead-zones/nitrogen-phosphorus) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

²¹⁵ The White House, *Executive Order: Chesapeake Bay Protection and Restoration* (May 12, 2009).

²¹⁶ Federal Leadership Committee for the Chesapeake Bay, *Fiscal Year 2011 Action Plan, Executive Order 13508, Strategy for Protecting and Restoring the Chesapeake Bay Watershed* (Sept. 30, 2010).

²¹⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.136, Goodlatte Amendment No. 467 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 18, 2011) (Roll Call No. 120).

²¹⁸ Statement of Rep. Jim Moran, *Congressional Record*, H1282 (Feb. 18, 2011).

²¹⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 1 (Feb. 19, 2011) (Roll Call No. 147).

²²⁰ Congressional Research Service, *H.R. 1 Full-Year FY2011 Continuing Resolution: Overview of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Provisions* (Aug. 29, 2011) at 6-7. The levels included in the final appropriations bill for 2011 were higher but still lower than the previous year.

²²¹ Congressional Research Service, *Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) FY2012 Appropriations* (Dec. 5, 2011) at 6.

V. Reducing Funding for Environmental Protection

A. H.R. 1, Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011

In February 2011, the House passed H.R. 1, the Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act of 2011, with near unanimous Republican support.²²² H.R. 1 cut EPA's budget by \$3 billion, 29% below FY2010 funding levels.²²³ The bill also included dozens of policy riders blocking EPA from taking specific regulatory actions, as discussed throughout this report.

H.R. 1 cut funding for EPA's environmental programs and management account by \$422 million (14%). This account primarily funds the development, implementation, and enforcement of air and water pollution control standards.²²⁴ The bill cut in half funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, a multi-agency effort to clean up pollution and combat invasive species in the Great Lakes.²²⁵ Funding for similar restoration programs for Puget Sound and the Chesapeake Bay were reduced by a combined 40%.²²⁶ The bill also cut the Clean Water State Revolving Fund by \$1.4 billion (67%) and the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund by \$557 million (40%) over the previous year's levels.²²⁷ These programs provide states and tribes with grants to upgrade treatment plants and other infrastructure to ensure clean water and safe drinking water.

The bill cut climate change funding government-wide by more than \$100 million (29%) from FY2010 levels.²²⁸ These cuts affected EPA, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the U.S. Forest Service programs to research, respond to, and prevent climate change.²²⁹

H.R. 1 also included significant cuts for programs at the Department of Energy. The bill cut funding for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs at DOE by \$775 million, a 35% cut

²²² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 1 (Feb. 19, 2011) (Roll Call No. 147).

²²³ House Committee on Appropriations, *Summary: Fiscal Year 2011 Continuing Resolution* (Feb. 11, 2011).

²²⁴ Congressional Research Service, *H.R. 1 Full-Year FY2011 Continuing Resolution: Overview of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Provisions* (Aug. 29, 2011) at 5.

²²⁵ *Id.*

²²⁶ *Id.*

²²⁷ *Id.* at 6-7.

²²⁸ House Committee on Appropriations, *Summary: Fiscal Year 2011 Continuing Resolution* (Feb. 11, 2011).

²²⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations, *FY2011 Continuing Resolution Reductions* (online at http://appropriations.house.gov/_files/ProgramCutsFY2011ContinuingResolution.pdf) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

from the previous year.²³⁰ The bill also cut funding for the Energy Information Administration (EIA) by \$15 million (14%).²³¹ EIA provides policymakers with data and impartial analysis of energy production and consumption in the United States.

H.R. 1 reduced funding for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which are responsible for implementing the Endangered Species Act, by \$379 million (23%) and \$387 million (8%), respectively, from the previous year's levels.²³² The bill also cut the Land and Water Conservation Fund by 87%, severely curtailing the ability of the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, and the Forest Service to acquire new lands for recreation and wildlife protection.²³³

B. FY2012 Budget and Appropriations Bills

On April 15, 2011, the House Republicans passed the budget resolution written by Rep. Paul Ryan (R-WI), Chairman of the Budget Committee, with only four Republicans voting no. All Democrats opposed the measure.²³⁴

The Ryan budget outlined massive cuts for energy and environmental programs. The budget reduced funding for energy programs, including programs at the Department of Energy, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, by 83% by 2020.²³⁵ The Ryan budget also cut the budget for natural resources and environmental programs by 13% by 2020.²³⁶ The report accompanying the Ryan budget stated that this budget “builds on the fiscal discipline of H.R. 1” by “paring back unnecessary spending and funds to carry out overreaching regulatory expansion,” and it cited funding limitations on EPA’s ability to reduce emissions of global warming pollutants as a policy option for savings.²³⁷

²³⁰ Congressional Research Service, *Energy and Water Development: FY2011 Appropriations* (May 11, 2011) at 12.

²³¹ *Id.*

²³² Congressional Research Service, *Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: FY2011 Appropriations* (May 12, 2011) at 4; Congressional Research Service, *Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies: FY2011 Appropriations* (July 25, 2011) at 6.

²³³ Congressional Research Service, *Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: FY2011 Appropriations* (May 12, 2011) at 46-47.

²³⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H. Con. Res. 34 (Apr. 15, 2011) (Roll Call No. 277).

²³⁵ H. Con. Res. 34, Section 102, Major Functional Categories, Energy (270) (112th Cong.).

²³⁶ H. Con. Res. 34, Section 102, Major Functional Categories, Natural Resources and Environment (300) (112th Cong.). This budget category covers programs at a range of agencies, including EPA, National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and Army Corps of Engineers.

²³⁷ House Committee on the Budget, *Concurrent Resolution on the Budget—Fiscal Year 2012* (112th Cong.) (2011) (H. Rept. 112-58) at 72.

The Ryan budget served as a guide for appropriations bills to cut funding for EPA, the Department of Energy, the Department of the Interior, and other agencies in FY2012.

H.R. 2354, the Republican funding bill for the Department of Energy, cut FY2012 clean energy and efficiency programs by almost \$1.9 billion (60%) below the President's request and \$487 million (27%) below the previous year's already reduced levels.²³⁸ This bill also cut funding for the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing program by 40% over the previous year.²³⁹ In contrast, the bill increased funding for nuclear energy programs by almost \$8 million (1%) and fossil energy research and development by \$32 million (7%) over FY2011 levels.²⁴⁰ House Republicans voted 209 to 21 to pass H.R. 2354 on July 15, 2011.²⁴¹

H.R. 2584, the FY2012 funding bill for EPA and the Department of the Interior, passed the House Appropriations Committee on July 12, 2011. It was debated and amended on the House floor in late July but never called for a final vote. The bill cut FY2012 funding for EPA by \$1.5 billion (18%) from FY2011 levels.²⁴² It cut funding for climate change programs by 22% government-wide from the previous year.²⁴³ It also cut the Clean Water State Revolving Fund by 55% and the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund by 14% below already reduced levels for FY2011.²⁴⁴

In addition, H.R. 2584 reduced the Fish and Wildlife Service budget for FY2012 by 21% below the previous year's already reduced levels, with significant cuts for endangered species protection, habitat conservation, and the National Wildlife Refuge System.²⁴⁵ The bill also slashed the Land and Water Conservation Fund by 78% below FY2011 levels, eliminating the majority of funds used by the federal government to acquire new lands for recreation and wildlife protection.²⁴⁶

²³⁸ Congressional Research Service, *Energy and Water Development: FY2012 Appropriations* (Oct. 14, 2011) at 13.

²³⁹ *Id.*

²⁴⁰ *Id.*

²⁴¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 2354 (July 15, 2011) (Roll Call No. 600).

²⁴² Congressional Research Service, *Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) FY2012 Appropriations* (Dec. 5, 2011) at 1.

²⁴³ Statement of Rep. Hal Rogers, *Congressional Record*, H5437 (July 25, 2011).

²⁴⁴ Congressional Research Service, *Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) FY2012 Appropriations* (Dec. 5, 2011) at 6.

²⁴⁵ Congressional Research Service, *Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: FY2012 Appropriations* (Dec. 7, 2011) at 10-11.

²⁴⁶ *Id.* at 57.

C. FY2013 Budget and Appropriations Bills

In March 2012, House Republicans passed the Ryan budget resolution for FY2013, which included significant cuts to energy programs. No Democrats supported this measure.²⁴⁷ The Ryan budget called for cutting funding for energy programs by almost 50% by 2022.²⁴⁸ In June 2012, the House passed H.R. 5325, an appropriations bill for 2013 that proposes to cut funding for clean energy and energy efficiency programs by more than \$400 million, a 24% reduction from the previous year and 39% below the President's request.²⁴⁹ This House bill cut funds for wind energy by 25%, solar energy by 46%, weatherization assistance by 20%, and building efficiency research and development by 43%.²⁵⁰ House Republicans voted 207 to 29 in support of this bill.²⁵¹

²⁴⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H. Con. Res. 112 (Mar. 29, 2012) (Roll Call No. 151).

²⁴⁸ H.Con.Res.112, Section 102, Major Functional Categories, Energy (270) (112th Cong.). This category includes civilian energy and environmental programs of the Department of Energy, the Rural Utilities Service of the Department of Agriculture, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

²⁴⁹ Congressional Research Service, *Energy and Water Development: FY2013 Appropriations* (May 10, 2012) at 15.

²⁵⁰ *Id.*

²⁵¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 5325 (June 6, 2012) (Roll Call No. 342).

VI. Cutting Support for Clean Energy Technologies and Programs

A. Votes to Cut Funding for Clean Energy Programs

House Republicans voted multiple times to slash funding for the Department of Energy's clean energy and energy efficiency programs. In February 2011, the House Republicans voted 235 to 3 to pass H.R. 1, an appropriations bill for FY2011 that allocated just \$1.5 billion for energy efficiency and renewable energy.²⁵² This was almost 40% below the President's funding request and a 35% cut from the previous year.²⁵³

On April 15, 2011, the House Republicans passed the FY2012 budget resolution written by Rep. Paul Ryan (R-WI), Chairman of the Budget Committee, with only four Republicans voting no. All Democrats opposed the measure.²⁵⁴ The Ryan budget outlined significant budget cuts for energy programs, reducing overall funding by 83% by 2020.²⁵⁵ Rep. Ryan called for spending cuts for renewable energy and energy research and investment in particular, declaring this "corporate welfare spending" best left to the private sector.²⁵⁶ In March 2012, House Republicans passed the Ryan budget resolution for 2013, which again included draconian cuts to energy programs.²⁵⁷ This Ryan budget proposed to reduce funding for energy programs by almost 50% by 2022.²⁵⁸

H.R. 2354, the 2012 appropriations bill for the Department of Energy and other agencies, allocated just \$1.3 billion to clean energy and efficiency programs. This is almost 60% below the President's request and 27% below the previous year's levels.²⁵⁹ The House Republicans voted 209

²⁵² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 1 (Feb. 19, 2011) (Roll Call No. 147). The final FY2011 continuing resolution appropriated \$1.8 billion for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

²⁵³ Congressional Research Service, *Energy and Water Development: FY2011 Appropriations* (May 11, 2011) at 12.

²⁵⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H. Con. Res. 34 (Apr. 15, 2011) (Roll Call No. 277).

²⁵⁵ H. Con. Res. 34, Section 102, Major Functional Categories, Energy (270) (112th Cong.). This category includes civilian energy and environmental programs of the Department of Energy, the Rural Utilities Service of the Department of Agriculture, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

²⁵⁶ House Committee on the Budget, *Concurrent Resolution on the Budget—Fiscal Year 2012* (112th Cong.) (2011) (H. Rept. 112-58) at 68.

²⁵⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H. Con. Res. 112 (Mar. 29, 2012) (Roll Call No. 151).

²⁵⁸ H.Con.Res.112, Section 102, Major Functional Categories, Energy (270) (112th Cong.). This category includes civilian energy and environmental programs of the Department of Energy, the Rural Utilities Service of the Department of Agriculture, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

²⁵⁹ Congressional Research Service, *Energy and Water Development: FY2012 Appropriations* (Oct. 14, 2011) at 13.

to 21 to pass this bill in July 2011.²⁶⁰ These cuts reduced funding for solar energy research and development by 37%, advanced vehicle technologies by 15%, energy-efficient building programs by 29%, and weatherization assistance by 81%.²⁶¹ At the same time, the bill proposed to increase funding for fossil fuels, such as coal and oil, by \$32 million (7%) over last year's levels.²⁶²

House Republicans voted down numerous attempts to increase funding levels for renewable energy and energy efficiency, including two amendments to increase funding for the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (ARPA-E).²⁶³ ARPA-E is dedicated to the development of cutting-edge energy technology, such as integrating advanced power electronics into solar panels to generate energy more efficiently. Former Rep. Jay Inslee (D-WA) noted that “while the Chinese are racing ahead on clean energy, we’re running backwards” by cutting funding for programs such as ARPA-E.²⁶⁴

House Republicans also voted 230 to 6 to defeat an amendment offered by Rep. Markey to increase clean energy funding by \$100 million and reduce funding for the fossil fuel and nuclear energy accounts by \$50 million each.²⁶⁵ They voted 226 to 10 to defeat a bipartisan amendment to restore full funding for advanced vehicle technology research by reducing funding for fossil fuels.²⁶⁶ And they voted against amendments to restore funding for key energy efficiency programs via small cuts in weapons funding.²⁶⁷

In September 2011, House Republicans voted for a continuing resolution to keep the federal government operating until mid-November and to provide disaster-relief funds to the Federal Emergency Management Agency.²⁶⁸ This bill would have rescinded \$100 million from Department of Energy's Innovative Technology Loan Guarantee Program and cut \$1.5 billion from its Advanced

²⁶⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 2354 (July 15, 2011) (Roll Call No. 600).

²⁶¹ Congressional Research Service, *Energy and Water Development: FY2012 Appropriations* (Oct. 14, 2011) at 15-16.

²⁶² *Id.* at 13.

²⁶³ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.32, Inslee Amendment No. 395 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 16, 2011) (Roll Call No. 56); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.612, Garamendi Amendment to H.R. 2354 (July 12, 2011) (Roll Call No. 553).

²⁶⁴ Statement of Rep. Jay Inslee, *Congressional Record*, H901 (Feb. 15, 2011).

²⁶⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.597, Markey Amendment to H.R. 2354 (July 12, 2011) (Roll Call No. 541).

²⁶⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.599, Connolly Amendment to H.R. 2354 (July 12, 2011) (Roll Call No. 543).

²⁶⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.605, Tonko Amendment to H.R. 2354 (July 12, 2011) (Roll Call No. 548); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.603, Welch Amendment to H.R. 2354 (July 12, 2011) (Roll Call No. 546).

²⁶⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Motion to Concur in the Senate Amendment with an Amendment to H.R. 2608 (Roll Call No. 727) (Sept. 23, 2011).

Technology Vehicle Manufacturing (ATVM) program. The ATVM program, launched in 2008, provides loans to support the manufacture of advanced technology vehicles and components in the United States. The Department of Energy estimates that the loan guarantees created or maintained 37,000 jobs in several states across the country.²⁶⁹

In June 2012, the House passed H.R. 5325, the 2013 appropriations bill for the Department of Energy and related agencies.²⁷⁰ This bill cut funding for clean energy and efficiency programs by more than \$400 million, a 24% reduction from the previous year and 39% below the President's request.²⁷¹ House Republicans voted down five amendments to this bill to restore funding for renewable energy and energy efficiency programs.²⁷² They also voted to prohibit the Department of Energy from issuing new loan guarantees for clean energy or advanced biofuels projects.²⁷³

House Republicans also crafted legislation specifically targeting the Department of Energy's loan guarantee programs, which are designed to accelerate the domestic commercial deployment of innovative and advanced clean energy technologies. The legislation, H.R. 6213, evolved out of congressional Republicans' investigation into the bankruptcy of Solyndra, a solar energy company that received a loan guarantee. House Republicans repeatedly mischaracterized the findings of this investigation, claiming that the Obama Administration gave Solyndra preferential treatment when the facts showed otherwise.²⁷⁴ H.R. 6213 would have barred the Department of Energy from accepting new loan applications but allowed the agency to continue processing \$34 billion in applications that had already been submitted.

Rep. Waxman offered an amendment to allow the best and most innovative clean energy projects to compete for funding rather than limiting funding to projects submitted to the

²⁶⁹ U.S. Department of Energy, Loan Programs Office, *Our Projects* (online at https://lpo.energy.gov/?page_id=45) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

²⁷⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 5325 (June 6, 2012) (Roll Call No. 342).

²⁷¹ Congressional Research Service, *Energy and Water Development: FY2013 Appropriations* (May 10, 2012) at 15.

²⁷² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1176 to H.R. 5325 (June 1, 2012) (Roll Call No. 312); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1179 to H.R. 5325 (June 1, 2012) (Roll Call No. 313); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1181 to H.R. 5325 (June 1, 2012) (Roll Call No. 314); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1184 to H.R. 5325 (June 5, 2012) (Roll Call No. 316); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1205 to H.R. 5325 (June 6, 2012) (Roll Call No. 326).

²⁷³ H.Amdt.1201 and H.Amdt.1219 to H.R. 5325, Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (112th Cong.). These amendments passed by a voice vote on June 5, 2012.

²⁷⁴ Memorandum from Committee on Energy and Commerce Democratic Staff to Committee Members and Staff, *Release of Republican Staff Report on the Solyndra Loan Guarantee* (Aug. 2, 2012) (online at <http://democrats.energycommerce.house.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Memo-Release-of-Republican-Staff-Report-on-Solyndra-Loan-Guarantee-2012-8-2.pdf>).

Department of Energy prior to the end of 2011. House Republicans voted 219-5 to defeat this amendment.²⁷⁵ The bill passed on September 14, 2012 but did not become law.²⁷⁶

B. Votes to Block Energy Efficiency Standards

In 2007, the lighting industry and energy efficiency advocates reached a consensus on national standards to make light bulbs more efficient and avoid a patchwork of conflicting state standards. These national standards went into effect on January 1, 2012, and are expected to save American households \$6 billion on energy costs in 2015 alone.²⁷⁷ Opponents of these standards claim that they will result in a ban of incandescent light bulbs. These claims are false; in fact, consumers will have a range of energy-efficient light bulb choices, including more efficient incandescent light bulbs.²⁷⁸

In July 2011, Rep. Joe Barton introduced the Better Use of Light Bulbs (BULB) Act, H.R. 2417, to repeal these standards. The National Electrical Manufacturers Association and American Lighting Association joined with consumer and environmental advocates to oppose the BULB Act. House Republicans voted 228 to 10 in support of the bill.²⁷⁹ H.R. 2417 did not pass on this vote, however, because the vote occurred under a procedure requiring a two-thirds majority. But one week later, during the debate on appropriations for the Department of Energy for FY2012, Rep. Michael Burgess (R-TX) offered an amendment to prevent the Department from using funds to implement the light bulb efficiency standards.²⁸⁰ This amendment passed on July 15, 2011, by a voice vote.

In December 2011, House Republicans successfully attached a rider to the FY2012 omnibus appropriations bill, H.R. 2055, to block the Department from enforcing the light bulb standards during FY2012. This bill became law on December, 23, 2011.²⁸¹

In 2012, Rep. Burgess offered his amendment to block implementation of the light bulb standards to the FY2013 appropriations bill for the Department of Energy. It again passed by voice

²⁷⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1482 to H.R. 6213 (Sept. 14, 2012) (Roll Call No. 582).

²⁷⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 6213 (Sept. 14, 2012) (Roll Call No. 584).

²⁷⁷ U.S. EPA, *Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 Backgrounder* (Spring 2011).

²⁷⁸ *Id.*; See American Lighting Association, *Fact Sheet: 4 Key Questions About the New Light Bulb Legislation* (online at www.americanlightingassoc.com/Downloads/Light-Bulb-Legislation-by-Longo.aspx) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

²⁷⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 2417 (July 12, 2011) (Roll Call No. 563).

²⁸⁰ H.Amdt.678 to H.R. 2354 (112th Cong.).

²⁸¹ Section 315, Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2012 (P.L. 112-74).

vote.²⁸² House Republicans also voted to block implementation of efficiency standards for battery chargers and external power supplies, including golf cart battery chargers and water efficiency standards for showerheads.²⁸³ The bill passed on June 6, 2012, with 207 Republicans voting in favor.²⁸⁴

²⁸² H.Amdt.1210 to H.R. 5325, Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (112th Cong.). This passed by a voice vote on June 5, 2012.

²⁸³ H.Amdt.1224 and H.Amdt.1226 to H.R. 5325, Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (112th Cong.). These amendments passed by a voice vote on June 5, 2012.

²⁸⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 5325 (June 6, 2012) (Roll Call No. 342).

VII. Allowing Unsafe Disposal of Toxic Coal Ash

On December 22, 2008, a Tennessee Valley Authority coal ash impoundment in Kingston, Tennessee, ruptured, releasing more than five million cubic yards of toxic sludge and blanketing the Emory River and 300 acres of surrounding land.²⁸⁵ As this episode demonstrated, improper disposal of the combustion wastes produced by coal-burning electric utilities can pose a threat to human health and safety. EPA considers 45 coal ash impoundments in 10 states as having “high hazard potential,” which means that a failure in the impoundment is likely to cause loss of human life.²⁸⁶ Unsafe disposal of coal ash can also threaten drinking water by leaching arsenic and other toxic chemicals into drinking water from unlined surface impoundments.²⁸⁷

In June 2010, EPA proposed two alternatives to ensure the safe disposal of coal ash under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).²⁸⁸ One proposal would regulate coal ash under the provisions for hazardous waste; the other would regulate coal ash as a solid waste under rules crafted to address the specific risks of coal ash. During consideration of H.R. 1, the Full Year Continuing Appropriations Act for 2011, Rep. David McKinley (R-WV) offered an amendment to block EPA from regulating coal ash under the hazardous waste provision. The amendment passed, with Republicans voting 220 to 18 in support.²⁸⁹

In October 2011, the House began consideration of H.R. 2273, the Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act. The bill would have blocked EPA from finalizing either of its proposed rules for coal ash disposal. Instead, H.R. 2273 would have created a system of state permit programs based on the disposal criteria developed for household garbage and required EPA to defer to those state programs, whether or not they are adequate. House Democrats offered several amendments to address the bill’s shortcomings, all of which were defeated.

Rep. Waxman offered an amendment to require state coal ash disposal programs to protect human health and the environment. The amendment failed, with only four Republicans voting in

²⁸⁵ U.S. EPA Region 4, *EPA’s Response to the TVA Kingston Fossil Plant Fly Ash Release: Basic Information* (online at www.epa.gov/region4/kingston/basic.html) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

²⁸⁶ U.S. EPA, *Coal Combustion Residues (CCR) - Surface Impoundments with High Hazard Potential Ratings* (Aug. 2009) (online at www.epa.gov/osw/nonhaz/industrial/special/fossil/ccrs-fs/) (accessed Sept. 26, 2013).

²⁸⁷ RTI International, *Human and Ecological Risk Assessment of Coal Combustion Wastes (Draft)*, Prepared for U.S. EPA, Office of Solid Waste (Aug. 6, 2007).

²⁸⁸ U.S. EPA, *Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Special Wastes; Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals from Electric Utilities*, 75 Fed. Reg. 35127-35264 (June 21, 2010) (proposed rule).

²⁸⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.158, McKinley Amendment No. 217 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 19, 2011) (Roll Call No. 136).

support.²⁹⁰ House Republicans also voted 227 to 2 to prevent EPA from enforcing the requirements of state coal ash programs if the state fails to do so.²⁹¹

House Republicans voted 222 to 4 against an amendment to require existing impoundments to retrofit to meet modern safety standards.²⁹² Rep. Markey stated that the country “shouldn’t have to wait for another catastrophe like Kingston to happen before we require these basic safety measures to be employed at all coal ash ponds.”²⁹³ No Republicans supported a measure establishing a warning system to alert first responders and residents of the pending failure of a hazardous coal ash impoundment.²⁹⁴

H.R. 2273 passed on October 14, 2011, with only three Republicans voting in opposition.²⁹⁵ Republicans included the text of this bill in H.R. 3409, a package of anti-environment bills favoring the coal industry. H.R. 3409 passed the House on September 21, 2012 but did not become law.²⁹⁶

²⁹⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.838, Waxman Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 2273 (Oct. 14, 2011) (Roll Call No. 794).

²⁹¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.841, Rush Amendment No. 5 to H.R. 2273 (Oct. 14, 2011) (Roll Call No. 797).

²⁹² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.839, Markey Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 2273 (Oct. 14, 2011) (Roll Call No. 795).

²⁹³ Statement of Rep. Ed Markey, *Congressional Record*, H6948 (Oct. 14, 2011).

²⁹⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Motion to Recommit H.R. 2273 (Oct. 14, 2011) (Roll Call No. 799).

²⁹⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 2273 (Roll Call No. 800) (Oct. 14, 2011).

²⁹⁶ Section 462 of H.R. 2584 (112th Cong.); U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 3409 (Sept. 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 603).

VIII. Obstructing the Regulatory Process

The House passed four bills designed to slow or obstruct the rulemaking process.

A. The Regulatory Accountability Act (H.R. 3010)

H.R. 3010, the Regulatory Accountability Act, would have rewritten the Administrative Procedure Act to make issuance of regulations vastly more difficult. The bill would have added more than 60 new analytic and procedural requirements to the rulemaking process, including an analysis of the potential costs and benefits of any “reasonable alternatives for a new rule or other response identified by the agency or interested persons.”²⁹⁷ The bill would have required the use of formal rulemakings, which entail time-consuming trial-like procedures, for “high impact” regulations with an annual cost of at least \$1 billion. And it would have required agencies to adopt the “least costly” regulation, regardless of that regulation’s feasibility or impact on public health, unless the agency shows that “additional benefits of the more costly rule justify its additional costs.”²⁹⁸ This determination and the agencies’ implementation of the bill’s other analytical and procedural requirements would be subject to judicial review, giving polluters new avenues to overturn regulations in court. The bill even directed courts to not defer to agency determinations unless the agency followed specific procedures to reach those determinations. H.R. 3010 passed with unanimous Republican support.²⁹⁹

During consideration of H.R. 3010, Rep. Gerry Connolly (D-VA) offered an amendment to exempt safeguards that relate to “the safety of food, the safety of the workplace, air quality, the safety of consumer products, or water quality” from the reach of H.R. 3010. This amendment was defeated with no Republicans voting in favor.³⁰⁰

Only one Republican supported an amendment by Rep. Jerry Nadler (D-NY) to exempt the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) from the requirements of H.R. 3010.³⁰¹ Rep. Nadler offered this amendment because the bill could make it “all but impossible” for NRC to enact new safety standards for reactors, noting that the disaster at Japan’s Fukushima nuclear power plant demonstrates that NRC “must have the ability and flexibility to impose new regulations quickly to safeguard the health and well-being of Americans.”³⁰²

²⁹⁷ See H.R. 3010 § 3(b).

²⁹⁸ *Id.* § 3(f).

²⁹⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 3010 (Dec. 2, 2011) (Roll Call No. 888).

³⁰⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.891, Connolly Amendment No. 5 to H.R. 3010 (Dec. 2, 2011) (Roll Call No. 884).

³⁰¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.892, Nadler Amendment No. 6 to H.R. 3010 (Dec. 2, 2011) (Roll Call No. 885).

³⁰² Statement of Rep. Jerrold Nadler, *Congressional Record*, H8097 (Dec. 2, 2011).

B. The REINS Act (H.R. 10)

The Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny (REINS) Act (H.R. 10) would have required both houses of Congress to approve all significant rules before federal agencies could implement them, including those to protect the environment and public health. In effect, this bill would have forced Congress to re-legislate provisions in the Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and other laws that require the agencies to conduct significant rulemakings. If Congress failed to act on a rule, the new rule would not go into effect, delaying important safeguards and wasting years of scientific inquiry, stakeholder comment, and agency staff resources. H.R. 10 passed the House on December 7, 2011, with Republicans voting unanimously in support.³⁰³

Rep. Carolyn McCarthy (D-NY) introduced an amendment to the REINS Act that would have exempted regulations relating to food safety, workplace safety, air quality, consumer product safety, or water quality from the bill's requirements. As Rep. McCarthy explained, the REINS Act would have the effect of adding 535 regulators to the rulemaking process with each member of Congress "forced to review the rules and regulations regarding highly technical matters currently handled by subject area experts."³⁰⁴ Not a single Republican voted for the amendment.³⁰⁵

C. The Regulatory Flexibility Improvements Act (H.R. 527)

The existing Regulatory Flexibility Act requires agencies to take into account the impacts of federal rules that regulate the conduct of small businesses. H.R. 527 would have expanded these requirements by mandating that federal agencies assess the "indirect effects" of regulations that do not directly affect small businesses. It also would have given the Office of Advocacy within the Small Business Administration the power to issue rules governing agency compliance with H.R. 527 and to intervene in agency adjudications. H.R. 527 passed with unanimous Republican support.³⁰⁶

Rep. Steve Cohen (D-TN) introduced an amendment to H.R. 527 that would have exempted regulations relating to food safety, workplace safety, air quality, consumer product safety, or water quality from the bill's requirements. Rep. Cohen stated that this amendment would protect workers and consumers "when they eat their breakfasts, their lunches and their dinners, when they buy toys for their children and their grandchildren, when they drive their cars, and when they work in their workplaces."³⁰⁷ No Republicans voted for the amendment.³⁰⁸

³⁰³ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 10 (Dec. 7, 2011) (Roll Call No. 901).

³⁰⁴ Statement of Rep. Carolyn McCarthy, *Congressional Record*, H8228 (Dec. 7, 2011).

³⁰⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.898, McCarthy Amendment No. 5 to H.R. 10 (Dec. 7, 2011) (Roll Call No. 897).

³⁰⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 527 (Dec. 1, 2011) (Roll Call No. 880).

³⁰⁷ Statement of Rep. Steve Cohen, *Congressional Record*, H8047 (Dec. 1, 2011).

³⁰⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.884, Cohen Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 527 (Dec. 1, 2011) (Roll Call No. 875).

D. Red Tape Reduction and Small Business Job Creation Act

H.R. 4078, the Red Tape Reduction and Small Business Job Creation Act, consolidated several Republican bills to add new hurdles to the regulatory process. The bill would have blocked federal agencies from enacting any rules costing more than \$100 million a year until the unemployment rate falls below 6%, unless Congress approves a waiver. The bill did not take the monetized benefits of the rule into account. During the floor debate on the bill, the House approved an amendment offered by Rep. David McKinley (R-WV) to lower the cost threshold to \$50 million, potentially sweeping a slew of additional standards and safeguards under the bill's jurisdiction.³⁰⁹

Rep. Ed Markey (D-MA) introduced an amendment that would have exempted from the bill's prohibitions any rules necessary to protect the public from extreme weather events, including drought, flooding, and catastrophic wildfire. Such events are likely to become more frequent as the climate warms. This amendment failed 177-240, with only seven Republicans voting in support.³¹⁰ House Republicans defeated similar amendments to allow rules related to safe drinking water and energy efficiency to proceed without delay.³¹¹

³⁰⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1459 to H.R. 4078 (July 26, 2012) (Roll Call No. 527).

³¹⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1451 to H.R. 4078 (July 25, 2012) (Roll Call No. 518).

³¹¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1447 to H.R. 4078 (July 25, 2012) (Roll Call No. 514); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1450 to H.R. 4078 (July 25, 2012) (Roll Call No. 517);

IX. Enriching the Oil and Gas Industry

A. Votes to Block or Limit Regulation of Oil and Gas Operations

House Republicans have voted 56 times to weaken environmental, health, and safety requirements for oil and gas companies.

The oil industry benefited from 14 votes to block EPA from taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the United States. The combustion of oil in the United States, primarily in the transportation sector, accounts for 40% of the country's emissions of carbon dioxide.³¹² Petroleum refineries also are a significant industrial source of greenhouse gases. In addition, the oil industry—and one oil company in particular, Shell—benefited from eight votes to allow offshore drilling operations to emit more air pollution along the Alaska, Pacific, and Atlantic coasts and limit public participation in air permitting decisions.³¹³

House Republicans also voted 14 times to weaken safety standards for offshore oil and gas drilling.

In May 2011, House Republicans voted unanimously to pass H.R. 1229, the Putting the Gulf of Mexico Back to Work Act.³¹⁴ This bill would have imposed a deadline of just 60 days for the Secretary of the Interior to approve or deny an application for a permit to drill in the Outer Continental Shelf. If the Secretary does not make a decision within 60 days, the permit would be approved automatically, even if the Secretary has not had time to assess the application for compliance with safety and oil spill response requirements. Rep. John Garamendi (D-CA) commented that the bill “seems to ignore every one of the recommendations that the [National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill] made about how to conduct deepwater drilling in a safe manner.”³¹⁵

During the debate on this bill, Republicans voted several times against amendments to ensure that drilling applicants would have the appropriate safety measures in place to prevent another major oil spill, including an amendment by Rep. Markey to set minimum standards for blowout preventers, establish new standards for well casing and cementing, and require independent third party certification of well design and blowout preventers;³¹⁶ an amendment by Rep. Garamendi to establish an independent safety organization to ensure that deepwater drilling applications meet safety requirements, as recommended by the National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon

³¹² U.S. EPA, *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2010*, Table 3-5 (EPA 430-R-12-001) (Apr. 2012).

³¹³ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 2021 (June 22, 2011) (Roll Call No. 478).

³¹⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 1229 (May 11, 2011) (Roll Call No. 309).

³¹⁵ Statement of Rep. John Garamendi, *Congressional Record*, H3134 (May 10, 2011).

³¹⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.272, Markey Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 1229 (May 10, 2011) (Roll Call No. 301).

Oil Spill;³¹⁷ and two amendments to ensure that the Secretary has enough time to review permit applications for deepwater drilling for compliance with all applicable safety requirements.³¹⁸

In July 2012, House Republicans passed another bill, H.R. 6082, to require significant new drilling off the Atlantic, Pacific, and Alaskan coasts with limited environmental review and without stronger drilling safety requirements. Specifically, the bill would have required the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a single environmental analysis of drilling in these new offshore waters, even though the potential environmental impacts along the Alaskan, Pacific, and Atlantic coasts would differ significantly by region. Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ) offered an amendment to strike the provision requiring that truncated environmental review. House Republicans voted 230-8 to oppose this amendment.³¹⁹ Rep. Ed Markey (D-MA) also offered an amendment requiring that companies drilling in offshore waters pursuant to this bill implement drilling safety requirements recommended by the BP oil spill commission. House Republicans voted 224-15 to oppose this amendment.³²⁰ The bill passed on July 25, 2012, with only nine Republicans voting in opposition.³²¹

House Republicans also voted to cut funding for oversight of offshore drilling. The FY2012 funding bill for the Department of the Interior reported by the Appropriations Committee provided \$33 million less than the President requested to ensure oversight and enforcement of offshore drilling safety requirements. The House Appropriations Committee also rejected the President's request to collect an additional \$52 million in inspection fees to support heightened oversight of offshore drilling.³²² Ultimately, the Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY2012, passed in December 2011, ensured that the Department of the Interior could collect these fees in order to hire additional personnel and cover costs associated with review and enforcement of offshore drilling permit applications.³²³

In addition to weakening oversight of offshore drilling, House Republicans pushed legislation to hasten permitting of new onshore drilling by weakening environmental safeguards. H.R. 4480, the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act, would have imposed arbitrary deadlines on the Interior Department's review of applications for permits to drill onshore. Drilling permits would be

³¹⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.271, Garamendi Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 1229 (May 10, 2011) (Roll Call No. 300).

³¹⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.274, Holt Amendment No. 6 to H.R. 1229 (May 11, 2011) (Roll Call No. 303); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.275, Polis Amendment No. 7 to H.R. 1229 (May 11, 2011) (Roll Call No. 304).

³¹⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1440, Holt Amendment to H.R. 6082 (July 25, 2012) (Roll Call No. 504).

³²⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1443, Markey Amendment to H.R. 6082 (July 25, 2012) (Roll Call No. 506).

³²¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 6082 (July 25, 2012) (Roll Call No. 511).

³²² Congressional Research Service, *Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies: FY2012 Appropriations* (Dec. 7, 2011) at 26-27.

³²³ P.L. 112-74.

automatically “deemed approved” after 60 days, even if the Interior Department has not finished its safety review or consultations with tribes or under the National Historic Preservation Act. The bill would have applied similar limitations to permits for construction of pipelines and roads in the National Petroleum Reserve, giving the Secretary only 60 days to review a permit before it was deemed approved. This would have made thorough environmental review of proposed roads and pipeline routes impossible.

H.R. 4480 also included a potentially unconstitutional requirement that would have required any American citizen seeking to protest an oil and gas lease, drilling permit, or right of way to post a nonrefundable \$5,000 “documentation fee.” Rep. Gerry Connolly (D-VA) offered an amendment clarifying that this provision could not infringe upon the protections afforded by the First Amendment to the Constitution to petition for the redress of grievances. House Republicans voted against this amendment 228-8.³²⁴

The bill passed on June 21, 2012 but did not become law.³²⁵

B. Votes to Open New Offshore Areas to Oil and Gas Drilling

In May 2011, the House passed H.R. 1230, the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act, to expedite leasing in the Gulf of Mexico and open new areas off the Virginia coast to oil and gas drilling. The bill would have required the Department of the Interior to hold four lease sales on a hasty timeline and to use out-of-date environmental analyses to determine potential impacts of new drilling. Only two Republicans voted to oppose this bill.³²⁶

Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ) offered an amendment to require updated environmental reviews before allowing the new lease sales to proceed. He argued that the bill deemed “the shoddy environmental analysis conducted four years ago, in other words, years prior to the gulf oil blowout, to be sufficient for all future lease sales in the Gulf, despite their glaring deficiencies.”³²⁷ This amendment was defeated, with only eight Republicans supporting it.³²⁸

House Republicans also passed H.R. 1231, the Reversing President Obama’s Offshore Moratorium Act, which would have required the Secretary of the Interior to open the Pacific, Atlantic, and Alaskan coasts to oil and gas drilling. This bill would have circumvented the standard process for identifying areas for lease and conducting thorough environmental reviews by directing the Secretary to issue leases for half of all unleased acreage in the Outer Continental Shelf. If

³²⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1302, Connolly Amendment to H.R. 4480 (June 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 398).

³²⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 4480 (June 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 410).

³²⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 1230 (May 5, 2011) (Roll Call No. 298).

³²⁷ Statement of Rep. Rush Holt, *Congressional Record*, H3088 (May 5, 2011).

³²⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.268, Holt Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 1230 (May 5, 2011) (Roll Call No. 295).

enacted, individual states could not have prohibited drilling off their coasts. Only nine Republicans opposed this bill.³²⁹

House Republicans defeated several amendments to H.R. 1231 to exclude development in certain coastal areas or to give states the opportunity to prevent drilling off their coasts. House Republicans voted 222 to 5 against a proposal to enact a permanent moratorium on oil and gas drilling in the eastern Gulf of Mexico along Florida's coast, despite concerns raised by the Department of Defense about the potential impacts of drilling on military operations in the area.³³⁰ They voted down a similar proposal to prohibit drilling off northern California's coast, despite local opposition.³³¹ Former Rep. Jay Inslee (D-WA) offered an amendment to give the state of Washington the ability to approve any oil and gas leases issued off its coast. This states' rights amendment was defeated, gaining only ten Republican votes.³³²

In July 2012, the Department of the Interior finalized its proposed oil and gas leasing program for 2012 to 2017. This plan strikes a balance between protection of sensitive coastal areas and expansion of oil and gas activities. It schedules 15 new lease sales in the Gulf of Mexico and coastal Alaska and makes more than 75% of the undiscovered technically recoverable oil and gas in the outer continental shelf available for development, yet it also prevents drilling off the California coast, the Florida coast, and East Coast beaches.³³³

In contrast to this balanced plan, House Republicans introduced H.R. 6082, a bill requiring the Department of the Interior to hold 29 new lease sales off the coasts of 14 states by 2017, including tracts off the coast of southern California. The bill also would have limited environmental review of drilling in these new areas. The bill passed on July 25, 2012, with only nine Republicans voting in opposition.³³⁴

None of these bills became law.

³²⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.R. 1231 (May 12, 2011) (Roll Call No. 320).

³³⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.285, Brown Amendment No. 6 to H.R. 1231 (May 12, 2011) (Roll Call No. 316). The Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, signed into law in December 2006, enacted a moratorium on new drilling in Gulf of Mexico within 125 miles off the Florida coastline until 2022.

³³¹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.286, Thompson Amendment No. 7 to H.R. 1231 (May 12, 2011) (Roll Call No. 317).

³³² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.287, Inslee Amendment No. 8 to H.R. 1231 (May 12, 2011) (Roll Call No. 318).

³³³ U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, *Proposed Final Outer Continental Shelf Oil & Gas Leasing Program 2012-2017* (June 2012) at 2.

³³⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 6082 (July 25, 2012) (Roll Call No. 511).

C. Votes to Open New Onshore Lands to Oil and Gas Drilling

In addition to opening up new coastal areas to drilling, House Republicans passed H.R. 3408, the Protecting Investment in Oil Shale the Next Generation of Environmental, Energy, and Resource Security (PIONEERS) Act. This bill would have required the Secretary of the Interior to lease onshore public lands for oil shale development and blocked additional environmental review under the National Environmental Policy Act, Endangered Species Act, and other statutes. Oil shale is a sedimentary rock that contains a waxy, bituminous substance called kerogen. To release the oil from the kerogen, a company must heat the rock to a high temperature, an expensive and energy-intensive process that is not yet commercially viable.³³⁵ According to the Government Accountability Office, development of oil shale resources in the western United States “poses significant environmental challenges” for water quantity and quality, air quality, and wildlife.³³⁶ Republicans voted 216 to 21 to pass this bill on February 16, 2012.³³⁷

House Republicans also tried to expand energy production on federal onshore lands as part of H.R. 4480, the Domestic Energy and Jobs Act. H.R. 4480 called for new onshore drilling in two primary ways. First, the bill set an arbitrary requirement that the Department of the Interior offer for lease at least 25% of the onshore federal lands nominated by the industry every year for energy production. This requirement applied whether or not drilling in these areas would compromise other uses of the lands, such as hunting, fishing, livestock grazing, and recreation, or damage an area’s cultural or ecological value. Second, the bill required the Secretary of Energy to develop a plan to increase domestic oil and gas leasing from onshore (and offshore) federal lands that are under the jurisdiction of other federal agencies within 180 days of a release of petroleum from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve (SPR). The plan would have had to increase the acreage of federal lands leased by a percentage equaling the percentage of SPR petroleum released, whether or not this conflicted with other agencies’ plans for those lands.

H.R. 4480 bill passed on June 21, 2012 but did not become law.³³⁸

D. Votes to Block Clean Energy Alternatives

As noted above, House Republicans have voted for budget resolutions and appropriations bills that dramatically cut funding for renewable energy and block implementation of programs designed to deploy clean energy technology, including alternative fuels that can reduce the country’s consumption of oil. Overall, during the 112th Congress, the House Republicans voted 46 times against improving vehicle efficiency and investing in alternatives to oil and gas.

³³⁵ Government Accountability Office, *Unconventional Oil and Gas Production: Opportunities and Challenges of Oil Shale Development*, Testimony of Anu K. Mittal, Director Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office, Before the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, Committee on Science, U.S. House of Representatives (112th Cong.) (May 10, 2012).

³³⁶ *Id.*

³³⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 3408 (Feb. 16, 2012) (Roll Call No. 71).

³³⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 4480 (June 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 410).

House Republicans' attack on advanced biofuels programs is of particular benefit to the oil industry. House Republicans voted to block the Department of Energy from providing loan guarantees to renewable energy systems and cutting-edge biofuels projects.³³⁹ House Republicans also passed an appropriations bill for the Department of Defense that blocked the agency from purchasing alternative fuels if they cost more than conventional fuels.³⁴⁰ The same bill blocked implementation of a provision in the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) that prohibits the government from entering into long-term contracts for the procurement of alternative fuels that are more polluting than conventional fuels.³⁴¹ In fact, during the 112th Congress, the House voted seven separate times to block implementation of this EISA provision, which is designed to promote the government's use of clean fuels that are not derived from coal or oil.³⁴²

E. Votes to Preserve Oil Industry Tax and Royalty Breaks

At the same time that House Republicans voted repeatedly to cut funding for clean energy, they also voted to preserve tax breaks for oil and gas companies. In March 2011, Rep. Bill Keating (D-MA) offered an amendment to appropriations legislation that would have revoked a collection of oil company tax giveaways totaling \$40 billion, saying "let's stop sending taxpayers' money to the most profitable companies in the world."³⁴³ Not a single Republican voted in favor of the measure.³⁴⁴

House Republicans also have voted to continue other oil industry giveaways. As the result of Interior Department errors and a successful oil company court challenge, oil companies that were

³³⁹ H.Amdt.1219 to H.R. 5325, Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013. This amendment passed by voice vote on June 5, 2012.

³⁴⁰ Section 314 of H.R. 4310, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (112th Cong.).

³⁴¹ Section 313 of H.R. 4310, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (112th Cong.).

³⁴² H.Amdt.477 to H.R. 2112, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (passed by voice vote on June 16, 2011); H. Amdt.670 to H.R. 2354, Energy and Water Development Appropriations (passed by voice vote on July 14, 2011); U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1078 to H.R. 5326, Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (May 9, 2012) (Roll Call No. 233); H.Amdt.1227 to H.R. 5325, Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act (passed by voice vote on June 5, 2012); H. Amdt.1264 to H.R. 5855, Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act (passed by voice vote on June 7, 2012); H.Amdt.1360 to H.R. 5972, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2013 (passed by voice vote on June 27, 2012); and H.Amdt.1428 to H.R. 5856, Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2013 (passed by voice vote on July 19, 2012).

³⁴³ Statement of Rep. Bill Keating, *Congressional Record*, H1426 (Mar. 1, 2011).

³⁴⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Motion to Recommit H.J. Res. 44 (Mar. 1, 2011) (Roll Call No. 153).

issued leases for drilling in the Gulf of Mexico from 1996 through 2000 are now able to produce oil without paying any royalties to the American people, no matter how high the price of a barrel of oil. The Government Accountability Office has estimated that these forgone royalties could amount to as much as \$53 billion over the life of these leases.³⁴⁵ The Interior Department projects that the American people stand to lose \$9.5 billion in foregone royalties over the next 10 years.³⁴⁶

Twice in 2011, Rep. Markey offered amendments to close this loophole, which allows oil and gas companies to avoid royalty payments for oil produced in the Gulf of Mexico. The amendments would have barred oil companies from receiving future leases unless they agreed to renegotiate their existing leases to require standard royalty payments and would have prevented the federal treasury from losing billions of dollars in future royalty payments.³⁴⁷ Nonetheless, House Republicans voted 226 to 11 and 223 to 14 to oppose these amendments to ensure that oil and gas companies pay their fair share on the oil and gas recovered from offshore drilling.³⁴⁸

In 2012, during debate on H.R. 4480, Rep. Rush Holt (D-NJ) offered a similar amendment to block new oil and gas leases on public lands for companies that have not yet renegotiated any royalty free leases they already own in the Gulf of Mexico. House Republicans voted 228-7 to defeat this amendment.³⁴⁹ Rep. Louise Slaughter (D-NY) also offered an amendment to H.R. 4480 requiring oil companies to forgo certain tax breaks before obtaining new leases on public lands. Only one Republican voted in favor of this amendment.³⁵⁰

F. Votes to Curtail Review of the Keystone XL pipeline

TransCanada's proposed Keystone XL pipeline would transport up to 830,000 barrels per day of tar sands crude oil from Alberta, Canada, to refineries in the Gulf Coast. This pipeline would almost double the quantity of tar sands fuel currently imported to the United States. It also raises serious environmental concerns because of the risks of spills and leaks, especially into the Ogallala Aquifer, and because producing oil from tar sands is more energy intensive than producing a barrel

³⁴⁵ Government Accountability Office, *Oil and Gas Royalties: The Federal System for Collecting Oil and Gas Revenues Needs Comprehensive Reassessment* (GAO-08-691) (Sept. 3, 2008).

³⁴⁶ Based on Interior Department estimates provided to Natural Resources Committee Democratic staff.

³⁴⁷ Estimates of total foregone royalty revenue vary widely, depending on assumptions made. At the high end of estimates, the federal treasury could lose \$53 billion. See Government Accountability Office, *Oil and Gas Royalties: Litigation over Royalty Relief Could Cost the Federal Government Billions of Dollars* (GAO-08-792R) (June 5, 2008).

³⁴⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.119, Markey Amendment No. 27 to H.R. 1 (Feb. 18, 2011) (Roll Call No. 109); Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.282, Markey Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 1231 (May 11, 2011) (Roll Call No. 313).

³⁴⁹ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.1307, Holt Amendment to H.R. 4480 (June 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 403).

³⁵⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Motion to Recommit H.R. 4480 with Instructions (June 21, 2012) (Roll Call No. 409).

of conventional oil. On a life-cycle basis, gasoline derived from tar sands generates substantially higher greenhouse gas emissions than gasoline from conventional oil.³⁵¹

In May 2011, House Republicans introduced legislation, H.R. 1938, to force the Obama Administration to make a decision on the Keystone XL permit by November 1, 2011. This bill, which would have short-circuited the existing State Department review process, passed on July 26, 2011, with only three Republican dissenters.³⁵² During the debate, House Republicans rejected concerns about the pipeline's impact on greenhouse gas emissions, air quality, and water quality. According to Rep. Steve Scalise (R-LA), they are the concerns of "radicals [who] don't want that oil coming in. They don't like oil at all. So I guess they're going to ride around on bicycles."³⁵³

Only five Republicans supported an amendment to require the pipeline operator, TransCanada, to demonstrate an ability to respond to a worst-case pipeline spill.³⁵⁴ Similarly, only four Republicans supported an amendment to examine whether current pipeline safety regulations are sufficient to address the risks of transporting tar sands oil.³⁵⁵ Only one Republican supported an amendment to require a study of the potential health impacts of air pollution from refineries processing tar sands oil.³⁵⁶

House Republicans voted almost unanimously to support a finding that the Keystone XL pipeline will result in no significant change in total United States or global greenhouse gas emissions, despite evidence to the contrary.³⁵⁷ They voted 232 to 3 against adding a finding that the pipeline would cross the Ogallala Aquifer and that spills from the pipeline could threaten groundwater and drinking water.³⁵⁸ Rep. Lee Terry (R-NE), the bill's sponsor, claimed that adding these facts about the pipeline's route and its potential environmental impact would amount to "gutting" the bill.³⁵⁹

³⁵¹ Natural Resources Defense Council, *GHG Emission Factors for High Carbon Intensity Crude Oils* (Sept. 2010).

³⁵² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 1938 (July 26, 2011) (Roll Call No. 650).

³⁵³ Statement of Rep. Steve Scalise, *Congressional Record*, H5512 (July 26, 2011).

³⁵⁴ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.727, Hanabusa Amendment No. 8 to H.R. 1938 (July 26, 2011) (Roll Call No. 646).

³⁵⁵ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.722, Eshoo Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 1938 (July 26, 2011) (Roll Call No. 642).

³⁵⁶ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.728, Johnson Amendment No. 9 to H.R. 1938 (July 26, 2011) (Roll Call No. 647).

³⁵⁷ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.721, Rush Amendment No. 2 to H.R. 1938 (July 26, 2011) (Roll Call No. 641).

³⁵⁸ U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Agreeing to H.Amdt.720, Welch Amendment No. 1 to H.R. 1938 (July 26, 2011) (Roll Call No. 640).

³⁵⁹ Statement of Rep. Lee Terry, *Congressional Record*, H5519 (July 26, 2011).

At the committee level, the House Foreign Affairs Committee also included language in the Foreign Relations Authorization Act that called on the Secretary of State to approve the pipeline.³⁶⁰ Rep. Howard Berman opposed the measure, arguing that he did not want to put aside the Administration's interagency process given the pipeline's potential impact on U.S. interests.

In December 2011, House Republicans included language about the Keystone XL pipeline in a bill to extend the payroll tax cut.³⁶¹ The bill directed the President to approve the Keystone XL pipeline within 60 days unless he determined the pipeline is not in the national interest. This would have curtailed the environmental review process, denied the public an opportunity to comment, and required the President to make a decision on the pipeline before a final route had even been selected. House Republicans voted 224 to 14 in support of this bill.³⁶²

In February 2012, House Republicans released the text of H.R. 7, the transportation reauthorization bill, which included several Keystone XL provisions. H.R. 7 eliminated the existing requirement to determine whether the pipeline is in the national interest prior to approval and instead directed the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) to issue a permit for the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline within 30 days of receiving the application, even if the final pipeline route had not been determined. The bill also prohibited FERC from adding conditions to the permit and deemed the permit issued if FERC did not act within 30 days. House Republicans did not call a vote on H.R. 7.

³⁶⁰ Section 1151, H.R. 2583 (112th Cong.)

³⁶¹ Subtitle A to Title I, H.R. 3630 (112th Cong.).

³⁶² U.S. House of Representatives, Roll Call Vote on Passage of H.R. 3630 (Dec. 13, 2011) (Roll Call No. 923).

X. Conclusion

The House was in session for 328 legislative days during the 112th Congress and took 317 anti-environment votes during this period. The House Republicans averaged almost one anti-environmental vote for every day the House was in session. More than 42% of these votes benefited the oil and gas industry.

Of the 317 anti-environment votes, 262 were roll call votes. In total, the House took more than 1,300 legislative roll call votes in the 112th Congress.³⁶³ Almost one in four of the roll call votes taken in the 112th Congress – 23% – were votes to undermine environmental protections.

On average, 227 Republican members of the House – 94% of the Republican members – voted for the anti-environment position during these roll call votes. On average, 164 Democratic members of the House – 87% of the Democratic members – voted for the pro-environment position.

The anti-environment votes reached broadly and deeply across federal environmental policy. They included 95 votes to undermine Clean Air Act protections, 67 votes to weaken protection of public lands and wildlife, 53 votes to block action to address climate change, and 38 votes to undermine Clean Water Act protections. The Environmental Protection Agency was the target of 145 of these votes; the Department of the Interior was the target of 81 of these votes; and the Department of Energy was the target of 55 of these votes.

³⁶³ This tally excludes 260 non-legislative roll call votes, including votes on Rules of the House, House Rules Committee resolutions providing for consideration of legislation, quorum calls, motions to adjourn, and votes to approve the House journal.