

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
Clean Air Act of 1970.	MACT to Control Air Toxics from Boilers ("Boiler MACT")	Maximum Achievable Control Technology standards to control toxic pollutants from industrial boilers. Court order issued final rule regarding controls on industrial emissions, but due to high volume of comments, EPA asked the court to extend the deadline for final standards to allow for more public comment.	EPA issued final rule, currently under reconsideration.	April 30, 2012	Judicial. February 21, 2011, a final rule was issued by court order by the Federal District Court of the District of Columbia.	Industrial producers with old or polluting boilers	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 2250, legislation to nullify EPA rules requiring reduction in toxic emissions from industrial boilers and delays such reductions until at least 2018.	Annual projected costs: \$1.5 billion Annual projected benefits: \$27 billion- \$67 billion
Clean Air Act of 1970.	Area Source Standards for Boilers	Sets standards for smaller boilers, requiring tune ups every two years for about 187,000 boilers nationally.	Under reconsideration	April 30, 2012 (Same schedule as the Boiler MACT)	Judicial. DC Circuit vacated the boiler and related incinerator rules in 2007.	Boilers at thousands of smaller commercial, industrial, and institutional facilities	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 2250, legislation to nullify EPA rules requiring reduction in toxic emissions from industrial boilers and delays such reductions until at least 2018.	Annual projected costs: \$487 million Annual projected benefits: \$360-\$870 million
Clean Air Act of 1970.	Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incinerator (CISWI)	Sets standards for emissions from commercial and industrial solid waste incinerators.	EPA released proposed revisions December 2, 2011.	Same schedule as the Boiler MACT	Judicial. DC Circuit court remanded the boiler rules in 2007.	88 boilers that qualify as incinerators because they burn solid	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 2250, legislation to nullify EPA rules requiring reduction	Annual projected costs: \$232 million Annual

Source: McCarthy, James E. and Claudia Copeland, "EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?" Congressional Research Service. January, 19, 2012. Revised (4/21/12)

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
	Standards					waste.	in toxic emissions from industrial boilers and delays such reductions until at least 2018.	projected benefits: \$360-\$870 million
Clean Air Act of 1970.	Mercury And Air Toxics Standards (MACT) for Electric Generating Units	Requires 44% of coal- and oil-fired electric generating units to install technology that will reduce mercury and acid-gas emissions by about 90%.	EPA finalized standards	December 21, 2011. Standards enforced in 3 years, with possible 1 year extension.	Judicial. DC Circuit Court of Appeals vacated a 2005 rule, and rather than seek an appeal with the Supreme Court, the EPA agreed to create new MACT rule by November 2011.	Coal-fired electric generating units	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 2401, which included an amendment to nullify the utility MACT. (H. Amdt. 799)	Annual projected costs: \$9.6 billion Annual projected benefits: \$37-\$90 billion annually, avoiding 11,000 premature deaths annually.
Clean Air Act of 1970.	Emission Standards for Portland Cement manufacturing MACT and NSPS	Requires 92% reduction in particulate matter and mercury and a 97% reduction in acid gas emissions. These standards are projected to avoid 960 to 2500 premature deaths annually.	EPA announced final rule	September 9, 2010	December 9, 2011, the DC Circuit court of appeals remanded the 2010 standards for kilns using solid waste as fuel to the EPA.	Portland cement manufacturing industry	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 2681, legislation to nullify this rule.	Annual projected costs: \$350 million  Annual projected benefits: \$6.7-\$18 billion
Clean Air Act of 1970.	Reciprocating Internal Combustion	Rules for RICE requirements on site location, size,	EPA announced final rule	March 3, 2010	Judicial. Standards respond in-part	900,000 engines used as backup	This standard has not been the subject of legislation.	Annual projected costs:

Source: McCarthy, James E. and Claudia Copeland, "EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?" Congressional Research Service. January, 19, 2012. Revised (4/21/12)

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
	Engine (RICE) Rule for Stationary Diesel Engines & RICE Rule for stationary spark engines	and age. Owners may have to install pollution control equipment, or burn cleaner fuel.			to 2008 DC Circuit Court of Appeals ruling.	generators		\$626 million in 2013  Annual projected benefits: \$1.45-\$3.5 billion annually by 2013
Clean Air Act of 1970.	Emission Standards for New Marine (C3) Engines and Emission Control Areas for Ocean-Going Ships	New emission standards for marine engines. Requires cleaner, low sulfur fuels for all ships within 200 nautical miles of most US shores—generally supported by the shipping industry.	EPA announced final rule	April 30, 2010	Neither—the rule reflects international standards set by the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution from Ships (MARPOL).	New marine engines for ocean-going ships beginning in 2011	These standards have not been the subject of legislation.	Annual costs: \$3 billion+ Annual projected benefits: \$90 billion+ Both environmental and industry groups support this rule.
Clean Air Act of 1970.	GHG Endangerment Finding	The EPA released findings that 6 GHGs endanger public health and welfare. They do not impose regulation directly, but support regulating GHG emissions.	EPA issued final rule	Rule announced December 15, 2009.	Judicial. Supreme Court required this finding in <i>Massachusetts v. EPA</i> , ruled April 2, 2007.	Required for EPA’s finalized GHG emission standards for cars and light-duty trucks.	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 910, legislation to strip the EPA of their authority to regulate greenhouse gas emissions.	This action was required prior to implementation of GHG emission standards for cars and light trucks.
Clean Air Act of	Tier 3 Motor Vehicle	Reviews old standards. Allows	EPA yet to issue	Rule proposal	Neither—May 2010, President	Auto and light truck	The House has not taken action on	Several Senators

Source: McCarthy, James E. and Claudia Copeland, “EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?” Congressional Research Service. January, 19, 2012. Revised (4/21/12)

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
1970.	Emission and Fuel Standards	for the use of new technology in cars, and tightens gasoline sulfur standards to improve performance in catalytic converters.	proposed rule	expected March 2012	Obama sent a memorandum to the EPA asking for a review of old vehicle emission standards.	manufacturers, consumers, distributors, and refineries of gasoline	these standards, which have yet to be proposed.	requested EPA Administrator Jackson delay the progress of this rule, concerned it would raise price of gasoline.
Clean Air Act of 1970.	Light Duty Motor Vehicle GHG Rule for Model Years 2012-2016	Requires an increase in fuel economy to 34.1 mpg by model year 2016, beginning in model year 2012. For 2017-2025 vehicles, average fuel economy will rise to about 50 mpg.	EPA issued final rule jointly with the Department of Transportation and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.	Rule announced May 7, 2010. Standards for model years 2017-2025 were proposed December 1, 2011.	Both. Supreme Court required this finding in <i>Massachusetts v. EPA</i> , ruled April 2, 2007. Also, Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 required more stringent fuel economy standards.	New cars, minivans, SUVs, light trucks. EPA estimates an additional cost of \$1,100 per vehicle. This cost is expected to be paid back through lifetime fuel savings.	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 2608, legislation to defund the Department of Energy's loans to support manufacturers of clean vehicles and renewable energies.	Total Projected Costs: \$192 billion Total Projected Benefits: \$801 billion  BMW, Chrysler, Toyota, Mazda, Volkswagen, GM, and Honda supported this rule, as well as the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers.
Clean Air Act of 1970.	Medium and Heavy-Duty Vehicle GHG Rule.	New standards in heavy-duty vehicles require 17% reduction in GHG emissions for diesel, and 12% for	EPA issued final rule	Announced September 15, 2011. Effective for model year 2014.	Legislative. Fuel standards required by section 102 of Energy Independence	New trucks, starting in 2014 model year.	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 910, legislation to strip the EPA of their authority to regulate greenhouse	Projected annual costs: \$8.1 billion  Projected annual

Source: McCarthy, James E. and Claudia Copeland, "EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?" Congressional Research Service. January, 19, 2012. Revised (4/21/12)

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
		gasoline. Standards will be implemented for 2014-2018.			and Security Act (EISA) of 2007.		gas emissions.	benefits: \$57 billion
Clean Air Act of 1970.	GHG Tailoring Rule	Defines which facilities are required to obtain GHG emission permits to and how the rule will be phased in. Of the 17,000 facilities, the rule requires 1,600 new or modified facilities to install Best Available Control Technology for reducing GHG emissions.	EPA issued final rule	Rule announced June 3, 2010.	Neither—the tailoring rule defines thresholds required by the Clean Air Act such that small businesses, farms, and large residential structures are not included in consideration of other GHG EPA rules.	17,000 stationary GHG producing facilities, producing annual emissions of 75,000-100,000 tons of carbon dioxide equivalents.	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 2401, which included an amendment to scrap EPA precedent and have the EPA set air pollution thresholds on safety based on industry costs.	About 6 million smaller scale sources—small businesses, farms, and large residential structures—are exempt from GHG emissions regulations.
Clean Air Act of 1970.	PSD and Title V Permit Requirements for GHG emissions.	Requires the facilities identified by the Tailoring Rule to install the Best Available Control Technology for pollutants, including GHGs. Necessity determined on case-by-case basis.	EPA issued final rule	Effective January 2, 2011.	Legislative. Required once Light Duty Motor Vehicle Rule was announced. Mandated under section 165 of the Clean Air Act.	Applies only to the large stationary sources identified by the Tailoring Rule.	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 910, legislation to restrict EPA authority and to repeal a dozen EPA regulatory actions dealing with greenhouse gases that trap heat inside the atmosphere.	State agencies will determine, based upon general EPA guidelines, whether emitters meet BACT requirements.  Over the past 20 years, about 75% of human-made carbon

Source: McCarthy, James E. and Claudia Copeland, "EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?" Congressional Research Service. January, 19, 2012. Revised (4/21/12)

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
								dioxide emissions were from burning fossil fuels. (Source: Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy)
Clean Air Act of 1970.	Expanded Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS2)	In 2010, EPA reduced standards for use of 12.95 billion gallons of biofuels (0.95 billion non-corn starch ethanol) in transportation fuel to 6.5 million gallons, due to lack of commercial biofuel production. The level was lowered again in 2011 and in 2012 for the same reason. Most recently, EPA lowered level to 8.65 million gallons.	EPA issued final rule.	Promulgated annually. Announced January 9, 2012 for this year.	Legislative. Required by the Energy Independence and Security Act (EISA) of 2007.	Petroleum refiners, biofuel producers.	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 2354, legislation to defund clean energy initiatives—cutting \$97 million investments in solar energy, \$46 million in clean emission vehicles, \$61 million for green buildings, \$141 million for building weatherization, and \$80 million for advanced energy research.	For 2012, EPA predicts an available 8.65 million gallons of cellulosic biofuel, 1.5 billion gallons biomass-based diesel, 2.0 billion gallons advanced biofuel, and 15.2 billion gallons of renewable fuel. (Source: EPA 2012 RFS fact sheet) Biofuels are a renewable alternative to gasoline for

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
								powering our vehicles. Each gallon of gasoline burned emits 20 pounds of carbon dioxide into the air. (Source: Office of Transportation and Air Quality, Department of Energy)
Clean Air Act of 1970.	Ethanol Blend Wall Waiver	In 2009, 52 ethanol producers asked the EPA to raise the cap (“blend wall”) on gasoline ethanol content from 10% to 15%. The “blend wall” limited the industry’s ability to meet requirements from the EISA. In 2011, EPA issued partial waiver for cars newer than model year 2001.	EPA issued final rule, including labeling requirements .	Announced June 23, 2011.	Legislative. The EISA of 2007 mandates increased use of renewable fuels. Unless EPA signs a waiver allowing for more use of ethanol in gasoline, it will be difficult to meet this mandate.	Gasoline refiners and blenders, auto manufacturers, and manufacturers of engines for outdoor equipment of all types.		
Clean Air Act of 1970.	National Ambient Air Quality Standard	EPA defines what it considers to be clean air with NAAQS and uses	Proposal withdrawn, at the President’s	Proposed January 19, 2010; withdrawn	Legislative. The Clean Air Act requires EPA to review NAAQS	Local governments	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 2401, legislation to delay effect of EPA	Estimated cost of \$19 billion to \$90 billion annually in

Source: McCarthy, James E. and Claudia Copeland, “EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?” Congressional Research Service. January, 19, 2012. Revised (4/21/12)

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
	(NAAQS) for Ozone	them to reduce pollution in certain areas. However, the NAAQS for ozone has wide reach and high potential cost, so the EPA aimed to review the ozone standard in particular.	request.	September 2, 2011.	every 5 years.		rules until studies of cumulative impacts to standards outside the scope of the Clean Air Act are complete.	2020, with benefits of roughly the same amount.
Clean Air Act of 1970.	National Ambient Air Quality Standard for Particulate Matter (PM), including farm dust	EPA regulates particulate matter (PM) in the air, such as output from industrial and urban areas. Agricultural interests lobbied Congress to restrict EPA regulation of rural PM with HR 1633, in December 2011. EPA has not yet proposed changes.	EPA yet to formally propose.	Proposal expected in 2012. Not likely to go into effect until 2013.	Both. In 2009, DC Circuit court remanded the 2006 fine particulate standards to EPA. Clean Air Act required review by October 2011.	Agricultural interests	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R.1633, a bill to stop the EPA from regulating farm dust as fine particulate.	Fine particulate, such as farm dust, affects far more people and counties than "coarse" (larger) particulate.
Clean Air Act of 1970.	National Ambient Air Quality Standard for Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> )	EPA defines what it considers to be clean air with NAAQS and uses them to reduce pollution in certain areas. Three NAAQS considered in 2010	EPA issued final review.	Announced June 22, 2010.	Both. DC Circuit remanded the SO <sub>2</sub> standard to EPA in 1998. Clean Air Act requires review of NAAQS	Coal-Fired Electric Plant	This standard has not been the subject of legislation.	Annual projected costs: \$1.8 billion to \$6.8 billion  Annual projected

Source: McCarthy, James E. and Claudia Copeland, "EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?" Congressional Research Service. January, 19, 2012. Revised (4/21/12)



Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
		and 2011; Sulfur Dioxide standard considered the most economically significant, with projected benefits 5 to 6 times the costs.			every 5 years.			benefits: \$9 billion to \$40.8 billion
Clean Air Act of 1970.	Cross-State Air Pollution Rule	Sets up cap-and-trade programs for SO <sub>2</sub> and NO <sub>x</sub> for power plants that cause air quality problems in downwind states. Projected to avoid 13,000 to 34,000 premature deaths.	Implementation was stayed by the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, December 30, 2011.	Oral argument expected in April 2012.	Judicial. DC Circuit remanded the rule to EPA in 2008.	Electric power plants in 28 Eastern states.	H.R. 2401 would have revoked this rule. Congressman Lewis voted against this bill.	Annual projected costs: \$9.6 billion Annual projected benefits: \$120 billion to \$280 billion
Clean Water Act of 1972. This law's goal was to eliminate most water pollution by 1985.	Construction Site Effluent Limitation Guidelines	Rule to limit pollution from storm water runoff at construction sites. Requires certain sites to use erosion and sediment control.	EPA yet to finalize rule	November 19, 2012	Judicial. Federal court ordered EPA to issue a final rule by December 1, 2009.	Construction firms disturbing one or more acres of land	"Our progress and developments in the world are important, but we must progress mindfully. We cannot allow something so simple as soil erosion at our construction sites destroy the beauty and life around us."	These rules are implemented via state-issued permits.
Clean Water Act	Pesticide Application	Requires all operators covered	EPA issued final permit	Rule took effect	Judicial. Federal court	Applicators of pesticides	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R.	The House passed H.R.

Source: McCarthy, James E. and Claudia Copeland, "EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?" Congressional Research Service. January, 19, 2012. Revised (4/21/12)

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
of 1972. This law's goal was to eliminate most water pollution by 1985.	General Permit	by the permit—including mosquito, aquatic weed and algae, and pest control—to minimize pesticide discharge into waters.	Oct. 31, 2011	immediately	ruling invalidated a 2006 EPA rule.		872, a bill to exempt aerial pesticide application activities from clean water permit requirements.	872 to repeal the rule, and the bill has since been approved by the Senate Agriculture Committee.
Clean Water Act of 1972. This law's goal was to eliminate most water pollution by 1985.	Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Limit (TMDL)	A TMDL is the upper limit of pollutant allowed in a body of water. States in the Chesapeake Bay watershed must develop plan to limit pollutants to TMDL to improve overall water quality.	EPA issued final rule Dec. 29, 2010	Chesapeake Bay states are developing and implementing cleanup plans.	Judicial. Court ordered schedule to restore water quality in Chesapeake Bay.	Chesapeake Bay watershed states	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 1, which included an amendment to block funding for development of the TMDL of Chesapeake Bay.	The TMDL is not direct regulation. The Bay watershed states must create plans to improve the current quality.
Clean Water Act of 1972	Florida Numeric Nutrient Water Quality Standards	Revises Florida's standards. Currently the state has poor water quality due to agricultural and industrial runoff. Standards are not effective until Florida translates federal requirements to state law.	EPA announced first phase of standards December 5, 2010.	Second phase of standards due by March 2012, and finalized by November 15, 2012.	Legislative. The Clean Water Act authorizes EPA to issue water quality standards if a state fails to adopt requirements that comply with the Clean Water Act.	Florida residents	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 1, which included an amendment to block new EPA water quality standards for Florida. (H. Amdt. 143)	Annual EPA-projected costs of the Phase I rule: \$16-\$25 million Annual projected benefits: \$28 million. Costs of Phase 2 rule unknown for now.
Clean Water Act	Revised Stormwater	Current rule regulates	EPA yet to propose rule	Final rule expected in	Judicial. EPA agreed to	Uncertain, as the rule has	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R.	Current rules on stormwater

Source: McCarthy, James E. and Claudia Copeland, "EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?" Congressional Research Service. January, 19, 2012. Revised (4/21/12)

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
of 1972. This law's goal was to eliminate most water pollution by 1985.	Rule	stormwater discharges. Revised rule ie Expected to focus on limiting pollution runoff from post-construction sites.		2012. Schedule has been delayed.	revise the rule as part of a 2010 settlement agreement.	not yet been proposed. EPA has toured the country seeking public comment, particularly potentially affected entities.	2018, legislation to remove EPA authority to enforce the Clean Water Act.	management date back to 1990.
Clean Water Act of 1977	CWA General Permit for Surface Coal Mining in Appalachia (Army Corps of Engineers)	Revised permit is intended to strengthen Clean Water Act permit rules for surface coal mining activities in Appalachia.	Various short term and long term actions underway by several agencies to strengthen regulation of surface coal mining in Appalachia	Finalized rule from the EPA due March 18, 2012.	Neither— President Obama's administration cited the 2007 rule's exceptions to mining waste disposals as potentially harmful to nearby waterways.	Coal industry, Appalachia	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 1, which included an amendment to block EPA, Corps of Army Engineers, Office of Surface Mining from protecting navigable waters from mountaintop removal coal mining. (H. Amdt. 151)	EPA and the Office of Surface Mining (DOI) have related ongoing regulatory initiatives.
Clean Water Act of 1972. This law's goal was to eliminate most water pollution	Revised Cooling Water Intake Rule	Rule protects fish from water intake valves used for cooling power plants and manufacturers.	EPA proposed regulations March 28, 2011.	Final rule due by July 27, 2012.	Judicial. EPA rules issued in 2004 were remanded by order of a federal court.	Approximately 1,150 existing power plants and other manufacturing facilities	"We must protect our wildlife. It is our duty to the Earth. We must tend to the nature and world around us. Without it, we could not thrive."	In 2009, the Supreme Court ruled that EPA may perform cost-benefit analysis in developing regulation of

Source: McCarthy, James E. and Claudia Copeland, "EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?" Congressional Research Service. January, 19, 2012. Revised (4/21/12)

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
								cooling water intake structures.
Clean Water Act of 1972. This law's goal was to eliminate most water pollution by 1985. Delayed 35 years.	Revised Steam Electric Effluent Guidelines	Rule will revise technology-based regulations from 1982. Addresses mercury, arsenic, selenium, nutrients, total dissolved solids, and other pollutants in the water supply near power plants.	EPA has yet to propose rule.	Proposed rule due by July 23, 2012. Final rule due by January 2014.	Judicial. November 2010 consent decree requires EPA to propose revised rule by July 2012, and announce final rule by January 2014.	Steam electric power plants	"Dirty water hurts everyone. We cannot allow anyone to poison our waters. We need to know, without any doubt, that the water we drink, that our children play in, is safe."	Previous rule dated back to 1982.
Clean Water Act of 1972. This law's goal was to eliminate most water pollution by 1985.	SPCC Revisions including Compliance Date Extension for Farms	SPCC stands for Oil Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Requirements. Requires secondary containment of oil storage.	EPA announced final rule November 22, 2011	Rule effective May 10, 2013	Neither—EPA seeks to update and clarify interpretations from 2002 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990.	Farms subject to SPCC provisions	"Oil spills devastate habitats and communities. We must prevent such disasters before they occur, for the sake of our lives, homes, and well-being."	Milk had previously been considered oil, due to animal fat content. As mentioned in the 2012 State of The Union Address, this provision has been removed.
Clean Water Act of 1972. This law's goal was to eliminate most water	"Waters of the United States" Interpretive Guidance	Revised guidance is intended to clarify the geographic extent of federal regulatory authority under the Clean Water Act.	EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers proposed revised guidance on April 27,	EPA and Army Corps expect to propose revised regulatin at a future date,	Neither—EPA and Army Corps seek to clarify regulatory jurisdiction of the Clean	Potentially affects a wide range of activities subject to Clean Water Act	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 1, which included over 20 amendments to remove EPA authority over clean air and water.	Public comment on proposed jurisdiction was accepted until July 31, 2011.

Source: McCarthy, James E. and Claudia Copeland, "EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?" Congressional Research Service. January, 19, 2012. Revised (4/21/12)

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
pollution by 1985.			2011	unknown	Water Act in light of 2001 and 2006 Supreme Court rulings.	requirements.		
Toxic Substances Control Act of 1976 grants EPA the authority to regulate harmful chemicals.	Lead Renovation, Repair, and Painting	EPA revised a rule to reduce human health hazards associated with exposure to lead-based paint. Requires training and certification for workers and firms that remodel, repair, or paint homes, public, or commercial buildings built before 1978. Revises record-keeping and disclosure provisions and eliminates an opt-out provision.	EPA finalized rule	Effective October 1, 2010	Judicial. August 2009 settlement sets numerous deadlines	Workers and firms that remodel, repair, or paint homes and some commercial buildings	“Irresponsible removal of lead paint can poison us, our children, and our environment. We must take necessary precautions. Anything else is simply irresponsible.”	Initially, provisions for enforcement of this rule were not funded due to an amendment on H.R. 4899, the Disaster Relief and Summer Jobs Act of 2010.
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 gives EPA	Coal Combustion Waste	Responds in part to 2008 coal ash slurry in Kingston, Tennessee that covered hundreds of acres with 1.1 billion gallons of ash.	EPA proposed rule	June 21, 2010	None	Coal-fired electric power plants	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 2273, a bill to alter this rule.	In addition to the slurry risks, EPA found that the containment practices—disposing of

Source: McCarthy, James E. and Claudia Copeland, “EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?” Congressional Research Service. January, 19, 2012. Revised (4/21/12)

Statutory Authority	Name of Rule	What will the Rule do?	Status	Expected Date	Judicial or Legislative Requirement?	Affected Entities	Actions by Congressman Lewis	Additional Information
authority over hazardous wastes.		Determines legal means to regulate such waste. EPA is still seeking public comments.						coal combustion waste—is harmful to environmental and human health, as it leaks arsenic and selenium.
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976 gives EPA guidelines for management of non-hazardous solid wastes.	Identification of Materials That Are Solid Wastes	Clarifies when certain materials, when burned as fuel in a combustion unit, qualify as “solid waste,” to be regulated under CISWI Definitions Rule. DC Circuit interpreted Clean Air Act to refer to “any solid waste material at all,” and EPA received many public comments—so the rule is under reconsideration.	Under reconsideration	April 30, 2012	Judicial. DC Circuit vacated related rules addressing boilers and incinerators in 2007.	Boilers and incinerators that burn discarded materials. Will not affect current oil recycling regulation, and explicitly excludes “scrap tires... under the oversight of established tire collection programs.”	Congressman Lewis voted against H.R. 2250, legislation to change definition of solid wastes.	EPA has stated that this rule would not directly impose any costs or benefits, but would work with the Boiler MACT and CISWI Standards. (See above.)