

ANDY BARR, JAMES COMER, BRETT  
GUTHRIE, THOMAS MASSIE, & (HAL RODGERS)\*

*HOUSE BILL & RESOLUTION VOTING RECORDS  
For E.P.A./ENVIRONMENT.*

[Current as of Tuesday, April 25, 2017]

**NOTE:** The entries below are the House bills sponsored or co-sponsored by **Andy Barr** as of April 22, 2017. The voting records of other Republican House of Representatives members from Kentucky also are cited. They are **James Comer, Brett Guthrie, Thomas Massie, and Hal Rodgers.**

Members of the E.P.A./Environment sub-committee of Indivisible Bluegrass compiled this information. We selected bills, etc., that are most applicable to the districts of the aforementioned Republican members of the House of Representatives. There might be additional bills, etc., that were overlooked. Therefore, consider this to be an “evolving” document, which means that it will be updated when appropriate.

Several bills *not* specific to EPA/Environment are included in the list below. Reason for inclusion is that the contents/goals/intentions will have ramifications for the environment, and for Kentucky in particular.

House Bills are listed by number (i.e., *lowest number to highest number*). This numerical listing includes *HJ Resolutions*. Each HR bill (etc.) is listed on a separate page. This permits the reader to add his/her notes if contents of the page are being used to communicate a message. The same format will apply to *Senate Bills, Resolutions*, etc. [forthcoming].

Data for these bills was taken from [congress.gov](http://congress.gov) and [countable.us](http://countable.us). Several summaries, when available, were copied verbatim, and several have been shortened. Members of the Indivisible Bluegrass E.P.A./Environment sub-committee wrote others, as well as the possible Talking Points.

*Senate* items (yet to be researched as of Tuesday, April 25, 2017) will be submitted separately. See Indivisible Bluegrass website for this material, and for possible additional data pertaining to the *House of Representatives*.

\*Voting Record for Hal Rodgers concerning EPA/Environment-Related bills is scanty. Possible Reason: Hal Rodgers has been a HR member for many years, and he might think that current anti-EPA legislation is either too extreme or unnecessary. However, the few bills he has “endorsed” most certainly do affect the Agency. Other voting record sources should be consulted for clarification.

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HJ Res. 22</b>	“Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of a rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources".
Background Information	Introduced (1/06/2017) by Scott Perry (R-Pa) HOUSE Committee: Introduced <b>Latest Action: No Co-Sponsors</b> from Kentucky.
Purpose of Bill	“This joint resolution nullifies the Environmental Protection Agency's rule published on June 3, 2016, that revised new source performance standards under the Clean Air Act and established new standards for emissions of greenhouse gases and volatile organic compounds from the oil and natural gas sector.”
Possible Talking Point(s)	Who is going to ‘establish’ the ‘new standards’ for these issues? And are these individuals going to be independent from administrators employed by the ‘oil and natural gas sectors’? Or will these business people be the authors?
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR Res. 38</b>	“Disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of the Interior known as the Stream Protection Rule.”
Background Information	Introduced (1/30/2017) by Bill Johnson (R-OH) <b>Latest Action:</b> House –Natural Resources Sub-committee; became Public Law No: 115-5 (02/16/2017). 71 co-sponsors. <b>Co-sponsors from Kentucky:</b> Andy Barr, James Comer, Brett Guthrie, and Thomas Massie
Purpose of Bill	“(This measure has not been amended since it was introduced. The summary of that version is repeated here.)  This joint resolution nullifies the Stream Protection Rule finalized by the Department of the Interior's Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement on December 20, 2016. The rule addresses the impacts of surface coal mining operations on surface water, groundwater, and the productivity of mining operation sites.
Possible Talking Point(s)	Effectively eliminates any and all protection of water ways (e.g., streams) from unlimited, uncontrolled contamination by surface coal mining activities.
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HJ Res. 59</b>	“Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs under the Clean Air Act".
Background Information	Introduced (//2017) by Markwayne Mullin (R-OK) <b>Latest Action:</b> HOUSE Committee: Referred to the Sub-committee on Environment (02/03/2017) 65 co-sponsors. <b>Co-Sponsors from Kentucky:</b> Andy Barr [Website also identifies Hal Rodgers].
Purpose of Bill	This joint resolution nullifies the Environmental Protection Agency's rule entitled, "Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs under the Clean Air Act." The rule addresses safety at facilities that use and distribute hazardous chemicals. It was published on January 13, 2017.
Possible Talking Point(s)	This bill seems to either loosen or eliminate all regulations pertaining to dispersal of toxic material into the environment. What is going to replaced such regulation because public safety is part of the duty of members of Congress?
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 119</b>	“LEVEL Act: Leave Ethanol Volumes at Existing Levels Act.”
Background Information	Introduced (01/03/2017) by Michael C. Burgess (R-Texas). HOUSE Committee: Referred to the Sub-committee on Environment <b>Latest Action: No Co-Sponsors from Kentucky.</b>
Purpose of Bill	“To repeal certain amendments to the Clean Air Act relating to the expansion of the renewable fuel program, and for other purposes.”
Possible Talking Point(s)	An effort to maintain the status quo regarding continued reliance upon corn-based ethanol for vehicles. Amendments to Clean Air Act perceived as a threat to current profitability for corn producers and the gas industry. Who decides which of the ‘certain amendments’ to the Clean Air Act and the use of renewable energy sources will be changed or thrown out?
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 229</b>	“Providing for Consideration of the Bill (H.R. 1430) to Prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from Proposing, Finalizing, or Disseminating Regulations or Assessments Based upon Science that is not Transparent or Reproducible.”
Background Information	Introduced (03/27/2017) by Rob Woodall (R-GA). HOUSE Committee: Rules. [HR Report 115-60]. <b>Latest Action:</b> HR. <b>No co-sponsors</b> but “Motion to reconsider laid on the table Agreed to without objection.” (03/28/2017)
Purpose of Bill	Only additional information pertaining to House Bill 1430.
Possible Talking Point(s)	See information pertaining to HR 1430.
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 350</b>	“RPM Act of 2017.”
Background Information	Introduced (//2017) by Patrick T. McHenry (R-NC) HOUSE Committee: Referred to the sub-committee on Environment (01/25/2017). <b>Latest Action:</b> 111 co-sponsors. <b>Co-sponsors from Kentucky:</b> Andy Barr, James Comer, Brett Guthrie, and Thomas Massie.
Purpose of Bill	“To establish a comprehensive and flexible integrated planning process and permitting process for municipal wastewater and stormwater management that will help municipalities comply with the requirements of this Act by enabling municipalities to identify the most cost-effective and protective approaches to comply with such requirements, and prioritize their investments in addressing such requirements” (text from the bill).
Possible Talking Point(s)	What exactly is meant by “flexible integrated planning...permitting process...? Who formulates these rules/regulations? And will ‘the most cost-effective and protective approaches’ favor investors’ profits over public safety?
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 465</b>	“Water Quality Improvement Act”
Background Information	Introduced (1/12/2017) by Bob Gibbs (OH) HOUSE Committee: Introduced and referred to the Sub-committee on Water resources and Environment (1/3/2017) <b>Latest Action:</b> 6 Co-sponsors. <b>No co-sponsors from Kentucky.</b>
Purpose of Bill	To “establish a comprehensive and flexible integrated planning process and permitting process for municipal wastewater and stormwater management that will help municipalities comply with the requirements of this Act by enabling municipalities to identify the most cost-effective and protective approaches to comply with such requirements, and prioritize their investments in addressing such requirements” (Text from Bill).
Possible Talking Point(s)	How will public safety be affected by these procedures? Who decides what procedures will be enforced/mandated?
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*



<b>HR 637</b>	“Stopping EPA Overreach Act of 2017”
Background Information	<p>Introduced (1/24/2017) by Gary Palmer (R-FL)                  HOUSE Committee: Introduced and referred to the Sub-committee on Water Resources and Environment (1/25/2017)  <b>Latest Action:</b> 120 Co-sponsors. <b>Co-sponsors from Kentucky:</b> James Comer, Brett Guthrie, Thomas Massie</p>
Purpose of Bill	<p>This bill amends the Clean Air Act to exclude carbon dioxide, water vapor, methane, nitrous oxide, hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride pollution from the scope of that Act.</p> <p>The bill declares that current law does not authorize or require the regulation of climate change or global warming and nullifies certain final rules relating to: (1) greenhouse gas and volatile organic compounds emissions, including methane emissions, from the oil and natural gas sector; and (2) carbon pollution emissions from the utility power sector.</p> <p>Before proposing or finalizing regulations or policies, the Environmental Protection Agency must analyze the net and gross impact of those regulations and policies on employment. Regulations and policies may not take effect if they have a negative impact on employment, unless they are approved by Congress and signed by the President.</p>
Possible Talking Point(s)	<p>This is a most draconian declaration!!! Sponsors are-literally-completely “gutting” the E.P.A., or the agency might still exist but totally emasculated regarding proposing programs to safeguard public health. Why is this bill so significant for Republicans? And just who, or what group, will benefit the most?</p>
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 694</b>	“Stop EPA Overregulation of Rural Americans Act.”
Background Information	Introduced (01/24/2017) by David Rouzer (R-NC). HOUSE Committees: ? <b>Latest Action:</b> Referred to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce (1/24/2017). 14 co-sponsors. <b>No co-sponsors from Kentucky:</b>
Purpose of Bill	“To Repeal the Environmental Protection Agency’s Most Recent Rule for New Residential Wood Heaters.”
Possible Talking Point(s)	Esoteric issue for most individuals. What is the rationale for the bill in the first place?
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 777</b>	“To provide for a comprehensive assessment of the scientific and technical research on the implications of the use of mid-level ethanol blends, and for other purposes.”
Background Information	Introduced (//2017) by James Sensenbrenner Jr. (R-WI) HOUSE Committee: Referred to the Sub-committee on Environment (1/31/2017) <b>Latest Action:</b> 1 Co-sponsor. <b>No co-sponsors from Kentucky:</b>
Purpose of Bill	<p>“This bill requires the Office of Research and Development at the Environmental Protection Agency to enter into an agreement with the National Academy of Sciences to provide a comprehensive assessment of research on the implications of the use of mid-level ethanol blends, which compares mid-level ethanol blends to gasoline blends containing 10% or 0% ethanol. A mid-level ethanol blend is an ethanol-gasoline blend containing 10%- 20% of ethanol that is intended to be used in any conventional gasoline-powered motor vehicle or nonroad vehicle or engine.</p> <p>The assessment must: (1) evaluate the environmental, safety, durability, and performance effects of the introduction of mid-level blends on onroad, nonroad, and marine engines, onroad and nonroad vehicles, and related equipment; and (2) identify areas of research, development, and testing necessary to ensure that existing motor fuel infrastructure is not adversely impacted by mid-level ethanol blends and to reduce the risk of misfueling by users at various points in the distribution and supply chain.</p> <p>The office must report on the assessment's findings. Any waivers granted under the Clean Air Act to allow the sale of mid-level ethanol blends for use in motor vehicles are nullified. The office is also prohibited from granting new waivers until after the report is submitted.”</p>
Possible Talking Point(s)	The groups that benefit most from this bill are corn producers/cultivators and the oil/gas industry. However, the amount of land devoted to maize could perhaps be better used to cultivate plants other than corn. Couple this with the elimination of fuel mileage standards, and the aforementioned groups really benefit!
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 806</b>	“Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2017”
Background Information	Introduced (02/01/2017) by Pete Olson (R-TX) HOUSE Committee: <b>Latest Action:</b> Introduced and Sub-committee hearings held (3/22/1017). 21 Sponsors. <b>Co-sponsors from Kentucky: Brett Guthrie</b>
Purpose of Bill	Ozone standards to be determined at state level.
Possible Talking Point(s)	Each state will undoubtedly have different standards. So, the problem is how can you effectively control ozone levels if each state has different ideas about safe levels? This bill effectively nullifies any and all attempts to control this potential enormous health problem.
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 848</b>	“Farm Regulatory Certainty Act.”
Background Information	Introduced (02/03/2017) by Dan Newhouse (R-WA). House Committee: Energy & Commerce Committee. <b>Latest Action:</b> “Referred to the subcommittee on Environment (02/10/2017). 43 co-sponsors. <b>No co-sponsors from Kentucky.</b>
Purpose of Bill	As of 4/16/2017, no additional information is available. Website says “[a] summary is in progress.”
Possible Talking Point(s)	As of 4/17/2017, I have no “Talking Points” because I do not know what the bill discusses or proposes. I “researched” it because Peter Wedlund wrote (4/7/2017) that it might be germane.
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 861</b>	“To Terminate the Environmental Protection Agency.”
Background Information	Introduced (02/03/2017) by Matt Gaetz (R-FL). House Committee: Energy & Commerce Committee. <b>Latest Action:</b> “Referred to the subcommittee on Environment (02/10/2017). 6 co-sponsors (original); 43 co-sponsors (latest). <b>Current (4/22/2017) co-sponsors from Kentucky:</b> Thomas Massie
Purpose of Bill	As of 4/16/2017, no additional information is available. Website says “[a] summary is in progress.”
Possible Talking Point(s)	As of 4/17/2017, I have no “Talking Points” because I do not know what the bill discusses or proposes. I “researched” it because Peter Wedlund wrote (4/7/2017) that it might be germane.  However, the intent is obvious. If this comes to pass, public health protection is non-existent. And with the Republican effort to terminate health insurance for most people, or subject the program to dubious revisions, good luck to all Americans!
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 928</b>	“Fracturing Regulations are Effective in State Hands Act”.
Background Information	Introduced (2/07/2017) by Louis Gohmert (R-TX) <b>Latest Action:</b> Referred to Sub-committee on Conservation and Forestry (2/24/2017) 6 co-sponsors. <b>No co-sponsors from Kentucky:</b>
Purpose of Bill	This bill gives states the sole authority to promulgate or enforce any regulation, guidance, or permit requirement regarding hydraulic fracturing on or under any land within their boundaries. Hydraulic fracturing or fracking is a process to extract underground resources such as oil or gas from a geologic formation by injecting water, a propping agent (e.g., sand), and chemical additives into a well under enough pressure to fracture the geological formation. Hydraulic fracturing on federal land must comply with the law of the state in which the land is located.
Possible Talking Point(s)	An effort to eliminate any federal government regulation of “fracking” activities. Instead, sole authority for issuing permits is to be the domain of state legislatures. However, influence of energy corporations most often particularly strong at the state level. Result is there will be no effort to protect citizens adversely affected by such activity.
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<p><b>HR 953</b></p>	<p>“Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017.”</p>
<p>Background Information</p>	<p>Introduced (02/07/2017) by Bob Gibbs (R-OH).                  HOUSE Committees: Transportation and Infrastructure, &amp; Agriculture.                  Latest Action: “Ordered to be Reported” (02/16/2017).                  39 co-sponsors. <b>Two Republican HR co-sponsors from Kentucky:</b>                  James <b>Comer</b> (02/16/2017) and Brett <b>Guthrie</b> (02/16/17).</p>
<p>Purpose of Bill</p>	<p>Related Bills: To amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes</p> <p>“Environmental Protection.” AND/OR “To amend* the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, and for other purposes.”</p> <p>“This Act may be cited as the “Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017”                  *Amendments are as follows:</p> <p><b>SEC. 2. USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.</b> Section 3(f) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (<a href="#">7 U.S.C. 136a(f)</a>) is amended by adding at the end the following:                  “(5) USE OF AUTHORIZED PESTICIDES.—Except as provided in section 402(s) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the Administrator or a State may not require a permit under such Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under this Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.”</p> <p><b>SEC. 3. DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.</b>                  Section 402 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (<a href="#">33 U.S.C. 1342</a>) is amended by adding at the end the following:                  “(s) DISCHARGES OF PESTICIDES.—                  “(1) NO PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a permit shall not be required by the Administrator or a State under this Act for a discharge from a point source into navigable waters of a pesticide authorized for sale, distribution, or use under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the residue of such a pesticide, resulting from the application of such pesticide.</p>



<p>Purpose of Bill</p> <p><b>[HR 953]</b></p>	<p>“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to the following discharges of a pesticide or pesticide residue:</p> <p>“(A) A discharge resulting from the application of a pesticide in violation of a provision of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act that is relevant to protecting water quality, if—</p> <p>“(i) the discharge would not have occurred but for the violation; or</p> <p>“(ii) the amount of pesticide or pesticide residue in the discharge is greater than would have occurred without the violation.</p> <p>“(B) Stormwater discharges subject to regulation under subsection (p).</p> <p>“(C) The following discharges subject to regulation under this section:</p> <p>“(i) Manufacturing or industrial effluent.</p> <p>“(ii) Treatment works effluent.</p> <p>“(iii) Discharges incidental to the normal operation of a vessel, including a discharge resulting from ballasting operations or vessel biofouling prevention.”</p>
<p>Possible Talking Point(s)</p>	<p>Pollution is a reality in many parts of the country. This has been documented by many organizations (public and private). It is neither “fake news” nor “alternative facts.”</p> <p>The way in which this bill is written allows anyone, or any group, to place possible contaminants, polluting agents, toxic material, etc. into waterways IF such material has been deemed permissible under the HR bill. No permit is required. This essentially removes government from protecting people’s health and anything that inhabits such water locations.</p> <p>What measures will be in place to offset inevitable health consequences and damaged eco-systems? Is this to be left up to the parties contemplating planning to use waterways for the disposal of such material?</p>
<p>Other</p>	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 1105</b>	“Stop WOTUS Act.”
Background Information	Introduced (2/16/2017) by Rick Allen (R-GA) <b>Latest Action:</b> Referred to the Sub-committee on Water (02/17/2017) 1 co-sponsor. <b>No co-sponsors from Kentucky:</b>
Purpose of Bill	To repeal the rule entitled "Clean Water Rule: Definition of 'Waters of the United States'".
Possible Talking Point(s)	If this bill is enacted, it is the end of any regulation whose goal/purpose is to prevent contamination of any and all water venues, including streams, rivers, lakes, wetlands and other water “locations.” This in turn will threaten wildlife habitats, and a myriad of other water sources necessary for quality human life.
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 1119</b>	“Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment Act”.
Background Information	Introduced (02/16/2017) by Keith Rothfus (R-PA) <b>Latest Action:</b> Referred to the sub-Committee on Environment (02/17/2017) 5 co-sponsors. <b>No co-sponsors from Kentucky:</b>
Purpose of Bill	To establish the bases by which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall issue, implement, and enforce certain emission limitations and allocations for existing electric utility steam generating units that convert coal refuse into energy.
Possible Talking Point(s)	Sounds like common sense. However, the big question is exactly what prior position (ideology) does the “Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency” carry into the position? It is doubtful whether or not this individual will give priority to the protection of American citizens if such action interferes with corporate and investor profits.
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 1261</b>	“To Clarify the Definition of Navigable Waters, and for Other Purposes.”
Background Information	Introduced 02/28/2017) by Mac Thornberry (R-TX) <b>Latest Action:</b> 1 co-sponsor. <b>No co-sponsors from Kentucky:</b>
Purpose of Bill	This bill nullifies the rule issued by the EPA and the Secretary of the Army entitled “Clean Water Rule: Definition of ‘Waters of the United States’”, signed by the Administrator and the Assistant Secretary on May 27, 2015.
Possible Talking Point(s)	Voiding the exiting regulation enables a loosening of restrictions and definitions of water “locations” throughout the USA. Possible, likely threat to exiting wildlife habitats and human activity in such locations.
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 1314</b>	“Renewable Fuel Standard Elimination Act.”
Background Information	<p>Introduced (03/02/2017) by Bob Goodlatte (R-VA).                  HOUSE Committee: Energy and Commerce.                  Latest Action: “Referred to the Subcommittee on Environment.”                  (03/17/2017)                  63 Co-sponsors. <b>Two Republican co-sponsors from Kentucky:</b> Thomas <b>Massie</b> (03/02/2017) and Andy <b>Barr</b> (03/30/2017).</p>
Purpose of Bill	<p>“To repeal the renewable fuel program of the Environmental Protection Agency.”</p> <p>OR/AND: “This Act may be cited as the ‘Renewable Fuel Standard Elimination Act.’” “This bill repeals Section 211(o) of the Clean Air Act (42 of U.S.C. 7545(o) is repealed).”</p>
Possible Talking Point(s)	<p>Some day in the possible not-too-distant future, oil, hence gasoline for transportation, might not be as plentiful and as inexpensive as currently exists. How does this bill avoid the inevitable increase cost of this source of energy?</p> <p>It seems that, in addition to inhalation of toxic particulates from such emissions, the American public will be forced to allocate more of their budgets for this kind of fuel source. This is money that is needed for everyday expenses, medical costs (especially if there is no health insurance possible/available), housing, etc. Therefore, how do you counter the argument that this bill is “penny wise and [ultimately] pound foolish”?</p> <p>In other words, how does this bill really benefit the American public, the people whose tax dollars are paying your salary and retirement benefits? And how does this bill not really benefit the fossil fuel/energy lobby and special interests?</p>
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<p><b>HR 1430</b></p>	<p>“Honest Act.” [<i>Complete/Full Title: “Honest and Open New EPA Science Treatment Act of 2017.”</i>]</p>
<p>Background Information</p>	<p>Introduced 03/08/2017 by Lamar Smith (R-TX).                  HOUSE Committee: Science, Space, and Technology.                  SENATE Committee: Environment and Public Works.                  Bill was passed by HR. 29 HR co-sponsors. <b>No co-sponsors from Kentucky.</b>  <b>Latest Action:</b> Referred to Senate Committee [“Received in the Senate and read twice and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.”] (03/30/2017).  <b>Other:</b> “2 roll call votes” as of 03/30/2017.</p>
<p>Purpose of Bill</p>	<p>“This bill amends the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to prohibit the Environmental Protection Agency from proposing, finalizing, or disseminating a covered action unless all scientific and technical information relied on to support such action is the best available science, specifically identified, and publicly available in a manner sufficient for independent analysis and substantial reproduction of research results. A covered action includes a risk, exposure, or hazard assessment, criteria document, standard, limitation, regulation, regulatory impact analysis, or guidance. Personally identifiable information, trade secrets, or commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential must be redacted prior to public availability.”</p>
<p>Possible Talking Point(s)</p>	<p>Who will decide what is “best available science”? Who is going to judge if a “research result” has been reproduced? Who in the apolitical scientific community is going to be allowed to participate in such decisions, or is this to be only members of Congress, either in the House of Representatives and/or the Senate?</p> <p>And if information is to be “redacted,” as indicated in the bill, who, or by what standard, is used in deciding if such action should be withheld from the public?</p> <p>What protection does the public have from the health and environmental problems that currently do exist? In other words, exactly whom or what group does this bill protect? Who does it possibly harm?</p>
<p>Other</p>	<p></p>

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>HR 1431- EPA</b>	“A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Update for the 2008 Ozone NAAQS.”
Background Information	Introduced (02/01/2017) by Pat Toomey (R-PA) <b>Latest Action:</b> Introduced ((02/03/2017) and read twice and referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works) 28 Sponsors. <b>No co-sponsors from Kentucky</b> (as of 4/22/2017).
Purpose of Bill	This joint resolution nullifies the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule Update finalized by the Environmental Protection Agency on October 26, 2016. The rule addresses interstate transport of ozone pollution with respect to the 2008 ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards under the Clean Air Act.
Possible Talking Points	Do the sponsors of this bill recognize the dangers to public health associated with ozone levels and air pollution? What replaces this protection mechanism?
Other	

\*\*\*\*\*

<p><b>HR 1644</b></p>	<p>“Supporting Transparent Regulatory and Environmental Actions in Mining Act”.</p>
<p>Background Information</p>	<p>Introduced (1/12/2017) by Alexander Mooney (R-WV)  <b>Latest Action:</b> House report 114-277 - Natural Resources. Passed in House. Received in Senate and read twice and referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources (01/19/2017).                  34 co-sponsors. <b>Co-Sponsors from Kentucky:</b> Andy <b>Barr</b>, Brett <b>Guthrie</b>, Hal <b>Rodgers</b>.</p>
<p>Purpose of Bill</p>	<p>Sec. 2) This bill amends the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to direct the Department of the Interior to make publicly available online and in the Federal Register, 90 days before publication, any draft, proposed, supplemental, final, or emergency rule, or any environmental analysis, economic assessment, policy, or guidance, and each scientific product upon which Interior has relied in developing the rule, the analysis, or the assessment.</p> <p>A scientific product is any product that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• employs the scientific method for inventorying, monitoring, experimenting, studying, researching, or modeling purposes;</li> <li>• is relied upon by Interior in developing any rule, environmental analysis, economic assessment, policy, or guidance; and</li> <li>• is not protected under copyright laws.</li> </ul> <p>For scientific products receiving federal funds Interior must also make publicly available the raw data used for them (any computational process or quantitative or qualitative data not protected by copyright or containing personally identifiable information, sensitive intellectual property, trade secrets, or business-sensitive information).</p> <p>If Interior fails to make publicly available any scientific product for longer than six months, it must withdraw the rule, environmental analysis, or economic assessment policy or guidance. This requirement shall not apply if a delay in the publication of a rule will pose an imminent and severe threat to human life.</p> <p>(Sec. 3) Interior shall arrange with the National Academy of Sciences for its Board on Earth Sciences and Resources to conduct a detailed, comprehensive study of the effectiveness of the "Surface Coal Mining and Reclamation Operations Permanent Regulatory Program; Stream</p>



<p>Purpose of Bill</p>	<p>Buffer Zones and Fish, Wildlife, and Related Environmental Values" Final Rule in protecting perennial and intermittent streams through the use of stream buffer zones. The study shall include suggestions and recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of the rule if it finds regulatory inefficiencies.</p> <p>Appropriations for the study are authorized for FY2016-FY2017.</p> <p>Until one year after publication of the Board's report to Congress, Interior may not issue any proposed or final regulations under the Act that relate either to stream buffer zones or to stream protection.</p> <p>(Sec. 4) The Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 is further amended to declare that nothing in it authorizes Interior to take any action that duplicates, implements, interprets, enforces, or determines compliance with specified mining, environmental, or fish and wildlife law.</p>
<p>Possible Talking Point(s)</p>	<p>The bill appears to make sense. However, if all agencies that the bill indicates are to be involved in decisions are “re-populated” by Trump advocates, the protections that prior regulations offered will be either modified or perhaps eliminated.</p> <p>Again, who are the people who will be making decisions?</p>
<p>Other</p>	

\*\*\*\*\*