Lofgren

Loudermilk

Love Lowenthal

(NM)

(NM)

Lummis

Maloney

Marino

Massie

McCaul

McCarthy

McClintock

McCollum

McHenry

McMorris

Meadows

Meeks

Meng

Mica

Messer

Mullin

Nadler

Noem

Nunes

Olson

Palmer

Pearce

Pelosi

Pingree

Pitts

Pocan

Pompeo

Quigley

Reichert

Ribble

Roskam

Roby

Posey Price (NC)

Pittenger

Perlmutter

Pascrell

Rodgers

Miller (MI)

Moolenaar

Napolitano

Neugebauer

Newhouse

O'Rourke

Carolyn

Luetkemeyer

Lujan Grisham

Luján, Ben Ray

Long

Lucas

Visclosky Walz	Wasserman Schultz Watson Coleman	Welch Wilson (FL)
	NOT VOTING—	16

Clawson (FL) Blumenauer Moore Brady (PA) Esty Stewart Graves (MO) Buchanan Waters, Maxine Carter (TX) Gutiérrez Varmuth Castro (TX) Heck (WA) Clarke (NY) Lvnch

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

#### □ 1401

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, mv vote was not recorded on rollcall No. 450, the Motion on Ordering the Previous Question to the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1599 and H.R. 1734. I was not present for the vote due to attending a national security briefing at the White House. I intended to vote "nay." On rollcall No. 451, the Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1599 and H.R. 1734, I intended to vote "nay."

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 249, noes 169, answered "present" 2, not voting 13, as follows:

# [Roll No. 452]

## AYES-249

Abraham Byrne Davis (CA) Aderholt Calvert Davis, Danny Allen DeGette Capps Cárdenas Amodei DeLauro Carney Carson (IN) Ashford DelBene DeSaulnier Barletta Cartwright DesJarlais Beatty Castro (TX) Deutch Becerra Chabot Dingell Chaffetz Bera Doggett Bilirakis Chu. Judy Donovan Cicilline Bishop (GA) Doyle, Michael Bishop (UT) Clay Cleaver Duncan (SC) Black Blackburn Cohen Duncan (TN) Blum Cole Collins (NY) Edwards Bonamici Ellison Emmer (MN) Boustany Comstock Cook Brady (TX) Engel Brat Cooper Eshoo Bridenstine Courtney Farr Brooks (AL) Cramer Fattah Crawford Brooks (IN) Fincher Crenshaw Fleischmann Brown (FL) Bustos Crowley Forbes Butterfield Fortenberry Cuellar

Foster Frankel (FL) Franks (AZ) Frelinghuysen Gabbard Gallego Garamendi Garrett Gibbs Goodlatte Graham Granger Graves (LA) Grayson Griffith Grothman Guthrie Hahn Hardy Harper Harris Hensarling Higgins Himes Hinoiosa Huelskamp Huffman Hultgren Hunter Hurd (TX) Hurt (VA) Jackson Lee Jeffries Johnson (GA) Johnson, E. B. Johnson, Sam Jolly Jones Kaptur Katko Keating Kelly (IL) Kelly (MS) Kelly (PA) Kildee King (IA) King (NY) Kline Knight Kuster Labrador LaMalfa Lamborn Larsen (WA) Larson (CT) Latta Levin Lipinski

Loebsack

Adams

Amash

Babin

Barr

Bass

Beyer

Bost

F.

Buck

Bucshon

Burgess

Capuano

Carter (GA)

Castor (FL)

Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)

Collins (GA)

Costello (PA)

Culberson

Cummings

DeFazio

Delaney

Denham

DeSantis

Dent

Curbelo (FL)

Davis, Rodney

Clyburn

Coffman

Conaway

Connolly

Conyers

Costa

Benishek

Bishop (MI)

Boyle, Brendan

Brownley (CA)

Aguilar

#### Rogers (KY) Rokita Rooney (FL)

Diaz-Balart Dold Duckworth Duffy Ellmers (NC) Farenthold Fitzpatrick Fleming Flores Foxx Fudge Gibson GosarGowdy Graves (GA) Green, Al Green, Gene Guinta Hanna Hartzler Hastings Heck (NV) Herrera Beutler Hice, Jody B. Hill Holding Honda Hoyer Hudson Huizenga (MI) IsraelIssa Jenkins (KS) Jenkins (WV) Johnson (OH) Jordan

Joyce

Kennedy

Kilmer Kind Kinzinger (IL) Kirkpatrick Lance Langevin Lawrence Lee Lewis Lieu, Ted LoBiondo Lowev MacArthur Maloney, Sean Marchant Matsui McDermott McGovern McKinley McNerney McSally Meehan Miller (FL) Mooney (WV) Moulton Mulvanev Murphy (FL) Murphy (PA) Nea1 Nolan Norcross Nugent Palazzo Pallone Paulsen

Payne

Perry

Peters

Ross Rothfus Royce Ruiz Ruppersberger Rush Russell Ryan (WI) Salmon Sanford Scalise Schiff Schweikert Scott (VA) Scott, Austin Scott, David Sensenbrenner Sessions Sherman Shimkus Shuster Simpson Smith (NE) Smith (NJ) Smith (TX) Smith (WA) Speier Stefanik Stewart Stutzman Takai Takano Thornberry Tiberi Titus Trott Tsongas Upton Van Hollen Wagner Walorski Walters, Mimi Walz Wasserman Schultz Webster (FL) Welch Wenstrup Westerman Westmoreland Williams Wilson (FL) Wilson (SC) Womack Yarmuth Young (IA) Young (IN)

Zeldin

Zinke

# NOES-169

Rvan (OH) Peterson Torres Poe (TX) Sánchez, Linda Turner Poliquin т Valadao Polis Sanchez, Loretta Vargas Price, Tom Sarbanes Veasey Rangel Schakowsky Vela Ratcliffe Schrader Velázguez Reed Serrano Visclosky Renacci Sewell (AL) Walberg Rice (NY) Sinema Walden Rice (SC) Sires Walker Slaughter Richmond Watson Coleman Smith (MO) Weber (TX) Rigell Roe (TN) Whitfield Stivers Swalwell (CA) Rogers (AL) Wittman Rohrabacher Thompson (CA) Woodall Ros-Lehtinen Thompson (MS) Yoder Rouzer Thompson (PA) Yoho Roybal-Allard Tipton Young (AK)

#### ANSWERED "PRESENT"-2

NOT VOTING-13

Gohmert Tonko

Blumenauer Esty Lynch Moore Brady (PA) Graves (MO) Grijalva Buchanan Waters, Maxine Carter (TX) Gutiérrez Clawson (FL) Heck (WA)

#### □ 1408

So the Journal was approved. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## OFFICIAL PHOTOGRAPH OF 114TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 292, this time has been designated for the taking of the official photo of the House of Representatives in session.

The House will be in a brief recess while the Chamber is being prepared for the photo. As soon as the photographer indicates that these preparations are complete, the Chair will call the House to order to resume its actual session for the taking of the photograph. At that point the Members will take their cues from the photographer. Shortly after the photographer is finished, the House will proceed with business.

# RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess while the Chamber is being prepared.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

## □ 1414

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.

(Thereupon, the Members sat for the official photograph of the House of Representatives for the 114th Congress.)

# RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

#### □ 1600

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker protempore (Mr. HUDSON) at 4 p.m.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

IMPROVING COAL COMBUSTION RESIDUALS REGULATION ACT OF 2015

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1734.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 369 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1734.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Hultgren) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

### □ 1602

# IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1734) to amend subtitle D of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to encourage recovery and beneficial use of coal combustion residuals and establish requirements for the proper management and disposal of coal combustion residuals that are protective of human health and the environment, with Mr. HULTGREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Shimkus) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Pallone) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in December of last year, EPA put out its final rule for coal ash. We applaud EPA's decision to regulate coal ash under subtitle D, confirming what we have been saying all along, that coal ash is not hazardous.

All you have to do is talk to any of the thousands of coal ash recyclers across the country, and they will tell you that not only is coal ash not hazardous, it is an essential component in their product. However, the rule remains seriously flawed; and implementation will result in confusion, conflict, and a lot of needless litigation.

A fundamental flaw with the rule is that it is self-implementing, which means that, now that EPA has finalized the rule, going forward, there will be zero regulatory oversight of coal ash by the EPA. What this means is that all of the requirements in the final rule, no matter how protective you believe they are, will be interpreted and implemented by the utilities with no oversight or enforcement by the EPA or the States.

This leads us to one of the other key flaws with the final rule, which is that it is enforceable only through citizen suits. Think about that; the final rule sets out a complex set of technical requirements for coal ash, but interpreting what they mean and how to implement them is left entirely to the regulated community with citizen lawsuits in Federal Court as the only mechanism for enforcement.

This will result in an unpredictable array of regulatory interpretations as judges throughout the country are forced to make technical compliance decisions that are better left to a regulatory agency.

Under current law, State permit programs will not operate in lieu of the final coal ash rule. Even if States adopt the final rule, regulated entities must comply with the requirements in the Federal rule and their State. This means, even if a utility was in full compliance with their State coal ash permit, they could and would be sued for noncompliance with the Federal rule.

The Western Governors' Association said it best in a letter to the House and Senate leadership on May 15 of this year:

Unfortunately, EPA's final rule produces an unintended regulatory consequence in that it creates a dual Federal and State regulatory system. This is because EPA is not allowed under RCRA subtitle D to delegate the CCR program to States in lieu of the Federal program.

Also, the rule does not require facilities to obtain permits, does not require States to adopt and implement new rules, and cannot be enforced by EPA. The rule's only compliance mechanism is for a State or citizen group to bring a citizen suit in Federal District Court under RCRA section 7002. This approach marginalizes the role of State regulation, oversight, and enforcement.

This brings us to where we are today, in need of legislative solution to address the fundamental flaws with the final rule. H.R. 1734 is the solution. The bill addresses the self-implementing aspect of the final rule, as well as the problem with citizen suit enforcement, by establishing enforceable permit programs that directly incorporate the technical requirements of the final rule.

The bill will ensure that every State has a coal ash permit program, that

every permit program will contain all of the minimal Federal standards or something more stringent, and that the technical requirements of EPA's final rule are implemented with direct regulatory oversight and enforcement.

The bill requires owners and operators to take actions such as preparing a fugitive dust control plan and conducting structural stability inspections within 8 months from the date of enactment, which makes compliance with these and other requirements directly in line with the timeframe for compliance under the final rule.

Notably, H.R. 1734 also requires owners and operators to begin groundwater monitoring within 36 months from the date of enactment with State environmental agencies immediately ensuring compliance, rather than having to wait for the courts.

It treats inactive surface impoundments in exactly the same manner as the final rule; applies all of the location restrictions from the final rule to the new surface impoundments and expansions of existing impoundments; and will ensure all relevant information—including all information associated with the issuance of permits, all groundwater monitoring data, structural stability assessments, emergency action plans, fugitive dust control plans, information regarding corrective action remedies, and certifications regarding closure—be made available on the Internet.

H.R. 1734 expressly protects the ability to file citizen suits under RCRA while ensuring parties to a lawsuit demonstrate actual harm from the coal ash and not just that a utility allegedly violated the requirements of the rule.

Some say that the bill "goes too far" because it allows States to exercise flexibility and make site-specific, risk-based decisions. Others say that the bill is a "giveaway" to the utilities or that allowing the States to exercise the same flexibility available under other RCRA permit programs "weakens" the requirement of the final rule.

To that, we say H.R. 1734 simply gives the States the same authority to implement coal ash permit programs that they have for other RCRA subtitle D and even subtitle C permit programs.

We trust the States are in the best position to analyze the local conditions and make risk-based permit decisions. We also know EPA trusts the States because EPA relies on the States for the implementation and enforcement of RCRA.

As we have heard before from the Environmental Council of the States and the Association of State and Territorial Solid Waste Management Officials and from the States themselves, they welcome the new minimum Federal requirements, are up to the task of regulating coal ash, and strongly support H.R. 1734.

In addition to ECOS and ASTSWMO, H.R. 1734 enjoys support from a wide array of stakeholders, including Utility