

To: Fred Barnes[fwbarnes@weeklstandard.com]
From: Jackson, Ryan
Sent: Mon 11/6/2017 11:53:16 PM
Subject: getting back with you
Reg Reform Accomplishments-9.25.2017.docx

Fred, thanks again for letting me contribute to your piece.

For the regulatory actions, attached is a roster we keep to keep things concise. For FY 2017, EPA promulgated 17 actions subject to EO 13771: 1 regulatory action and 16 deregulatory actions. 6 of the actions had cost or cost-savings that could be calculated, which amounted to a net annualized cost savings of \$70 million. However, future cost-savings could result from taking action on any of the burdensome rules from the previous administration, such as:

- CPP, which could cost \$5 to 8 billion in 2030. EPA estimated a loss of roughly 34,000 jobs in 2030, while the Energy Information Administration (EIA) estimated a loss of about 376,000 jobs under the CPP in 2030.
- Steam Electric ELG, which could cost \$1.2 billion per year in the first five years with an annualized cost of \$480 million. EPA estimated the rule could reduce total operations and maintenance labor at coal-fired electric plants by the equivalent of 835 full-time employees in 2030.
- WOTUS, with an annualized cost of approximately \$150-500 million.
- CCR Rule, with an annualized cost of up to \$735 million.
- Methane ICR, with compliance costs exceeding \$40 million.

Attached is the more full list.

I also mentioned state implementation plans. These are the plans states send to EPA to approve so states can take steps to set their air quality standards. Already this year since March 1, EPA has approved 206 state plans. In fact, 10 of those SIP approvals are reversing federal implementation plans (FIPs) and working with states to approve their plans. The previous Administration has allowed this SIPs to back up waiting approval and also issued a total of 56 FIPs instead of working with states to approve their submitted plans.

Below are groups Pruitt has met with since February which are NGO or public health groups some of which are opposed or apprehensive about EPA actions, but groups we have offered to

continue to meet and work with:

- [REDACTED] The Nature Conservancy
- [REDACTED] Audubon Society
- [REDACTED] American Lung Association
- [REDACTED] American Public Health Association
- [REDACTED] American Academy of Pediatrics
- [REDACTED] March of Dimes
- [REDACTED] Alliance of Nurses for Healthy Environments
- [REDACTED] Physicians for Social Responsibility
- [REDACTED] Trust for America's Health
- [REDACTED] National Medical Association
- [REDACTED] Asthma and Allergy Foundation of America
- [REDACTED] National Environmental Health Association
- [REDACTED] NYU School of Medicine
- [REDACTED] National Association of Environmental Medicine
- [REDACTED] National Association of County and City Health Officials
- [REDACTED] Health Care Without Harm
- [REDACTED] Healthy Air Campaign
- [REDACTED] American Lung Association
- [REDACTED] East Chicago Community Action Group
- [REDACTED] Texas Health and Environment Coalition
- [REDACTED] Galveston Bay Foundation

Finally, I mentioned that Administrator Pruitt has done a few “Hill days” where he’ll meet with members in their offices on Capitol Hill. In the course of these meetings, he’s met with Democrats as well as Republicans. Some of the Democrats include Senator Joe Donnelly and Congressman Pete Visclosky on superfund sites. Pruitt’s also regularly meet with governors like Gov. Steve Bullock (Mont.), Gov. Kate Brown (Ore.), Gov. David Ige (Hawaii), Gov. John Hickenlooper (Colo.), and Gov. Dayton (Minn.).

I’ll send a separate email on coordinating travel.

Thanks again.

Ryan Jackson

Chief of Staff

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy