To: Konkus, John[konkus.john@epa.gov]
Cc: Graham, Amy[graham.amy@epa.gov]; Ferguson, Lincoln[ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov]; Wilcox, Jahan[wilcox.jahan@epa.gov]
From: Bowman, Liz
Sent: Fri 6/2/2017 5:00:43 PM
Subject: Re: following up

It's aggressive but I think it's good too ... ?

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 2, 2017, at 12:59 PM, Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov> wrote:

Hang this on the wall. This is as good as it gets. The only question remains, where does it run in tomorrow's print edition.

From: Eilperin, Juliet [mailto:Juliet.Eilperin@washpost.com]
Sent: Friday, June 2, 2017 12:12 PM
To: Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>
Cc: Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>; Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>; Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: following up

And the story is up now: http://wapo.st/2rjUvRS

Best, Juliet

From: Bowman, Liz [mailto:Bowman.Liz@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 02, 2017 10:34 AM
To: Eilperin, Juliet <Juliet.Eilperin@washpost.com>
Cc: Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>; Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>; Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: following up

Hey Juliet – Ryan and I talked and we are comfortable sending you the following details on the regulations. This is only for background, not to be quoted or attributed. I think this is easier than me talking you through this on phone. Please note, the number in the EO on energy independence should be 3, not 4, I typed it incorrectly last night. Please let me know if you have questions. Thank you – Liz Bowman, 202-309-3416

✓· **TSCA Implementation:** Clearing the backlog of new chemicals that were waiting for approval from EPA. The Agency has split by half the backlog of new chemical submissions being reviewed under the Toxic Substances Control Act, bringing the number of these cases down from roughly 300 to 150 with plans to fully eliminate the backlog by the end of July. We also are on track to meet the deadlines outlined in the Lautenberg Chemical Safety Act, with regard to EPA's significant rules on prioritizing chemicals that need to be reviewed for safety, and how we will conduct safety risk evaluations being released in late June.

✓· **New Source Performance Standards:** Reviewing the New Source Performance Standards for coal-fired power plants, which prevents companies from building new plants.

✓· **Oil and Gas Methane NSPS:** EPA announced a decision to reconsider the Oil and Gas Methane New Source Performance Standards for new and modified sources, delaying a costly compliance requirement.

✓· **CPP:** Reviewing the so-called Clean Power Plan that threatens over 125,000 U.S. jobs.

✓· **Ozone Standard:** Requested delay of oral arguments on the ozone standard.

✓· **ELG Rule:** EPA announced the agency's decision to review and reconsider the final rule that amends the effluent limitations guidelines and standards for the steam electric power generating category under the Clean Water Act (ELG Rule), which costs an estimated $480 million annually.

✓· **Coal Combustion Residuals (CCR Rule):** EPA expects provide draft guidance to the states[epa.gov] on the CCR rule at the end of the month and begin acting on state permit applications this year.

✓· **Energy Independence EO:** Following the President's Energy Independence Executive Order, Administrator Pruitt signed three notices to review and, if appropriate, to revise or rescind major, economically significant, burdensome rules the last Administration issued.

✓· **CAFE Standards:** EPA rescinded an evaluation of greenhouse gas and fuel economy standards for model year 2022-2025 vehicles, and is working with DOT to conduct a collaborative and robust review of the standards. According to the Auto Alliance, "no

agency has ever set emission limits so far into the future," and this puts 1.1 million jobs at risk and cost the industry $200 billion by 2025 to comply.

✓· **WOTUS:** EPA is restoring states' important role in the regulation of water by reviewing the "Waters of the U.S." or WOTUS.

✓· **Flint, Michigan:** The Agency is allocating funds for vital environmental projects that go directly to the health of our citizens, such as providing $100 million to upgrade drinking water infrastructure in Flint, Michigan.

✓· **Methane ICR:** EPA is telling businesses they no longer have this additional bureaucratic burden, with the cost to American businesses attempting to comply exceeding $42 million.

✓· **Regulatory Reform:** Launched the EPA Regulatory Reform Task Force to undergo extensive reviews of the misaligned regulatory actions from the past administration.

✓· **Risk Management Rule (RMP Rule):** EPA delayed the RMP rule to make sure that any additional regulations actually make chemical facilities safer, without duplicating regulations or opening our country up to dangerous national security threats. EPA estimates the RMP rule to cost $131.8 million annually, or $1.3 billion over ten years.

✓· **Superfund Sites:** We are getting real results at cleaning up Superfund sites, including: East Chicago (IN), West Oakland (CA) and Pompton Lake (NJ). Administrator Pruitt is the first EPA Administrator to visit East Chicago site.

✓· **Superfund Plan:** We announced new plans to get better results at Superfunds, including a new task force and a new authority for the Administrator to decide remedies that cost over $50 million.

✓· **Water Infrastructure:** Opened the application process for EPA's WIFIA program; a low-risk loan for businesses that will provide $1 billion in credit to finance over $2 billion in water infrastructure investments.

✓· **EPA Originalism:** EPA Administrator Pruitt launched a "Back-to-Basics" Agenda, touring a Pennsylvania coal mine, a Missouri power plant, and visiting a contaminated "Superfund" site in E. Chicago, to discuss how EPA is refocusing the agency on its core mission of protecting the environment through sensible regulations developed in cooperation with state, local and tribal partners.

✓· **MATS Rule:** EPA is reviewing the rule to determine whether it complies with our statutory mandate, and abides by sound regulatory principles.

✓· **Clean Air Act/SSM SIP:** Asked the court to postpone oral arguments over an Obama-era rule making 36 states rework their Clean Air Act compliance plans.

✓· **Pebble Mine:** EPA is allowing Pebble Mine to re-apply for a permit for mining and providing a fair opportunity for the company to apply.

From: Eilperin, Juliet [mailto:Juliet.Eilperin@washpost.com]
Sent: Friday, June 2, 2017 7:31 AM
To: Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>
Cc: Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>; Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>; Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: following up

Sure, just call my cell, 202-302-3663.

From: Bowman, Liz [mailto:Bowman.Liz@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 02, 2017 7:17 AM
To: Eilperin, Juliet <Juliet.Eilperin@washpost.com>
Cc: Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>; Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>; Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: following up

I can walk you through them over the phone after my breakfast meeting ...like 9:930?

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 2, 2017, at 6:45 AM, Eilperin, Juliet <Juliet.Eilperin@washpost.com> wrote:

> Thanks, and do you happen to have a list of the more than two dozen significant regulatory actions? I ask because we've tracked a lot of them, obviously, but we don't have a comprehensive list. If it helps, I could send the ones I know offhand (it's about a dozen) and then you could mention the others. Thanks.
>
> On Jun 2, 2017, at 6:27 AM, Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov> wrote:
>
>> Juliet -- I have an updated list of some of the meetings below:

27 governors calls/meetings, 3+ environment commissioners, 6 ag commissioners, 3+ farm bureaus, 14+ mayors

from my iPhone

On Jun 1, 2017, at 11:04 PM, Eilperin, Juliet <Juliet.Eilperin@washpost.com> wrote:

Dear Liz,

This is helpful, thanks. I'm just finishing a draft of the story now, so I will pop in this quote. Some of what you have below is already included in the piece, but I will look through whether there's more to weave in, and once I get some feedback from my editor (which should be first thing in the morning) I will check in once more.

Best, Juliet

From: Bowman, Liz [mailto:Bowman.Liz@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 11:01 PM
To: Eilperin, Juliet <Juliet.Eilperin@washpost.com>
Cc: Graham, Amy <graham.amy@epa.gov>; Ferguson, Lincoln <ferguson.lincoln@epa.gov>; Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: following up

Hi Juliet – I am sorry for the late response, and I am not entirely sure this is what you are looking for, but I am going to provide you with some information that you can use on background, and a short quote you can use for the record, attributable to me. We can talk more tomorrow, but hopefully this is somewhat helpful. Thanks – Liz

"Administrator Pruitt is implementing President Trump's executive orders to protect the environment, save manufacturing jobs and promote American energy independence." - Liz Bowman, EPA spokesperson

Additional information for background:

–□□□□□□□ Since being sworn in, EPA Administrator Pruitt has consulted with at least 22 bipartisan governors, 10 bipartisan Members of Congress, three foreign leaders, four state agriculture departments and over a dozen bipartisan organizations.

–□□□□□□□ In his first 100 days, Administrator Pruitt has spearheaded nearly two dozen significant regulatory reform actions

–□□□□□□□ Following the President's Energy Independence EO, Administrator Pruitt signed four notices to review and, if appropriate, to revise or rescind major, economically significant, burdensome rules the last Administration issued. This includes the so-called Clean Power Plan that threatens 400,000 U.S. jobs.

–□□□□□□□ EPA announced the agency's decision to review and reconsider the final rule that amends the effluent limitations guidelines and standards for the steam electric power generating category under the Clean Water Act (ELG Rule), which costs an estimated $480 million annually.

–□□□□□□□ EPA is restoring states' important role in the regulation of water by reviewing the "Waters of the U.S." or WOTUS.

–□□□□□□□ Launched the EPA Regulatory Reform Task Force to undergo extensive reviews of the misaligned regulatory actions from the past administration.

–□□□□□□□ We are getting real results at cleaning up Superfund sites, including: East Chicago (IN), West Oakland (CA) and Pompton Lake (NJ).

–□□□□□□□ EPA opened the application process for EPA's WIFIA program; a low-risk loan for businesses that will provide $1 billion in credit to finance over $2 billion in water infrastructure investments.

From: Eilperin, Juliet [mailto:Juliet.Eilperin@washpost.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 1, 2017 7:40 PM
To: Bowman, Liz <Bowman.Liz@epa.gov>
Subject: following up

Dear Liz,

My apologizes for the somewhat hectic nature of our conversation, I know you had a very busy day.

As we discussed, we are writing about how the Administrator is having an impact on policy in the short time he's been in office. Much of this will be based on the public record, given his many policy announcements, as well as a couple of public comments. In terms of how we are describing this, part of this is because so much of what EPA did under Obama was through executive action, rather than legislation, and because the EPA agenda meshes closely with what Trump pledged to do on the campaign. But, as I mentioned, people inside and outside the administration have also noted that Pruitt's approach has contributed to the impact he's had. For example, our main story has a quote from a White House official referring to Pruitt and a couple of other opponents of the Paris accord by saying "They were presenting facts and figures… They were really important. That was the evidentiary case." That's the sort of description I was seeking for this story.

Even if it's under a tight deadline, I think it makes sense to try to capture--in more granular detail--how the Administrator has operated. I don't know what details you can provide—in the past we have often been able to get descriptions of how many interactions a Cabinet member has had with a president in a given period of time, for example, but I understand that you don't seem to have that information at hand. You seemed to be concerned that the story would depict the discussions about Paris as less than deliberative; I don't think that's true, the consensus on all sides is that it was deliberative. But, as I've mentioned, this story is broader than just Paris.

I hope that helps clarify things, and let me know if you either want to try to talk later tonight, or perhaps continue the conversation via email.

Best, Juliet

Juliet Eilperin

Senior National Affairs Correspondent

Washington Post

Juliet.eilperin@washpost.com

(O) 202-334-7774

(C) 202-302-3663

@eilperin