The Honorable Joe Barton
Ranking Member
Committee on Energy and Commerce
House of Representatives
2125 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6115

The Honorable Michael C. Burgess
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
Committee on Energy and Commerce
House of Representatives
2125 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515-6115

Dear Congressman Barton and Congressman Burgess:

Thank you for your October 14 letter about EPA's work to carry out the instructions that Congress wrote into the Clean Air Act.

I can report that the pace of EPA's Clean Air Act regulatory work under this administration is actually not highly accelerated compared to the pace under the previous administration. In fact, whereas EPA promulgated seventy-eight Clean Air Act rules during President Bush's first term, the chart attached to your October 14 letter identifies only sixty-nine Clean Air Act rules that could be promulgated during President Obama's first term.

The chart attached to your letter identifies eight of EPA's current Clean Air Act rulemakings as having projected compliance costs in excess of one billion dollars. One of those, however – the national ambient air quality standard for nitrogen dioxide – actually has projected compliance costs of only $3.6 million (your chart states $3.6 billion). Of the remaining seven rulemakings, one was initiated under the previous administration, two are in response to mandatory-duty lawsuits, and __ are corrected versions of rules that were first promulgated under the previous administration but then overturned in court for being inconsistent with Congress's instructions.

Your chart does not present the projected economic benefits of any of the listed rulemakings. Those benefits projections can be found in the same documents from which the cost projections were drawn. Had the chart included the benefits projections, readers of it would

be able to see that the projected benefits exceed the projected costs by at least __ to 1. According to the current public-review draft of an EPA report entitled "The Benefits and Costs of the Clean Air Act: 1990 to 2020,"[1] the benefits of Clean Air Act rules are expected to reach nearly $2 trillion in 2020 – exceeding projected costs by more than 30 to 1.

Finally, EPA's work to implement the Clean Air Act has a positive impact on employment in America. When we remove harmful smog and soot from the air, fewer outdoor workers are forced off the job, and fewer parents are forced to stay at home or at the hospital with asthmatic children. Moreover, requirements to cut harmful industrial pollution spur investment in pollution-reducing equipment. Thanks to the Clean Air Act and EPA's implementation of it, American manufacturing companies lead the burgeoning global market in pollution-reduction technology. The Department of Commerce estimates that in 2007 environmental firms and small businesses in the U.S. generated $282 billion in revenues and $40 billion in exports, while supporting 1.6 million American jobs. Air pollution control equipment alone generated revenues of $18.3 billion in 2007, including exports of more than $3 billion.

Jobs related to Clean Air Act implementation are widely dispersed throughout the states and occur in many sectors of the economy. The U.S. boilermaker population, for example, grew by approximately 35 percent – or 6,700 boilermakers – in just two years, between 1999 and 2001, according to data from the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers. That increased boilermaker population was in response to the surge in construction of retrofits resulting from EPA's Clean Air Act actions, including the "NO_x SIP Call" to control power plant and other emissions contributing to interstate ozone pollution problems in the East.

EPA's common-sense steps to implement the Clean Air Act save America much more money than they cost. The companies whose products enable industry to meet the Clean Air Act's public-health requirements support hundreds of thousands of American jobs. Those requirements continue to create vast new global markets for American-made technologies.

Thank you again for your letter. If you have additional questions, please feel free to contact me or to have your staff contact David McIntosh in EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations.

Sincerely,

Lisa P. Jackson

[1] http://www.epa.gov/oar/sect812/aug10/fullreport.pdf