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**Summary of Top Hits**

**PRUITT WOULD DISMANTLE THE EPA:** The EPA was created to protect the environment and Americans’ health–this is the agency’s entire mission. Scott Pruitt is fundamentally opposed to that mission. He bragged about suing the EPA 14 times while he was attorney general. And now that Pruitt is in charge he’s taking full advantage of his position by weakening or ending rules that prevent corporations from releasing toxic substances into the land, air, and water. Instead of working with the EPA’s scientists to clean up Superfund sites, he appointed a personal friend with no experience to run the Superfund program. One of his political patrons has even bragged about working with Pruitt to “bury the sons of bitches” at the EPA. Pruitt has always wanted to dismantle the EPA, and now he’s doing so from the inside.

**PRUITT IS UNDER THREE IG INVESTIGATIONS:** Scott Pruitt is facing three separate investigations by the EPA’s inspector general for actions he has taken while in office. The inspector is looking into: (1) whether Pruitt misused taxpayers’ money by having a $25,000 special soundproof phone booth built in his office, (2) whether Pruitt misused taxpayers’ money by traveling on the taxpayers’ dime on private and military jets, and (3) whether Pruitt violated the law by lobbying on behalf of the mining industry while earning a salary from the federal government.

**PRUITT’S ACTIONS ARE FOR HIS OWN POLITICAL GAIN:** Scott Pruitt’s actions have shown that his biggest goal is not to protect the health and safety of the American people, but to advance his own personal political career. He meets almost exclusively with the corporations he is supposed to be overseeing–hearing and addressing their interests and concerns–and barely at all with groups who represent Americans on health issues. He’s given top jobs to friends–including a former banker who had been banned from the banking industry for life for repeated ethical violations–while sidelining scientists.

**PRUITT ACTIONS AT EPA HAVE REAL CONSEQUENCES:** The actions that Scott Pruitt has taken at the EPA have real consequences in everyday Americans’ lives. Under Pruitt, EPA scientists and staff can’t even ask companies for information about pollutants they release without permission from Washington, DC. The EPA has brought far fewer cases against polluters over the past nine months than the Obama administration did during the same period. And since Pruitt became the EPA administrator, hundreds of employees have retired or quit and not been replaced, making it impossible to keep an eye on all of the industries it is supposed to oversee.

**PRUITT EPA SUPPRESSED SCIENCE:** Scott Pruitt has spent the past year trying to eliminate science entirely from the EPA–an agency whose work is BASED on science. Pruitt has had references to scientific data removed from the EPA’s website. He has removed dozens of scientists from boards that advise the EPA. And when one agency staff member wanted to meet with him to discuss the science behind limiting the use of a pesticide that causes brain damage in children and Parkinson’s disease, Pruitt’s chief of staff said that he was successful in “scaring” the staff member.

**PRUITT RUNS EPA LIKE HE IS PARANOID**. Pruitt does not act like someone in charge of a major government agency–instead, he acts like a paranoid conspiracy theorist. He is the first EPA administrator in history to have a 24-hour personal security detail, one that consists of 30 people and costs the American people $2 million per year. He spent $25,000 of taxpayers’ money to build a soundproof phone booth in his office, and has his office regularly swept for listening devices. And he wanted to spend $120,000 to hire a Republican political consulting firm to identify, monitor, and dig up dirt on EPA employees who are critical of Pruitt or Donald Trump. These are the kinds of actions you would expect from a paranoid foreign dictator, not from the head of the EPA.

**PRUITT IS BAD FOR PUBLIC HEALTH**. As EPA administrator, one of Pruitt’s first actions was to allow continued use of chlorpyrifos, a pesticide that has long-term harmful effects on children. When he was attorney general of Oklahoma, Scott Pruitt used his position of power to attack lifesaving measures established by the EPA, including restrictions on dangerous mercury pollution, industrial methane pollution from the oil and gas companies, carbon pollution and other toxic substances. Pruitt even disputes the Clean Air Act, which has provided the bipartisan bedrock of our public health and environmental protections for decades.

**PAY TO PLAY:** When Pruitt was attorney general of Oklahoma, his campaigns and political organizations received more than $3 million from fossil fuel interests–and he repeatedly took actions to benefit corporations within days of their checks being delivered. Now that he's at the EPA, polluting industries have an open door. Pruitt met with a huge trash collection company, and within weeks announced that the EPA was going to hold off on air quality rules at landfills. He met with representatives of big industrial agriculture companies, and days later announced that the EPA was going to loosen standards for the use of pesticides.

# Top Hit: Pruitt Would Dismantle the EPA

The EPA was created to protect the environment and Americans’ health–this is the agency’s entire mission. Scott Pruitt is fundamentally opposed to that mission. He bragged about suing the EPA 14 times while he was attorney general. And now that Pruitt is in charge he’s taking full advantage of his position by weakening or ending rules that prevent corporations from releasing toxic substances into the land, air, and water. Instead of working with the EPA’s scientists to clean up Superfund sites, he appointed a personal friend with no experience to run the Superfund program. One of his political patrons has even bragged about working with Pruitt to “bury the sons of bitches” at the EPA. Pruitt has always wanted to dismantle the EPA, and now he’s doing so from the inside.

## Scott Pruitt Sued the EPA 14 Times

**Pruitt Has Sued EPA 14 Times**. According to an article in the New York Times, “It was one of a series of instances in which Mr. Pruitt put cooperation with industry before confrontation as he sought to blunt the impact of federal environmental policies in his state — against oil, gas, agriculture and other interests. His antipathy to federal regulation — he sued the Environmental Protection Agency 14 times — in many ways defined his tenure as Oklahoma’s attorney general.” [New York Times, [1/14/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/14/us/scott-pruitt-trump-epa-pick.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&_r=0)]

1. **Challenged The Cross State Air Pollution Rule**. [United States Court of Appeals, Case# 11-1302, 12/10/14]
2. **Challenged Rule Placing Limits On Mercury Pollution** [United States Court of Appeals, Case#12-1100, 10/23/12]
3. **Challenged Limits On Mercury A Second Time**. [United States Court of Appeals, Case#16-1127, 11/18/16]
4. **Challenged EPA Effort To Reduce Ozone Pollution.** [United States Court of Appeals, Case#15-1385, 4/22/16]
5. **Challenged EPA Rule Limiting Pollution During Power Plant Shutdowns Or Malfunctions**. [United States Court of Appeals, Case#15-1166, 3/16/16]
6. **Challenged Plan By EPA To Protect Scenic Vistas In Certain National Parks**. [United States Court of Appeals, Case#12-9526, 7/19/13]
7. **Challenged Clean Air Standards For Oil And Gas Drilling And Production Sites**. [United States Court of Appeals, Case#16-1264, 8/2/16]
8. **Challenged Determination That Greenhouse Gas Pollution Endangers Health And Environment**. [United States Court of Appeals, Case#09-1322, 6/26/12]
9. **Challenged The Clean Power Plan--Intended To Curb Climate Change**. [United States Court of Appeals, Case#14-1151, 12/15/14]
10. **Challenged The Clean Power Plan-A Second Time** [United States District Court, Case315-CV-369-CVE-FHM, 7/1/15]
11. **Challenged The Clean Power Plan-A Third Time**. [United States Court of Appeals, Case#15-1284, 8/24/15]
12. **Sued To Block The Clean Power Plan A Fourth Time**. [United States Court of Appeals, Case#15-1363, 4/22/16]
13. **Challenged Carbon Pollution Standards For New Power Plants**. [United States Court of Appeals, Case#15-1381, 10/13/16]
14. **Challenged The Clean Water Rule.** [United States District Court, Case#15-3822, 11/1/16]

[New York Times, [1/14/17](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/01/14/us/politics/document-Pruitt-v-EPA-a-Compilation-of-Oklahoma-14.html)]

## Pruitt is Weakening Clean Air, Water, and Toxic Standards

### Clean Air

**Pruitt Repealed Major Obama-Era Carbon Emissions Rule**. According to the New York Times, “The Environmental Protection Agency announced…that Scott Pruitt, the chief of the agency, had signed a measure to repeal President Barack Obama’s signature policy to curb greenhouse gas emissions from power plants, setting up a bitter fight over the future of America’s efforts to tackle global warming. Mr. Pruitt, who had signaled the move at an event with coal miners in eastern Kentucky on Monday, said in a news release that his predecessors had departed from regulatory norms in writing the Clean Power Plan, which was finalized in 2015 and would have pushed states to move away from coal in favor of sources of electricity that produce fewer carbon emissions.” [New York Times, [10/9/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/09/climate/clean-power-plan.html)]

**EPA Delayed State Deadlines For NAAQS**. According to an EPA Press Release, “U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Scott Pruitt sent a letter to governors today to inform them of EPA’s efforts related to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone promulgated in October 2015. EPA is extending the deadline for promulgating initial area designations, by one year, for the 2015 ozone NAAQS. ‘States have made tremendous progress and significant investment cleaning up the air. We will continue to work with states to ensure they are on a path to compliance,’ said Administrator Scott Pruitt.” [EPA Press Release, [6/6/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-extend-deadline-2015-ozone-naaqs-area-designations)]

**EPA And DOT Announced Plan To Roll Back Fuel Efficiency Standards**. According to the New York Times, “The Trump administration is expected to begin rolling back stringent federal regulations on vehicle pollution that contributes to global warming, according to people familiar with the matter, essentially marking a U-turn to efforts to force the American auto industry to produce more electric cars. The announcement — which is expected as soon as Tuesday and will be made jointly by the Environmental Protection Agency administrator, Scott Pruitt, and the transportation secretary, Elaine L. Chao — will immediately start to undo one of former President Barack Obama’s most significant environmental legacies.” [New York Times, [3/3/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/03/us/politics/trump-vehicle-emissions-regulation.html)]

### Clean Water

**EPA Moved To Rescind WOTUS**. According to a press release, “The Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Army, and Army Corps of Engineers (the agencies) are proposing a rule to rescind the Clean Water Rule and re-codify the regulatory text that existed prior to 2015 defining ‘waters of the United States’ or WOTUS. This action would, when finalized, provide certainty in the interim, pending a second rulemaking in which the agencies will engage in a substantive re-evaluation of the definition of ‘waters of the United States.’ The proposed rule would be implemented in accordance with Supreme Court decisions, agency guidance, and longstanding practice. ‘We are taking significant action to return power to the states and provide regulatory certainty to our nation’s farmers and businesses,’ said Administrator Scott Pruitt. ‘This is the first step in the two-step process to redefine ‘waters of the U.S.’ and we are committed to moving through this re-evaluation to quickly provide regulatory certainty, in a way that is thoughtful, transparent and collaborative with other agencies and the public.’” [EPA, [6/27/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-us-army-move-rescind-2015-waters-us)]

**Rolled Back Limits On Toxic Discharge From Power Plants Into Public Waterways.** According to the New York Times, “Rolled back limits on toxic discharge from power plants into public waterways. April 12 Who wanted it changed? Utility and fossil fuel industry groups opposed the rule, which limited the amount of toxic metals — arsenic, lead, and mercury, among others — power plants could release into public waterways. Industry representatives said complying with the guidelines would be extremely expensive. The E.P.A. has delayed compliance deadlines while it reconsiders the rule, which had been challenged in court.” [New York Times, [5/2/17](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/05/02/climate/environmental-rules-reversed-trump-100-days.html?_r=0)]

**EPA Announced It Would Reconsider ELG Rule**. According to an EPA press release, “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 has been estimated to cost $480 million per year and has a reported average cost of $1.2 billion per year during the first five years of compliance. ‘This action is another example of EPA implementing President Trump’s vision of being good stewards of our natural resources, while not developing regulations that hurt our economy and kill jobs,’ said EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt.” [EPA, [4/13/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-reconsider-elg-rule)]

### Toxic Chemicals

**E.P.A. Delays Bans On Uses Of Hazardous Chemicals**. According to the New York Times, “The Environmental Protection Agency will indefinitely postpone bans on certain uses of three toxic chemicals found in consumer products, according to an update of the Trump administration’s regulatory plans. Critics said the reversal demonstrated the agency’s increasing reluctance to use enforcement powers granted to it last year by Congress under the Toxic Substances Control Act. E.P.A. Administrator Scott Pruitt is ‘blatantly ignoring Congress’s clear directive to the agency to better protect the health and safety of millions of Americans by more effectively regulating some of the most dangerous chemicals known to man,’ said Senator Tom Carper, Democrat of Delaware and the ranking minority member on the Senate Environment and Public Works committee.” [New York Times, [12/19/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/19/health/epa-toxic-chemicals.html)]

**EPA Extended Timeline for Pesticide Applicators Rule**. According to an EPA press release, “U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt today announced a 12-month extension for implementation of the revised final Certification and Training of Pesticide Applicators (C&T) rule. EPA received feedback from states and stakeholders that more time and resources are needed to prepare for compliance with the rule. The extended timeline will enable EPA to work with states and provide adequate compliance and training resources. ‘In order to achieve both environmental protection and economic prosperity, we must give the regulated community, which includes farmers and ranchers, adequate time to come into compliance with regulations. Extending the timeline for implementation of this rule will enable EPA to consult with states, assist with education, training and guidance, and prevent unnecessary burdens from overshadowing the rule’s intended benefits,’ said Administrator Pruitt.” [EPA, [5/11/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-extends-timeline-pesticide-applicators-rule)]

**Pruitt Denied Petition To Ban Widely Used Pesticide**. According to the EPA, “U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Scott Pruitt signed an order denying a petition that sought to ban chlorpyrifos, a pesticide crucial to U.S. agriculture. ‘We need to provide regulatory certainty to the thousands of American farms that rely on chlorpyrifos, while still protecting human health and the environment,’ said EPA Administrator Pruitt. ‘By reversing the previous Administration’s steps to ban one of the most widely used pesticides in the world, we are returning to using sound science in decision-making – rather than predetermined results.’” [EPA, [3/29/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-administrator-pruitt-denies-petition-ban-widely-used-pesticide-0)]

## Appointed Personal Friend with No Experience to Run Superfund Program

**Pruitt Hired Friend Albert Kelly To Oversee Superfund Program.** According to the Intercept, “The Environmental Protection Agency has tasked a banker who was banned from the banking industry for life with oversight of the nation’s Superfund program. In May, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation fined Oklahoma banker Albert Kelly $125,000. According to a consent order, which The Intercept obtained through the Freedom of Information Act, the FDIC had ‘reason to believe that [Kelly] violated a law or regulation, by entering into an agreement pertaining to a loan by the Bank without FDIC approval. Two weeks later, EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt appointed Kelly to lead an effort to streamline the Superfund program.’” [The Intercept, [12/28/17](https://theintercept.com/2017/12/28/scott-pruitt-failed-banker-running-epa-superfund-program/)]

* **Kelly Had Been Banned From The Banking Industry ‘For Life’ By The FDIC**. According to the Intercept, “In July, the FDIC went further, banning Kelly from banking for life. The ‘order of prohibition from further participation’ explained that the FDIC had determined Kelly’s ‘unfitness to serve as a director, officer, person participating in the conduct of the affairs or as an institution-affiliated party of the Bank, any other insured depository institution.’” [The Intercept, [12/28/17](https://theintercept.com/2017/12/28/scott-pruitt-failed-banker-running-epa-superfund-program/)]
* **Pruitt Had Received Loans From Kelly’s Bank**. According to the Intercept, “But Pruitt, who had received loans from Kelly’s bank, apparently didn’t find Kelly’s unfitness to serve in the financial industry as disqualifying his longtime friend from serving as a top official at the EPA. Since May, Kelly, or Kell as he was known in Oklahoma, has led the effort to streamline the Superfund program — which oversees remediation of some of the country’s most toxic sites.” [The Intercept, [12/28/17](https://theintercept.com/2017/12/28/scott-pruitt-failed-banker-running-epa-superfund-program/)]

### Robert Murray Said He Would ‘Bury The Sons Of Bitches’ At EPA

**Murray Said That He Was “Going To Bury Those Sons Of Bitches” With His Lawsuit To The Clean Power Plan.** “PRUITT: The Clean Power Plan, this particular rule, has been stopped dead in its tracks. And-and will not survive this presidency. MURRAY: It invigorated us. I've fought this fight every day. And now I'm going to bury the sons of bitches. NARRATOR: It was the middle of the 2016 presidential campaign, and Murray headed off to New York, to try to forge another political alliance. MURRAY: I called Donald Trump's office at Trump Tower in New York. And when I walked into his office he was alone. We talked for 50 minutes. I can talk. He can talk. About coal, about the connection between coal miners' jobs, coal miners' families. I was so impressed with him.” [Frontline, PBS, [10/11/17](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/film/war-on-the-epa/); [Clip](https://www.iqmediacorp.com/ClipPlayer/?ClipID=b57a6777-4e9a-4768-9e55-100fb95dd5d7)]

**New York Times: Trump** **Took On Robert Murray As An Informal Campaign Adviser And “Mr. Murray And Others Helped Choose The Perfect Candidate: Mr. Pruitt[.]”** “Mr. Trump took on as an informal campaign adviser Robert E. Murray — chief executive of the same coal company that had been working closely for years with the Republican attorneys general to unwind the Obama environmental legacy. […] When it came time to translate Mr. Trump’s campaign promises to coal country into policy, Mr. Murray and others helped choose the perfect candidate: Mr. Pruitt, the Oklahoma attorney general. Mr. Trump, who had never met Mr. Pruitt before his election, offered him the job of E.P.A. administrator — putting him in a position to dismantle the environmental rules that he had long sought to fight in court.” [New York Times, [6/03/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/03/us/politics/republican-leaders-climate-change.html?_r=0)]

* **Pruitt Affiliated Super PAC Received $50,000 From Murray Energy CEO**. Murray Energy CEO Robert Murray donated $50,000 to the Liberty 2.0 Super PAC on August 26, 2016. [CQ MoneyLine, Super PAC Donors, accessed 1/9/17]
* **Super PAC Located At Pruitt Campaign Office; Primary Consultant Shared With Pruitt PAC Oklahoma Strong**. According to Oklahoma Watch, “Pruitt’s name does not appear on any of the documents establishing either PAC. However, not only are the PACs located in his campaign office, but the primary consultant and fundraiser for his state campaign, Tamara Cornell, is the main consultant, incorporator, record-keeper, vice-treasurer and a board member for both Oklahoma Strong and Liberty 2.0.” [Oklahoma Watch, [11/30/15](http://oklahomawatch.org/2015/11/30/pacs-tied-to-pruitt-reach-out-nationally-for-donors/)]

**Top Hit: Pruitt is Under Three IG Investigations**

Scott Pruitt is facing three separate investigations by the EPA’s inspector general for actions he has taken while in office. The inspector is looking into: (1) whether Pruitt misused taxpayers’ money by having a $25,000 special soundproof phone booth built in his office, (2) whether Pruitt misused taxpayers’ money by traveling on the taxpayers’ dime on private and military jets, and (3) whether Pruitt violated the law by lobbying on behalf of the mining industry while earning a salary from the federal government.

Travel Expenses

**EPA Inspector General To Investigate Pruitt Travel**. According to Reuters, “The frequent travels of the head of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Scott Pruitt, to Oklahoma will be investigated following congressional requests, the agency’s Office of Inspector General said on Monday. Pruitt’s many travels to his home state have fueled speculation that he intends to run for the U.S. Senate from Oklahoma.” [Reuters, [8/28/17](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-epa-pruitt-idUSKCN1B821U)]

* **IG Investigation To Explore Frequency, Cost, And Extent Of Pruitt Travel.** According to Reuters, “The Office of Inspector General said it would look into the ‘frequency, cost and extent’ of Pruitt’s travels to Oklahoma through July 31, and whether travel policies and procedures were followed. It said the investigation will also aim to determine ‘whether EPA policies and procedures are sufficiently designed to prevent fraud, waste and abuse with the Administrator’s travel that included trips to Oklahoma.’” [Reuters, [8/28/17](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-epa-pruitt-idUSKCN1B821U)]
* **Pruitt Was In Oklahoma On At Least 43 Of The 92 Days Of March, April And May**. According to Reuters, “Pruitt was in Oklahoma on at least 43 of the 92 days of March, April and May, according to copies of his travel records obtained by the Environmental Integrity Project watchdog group and reviewed by Reuters last month.” [Reuters, [8/28/17](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-epa-pruitt-idUSKCN1B821U)]
* **Pruitt Often Met With Oil And Gas Industry While In Oklahoma**. According to Reuters, “The travel records show Pruitt’s schedule this spring often took him to cities in the U.S. heartland where he held meetings, often with oil and gas industry representatives, made speeches and attended events before flying to Tulsa for extended weekends. The records showed Pruitt paid for some legs of the trips directly related to his visits home, although it was not clear he paid for all such legs.” [Reuters, [8/28/17](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-epa-pruitt-idUSKCN1B821U)]

**The Hill: EPA Head Disputed Charge He Spent Too Much Time At Home In Oklahoma.**According to The Hill, “Scott Pruitt, who has lived in Oklahoma for much of his life and was most recently its attorney general, said groups making those accusations are wrong. He blamed former Obama administration employees driven by their opposition to him for the claims. Pruitt defended himself Thursday while in Oklahoma to speak with agricultural interests about his efforts to roll back former President Barack Obama’s Clean Water Rule. ‘The folks talking about this, one, their facts are wrong, and that’s not a surprise. But it’s an alt-EPA,’ he told Oklahoma City television station Fox 25, referring to the social media identity of an anti-Trump group that claims to be EPA employees. ‘It’s a group of employees that worked for Obama, that formed an organization to put out these kinds of things that are not accurate and completely forthcoming as far as those issues,’ Pruitt continued. … The environmental group said the EPA paid at least $12,000 for the airfare for those trips, since they often included at least some official responsibilities, after which Pruitt went home to Tulsa. Pruitt was in Oklahoma for about 90 percent of the days that he traveled, the group said.” [The Hill, [7/28/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/344295-epa-head-disputes-charge-that-he-spends-too-much-time-in-oklahoma)]

**Politico: Records Showed Pruitt Spent Significant Time In Oklahoma In Spring.**According to Politico, “EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt spent 43 days in March, April and May on trips to his home state of Oklahoma, according to travel records obtained by the watchdog group Environmental Integrity Project. The records, released under the Freedom of Information Act, include weekend trips home as well as official business in the state, such as a tour of a chemical plant or an awards event hosted by the Oklahoma Well Strippers Association. The records indicate Pruitt sometimes paid his own airfare but often went at the government’s expense. … The group will ask EPA’s inspector general to investigate Pruitt’s travel Monday, an EIP spokesman said. As precedent, he pointed to a 2015 IG report on a regional administrator who scheduled more than half of his official trips to areas near his home in California’s Orange County, some of which the IG questioned. EPA spokeswoman Liz Bowman said in a statement that Pruitt was focused on running EPA, ‘not running for elected office. The administrator’s travel, whether to Utah, Michigan or Oklahoma, all serves the purpose of hearing from hard-working Americans about how EPA can better serve the American people.’” [Politico, [7/24/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/story/2017/07/pruitt-spent-significant-time-in-oklahoma-in-spring-records-show-160045)]

**New York Times: “Scott Pruitt Spent Much Of Early Months At E.P.A. Traveling Home, Report Says.”** According to the New York Times, “Scott Pruitt, the head of the Environmental Protection Agency, traveled to his home state, Oklahoma, 10 times over three months this year, largely at taxpayer expense, according to a report released Monday. The findings from the Environmental Integrity Project, a nonprofit group founded by former E.P.A. officials, are drawn from Mr. Pruitt’s calendar and the travel expenses he has submitted for reimbursement. Obtained under the Freedom of Information Act, the documents show Mr. Pruitt spent 43 out of 92 days from March through May in Oklahoma or traveling to or from the state.” [New York Times, [7/24/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/24/climate/scott-pruitt-epa-travel-expenses.html)]

* **Pruitt Could Run For Governor In 2018; Senate In 2020 Or 2022**. According to the New York Times, “Were Mr. Pruitt to try to replace Gov. Mary Fallin of Oklahoma in 2018, his tenure as E.P.A. chief would be cut short. Mr. Inhofe, 82, has not said whether he intends to run for re-election when his six-year term ends in 2020. Oklahoma’s other senator, James Lankford, 49, is up for re-election in 2022.” [New York Times, [7/24/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/24/climate/scott-pruitt-epa-travel-expenses.html)]

**Pruitt Travel Fueled Speculation Of Ambition For Higher Office**. According to Reuters, “Pruitt’s many travels to his home state have fueled speculation that he intends to run for the U.S. Senate from Oklahoma.” [Reuters, [8/28/17](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-epa-pruitt-idUSKCN1B821U)]

**Pruitt Took Private And Military Flights Totaling More Than $58,000.** According to the Washington Post, “Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt has taken at least four noncommercial and military flights since mid-February, costing taxpayers more than $58,000 to fly him to various parts of the country, according to records provided to a congressional oversight committee and obtained by The Washington Post.” [Washington Post, [9/27/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/09/27/epas-pruitt-took-charter-military-flights-that-cost-taxpayers-more-than-58000/?utm_term=.2149ad68a61c)]

* **June: Pruitt Flew From Andrews Air Force Base To Cincinnati At Cost Of $36,000**. According to the Washington Post, “The most expensive of the four trips came in early June, when Pruitt traveled from Andrews Air Force Base to Cincinnati to join President Trump as he pitched a plan to revamp U.S. infrastructure. From there, the administrator and several staff members continued on a military jet to John F. Kennedy airport in New York to catch a flight to Italy for an international meeting of environmental ministers. The cost of that flight was $36,068.50.” [Washington Post, [9/27/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/09/27/epas-pruitt-took-charter-military-flights-that-cost-taxpayers-more-than-58000/?utm_term=.2149ad68a61c)]
* **July: Pruitt Flew From Tulsa To Guymon, Oklahoma For $14,000**. According to the Washington Post, “On July 27, records show, Pruitt and six staff members arranged a flight on a Department of Interior plane from Tulsa to the tiny outpost of Guymon, Okla., at a cost of $14,434.50. The EPA noted that ‘time constraints’ on Pruitt’s schedule wouldn’t allow him to make the 10-hour round-trip drive. The purpose of the trip was to meet with landowners ‘whose farms have been affected’ by a controversial rule regulating water bodies in the United States, according to the agency. Pruitt has initiated a process to withdraw the regulation, known as the Waters of the United States rule.” [Washington Post, [9/27/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/09/27/epas-pruitt-took-charter-military-flights-that-cost-taxpayers-more-than-58000/?utm_term=.2149ad68a61c)]
* **August 4: Pruitt Flew From Denver To Durango, Colorado For $5,700**. According to the Washington Post, “Pruitt and three staff members arranged a private air charter on Aug. 4, on a trip from Denver to Durango, Colo. The flight cost $5,719.58. According to the EPA, the commercial flight Pruitt had planned to take ‘was delayed ultimately for eight hours, which would have caused him to miss a mission critical meeting at Gold King Mine’ with Gov. John Hickenlooper (D) and other officials. Hickenlooper offered a seat on his plane, but Bowman said that the governor’s aircraft only had room for Pruitt and that the EPA already had booked the private plane by then. The charter company involved, Mayo Aviation, bills itself as ‘Colorado’s premier jet charter service.’” [Washington Post, [9/27/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/09/27/epas-pruitt-took-charter-military-flights-that-cost-taxpayers-more-than-58000/?utm_term=.2149ad68a61c)]
* **August 9: Pruitt Flew Grand Forks, North Dakota For $2,100**. According to the Washington Post, “Finally, on Aug. 9, Pruitt and two staffers traveling in North Dakota flew on a state-owned plane to an event in Grand Forks. The flight cost the EPA $2,144.40. ‘The Governor of the State of North Dakota offered seats on the state-owned plane to transport the Administrator to this event,’ the agency noted in its justification for the trip, which involved touring the University of North Dakota’s Environmental Research Center. ‘There is no government rate established for this route.’” [Washington Post, [9/27/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/09/27/epas-pruitt-took-charter-military-flights-that-cost-taxpayers-more-than-58000/?utm_term=.2149ad68a61c)]

**EPA IG Expanded Investigation To Include $40,000 Spent On Trip To Morocco**. According to the Washington Examiner, “EPA’s inspector general said Wednesday it will investigate Administrator Scott Pruitt’s recent trip to Morocco to promote natural gas. Sen. Tom Carper, D-Del., who requested the probe, says Pruitt’s four-day trip to Morocco last month was inappropriate because the EPA plays no formal role in overseeing natural gas exports, which falls under the jurisdiction of the Energy Department or Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. The EPA inspector general already is investigating Pruitt for his use of private and military flights and his frequent travel as administrator to his home state of Oklahoma, where he served as attorney general. The inspector general’s office expanded the probe to include Pruitt’s travels through the end of the year, including the Morocco trip, which cost $40,000.” [Washington Examiner, [1/10/18](http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/epa-inspector-general-to-probe-scott-pruitts-trip-to-morocco-to-promote-natural-gas/article/2645569)]

Phone Booth

**EPA IG Announced It Would Investigate Pruitt’s Decision To Spend $25,000 On Secure Phone Booth.** According to the Washington Post, “The Environmental Protection Agency’s inspector general will investigate how it decided to spend more than $25,000 installing a secure, soundproof communications booth in the office of Administrator Scott Pruitt.” [Washington Post, [12/12/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/12/12/epa-watchdog-plans-to-investigate-scott-pruitts-25000-secure-phone-booth/?utm_term=.8a295140e529)]

**Frank Pallone Jr. (D-N.J.), The Ranking Member Of The House Energy And Commerce Committee, Requested The Inquiry**. According to the Washington Post, “Rep. Frank Pallone Jr. (D-N.J.), the ranking member of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, requested the inquiry earlier this fall, asking the EPA watchdog to examine any potential waste, fraud or abuse related to the project. The small booth was purchased from the Richmond-based company Acoustical Solutions.” [Washington Post, [12/12/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/12/12/epa-watchdog-plans-to-investigate-scott-pruitts-25000-secure-phone-booth/?utm_term=.8a295140e529)]

**Pruitt Sought ‘Far More Expensive, Customized’ Version Of Soundproof Booth**. According to the Washington Post, “Typically, the type of soundproof booth like the one installed at the agency’s headquarters is used to conduct hearing tests. But the EPA sought out a far more expensive, customized version that Pruitt could use to communicate privately with top government officials. The agency appears to also have spent an additional $7,978 removing closed-circuit television equipment to make room for the booth in an area off Pruitt’s third-floor office, according to a government contracting database.” [Washington Post, [12/12/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/12/12/epa-watchdog-plans-to-investigate-scott-pruitts-25000-secure-phone-booth/?utm_term=.8a295140e529)]

**EPA Officials Said Booth Was Necessary For Administrator Pruitt To Communicate With White House**. According to the Washington Post, “EPA officials initially said that Pruitt needed a secure communications area in his office so he could have private calls with the White House and other administration officials. Pruitt himself has repeated the claim, describing the soundproof booth as a Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility, or SCIF.” [Washington Post, [12/12/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/12/12/epa-watchdog-plans-to-investigate-scott-pruitts-25000-secure-phone-booth/?utm_term=.8a295140e529)]

**Pruitt: “It’s Necessary For Me To Be Able To Do My Job.”** According to the Washington Post, “‘It’s necessary for me to be able to do my job,’ Pruitt told lawmakers during a hearing on Capitol Hill last week.” [Washington Post, [12/12/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/12/12/epa-watchdog-plans-to-investigate-scott-pruitts-25000-secure-phone-booth/?utm_term=.8a295140e529)]

**Washington Post: “No Previous EPA Administrators Had Such A Setup.”** According to the Washington Post, “But no previous EPA administrators had such a setup, and the agency has long maintained a SCIF on a separate floor from the administrator’s office, where officials with proper clearances can go to share information classified as secret. The agency has not specified what aspects of that facility might be outdated, or whether the unit inside Pruitt’s office would meet the physical and technical specifications generally required for a SCIF.” [Washington Post, [12/12/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/12/12/epa-watchdog-plans-to-investigate-scott-pruitts-25000-secure-phone-booth/?utm_term=.8a295140e529)]

National Mining Association Meeting

**House Energy And Commerce Committee’s Top Democrat, Rep. Frank Pallone Requested GAO Investigation Of Pruitt Meeting With NMA**. According to EE News, “U.S. EPA’s inspector general has agreed to investigate Administrator Scott Pruitt’s April meeting with the mining trade group. The House Energy and Commerce Committee’s top Democrat, Rep. Frank Pallone Jr. of New Jersey, requested that the watchdog compile a ‘factual record’ of what happened when Pruitt met with the National Mining Association.” [EE News, [12/6/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/12/06/stories/1060068267)]

**Pallone’s Request Triggered IG Involvement**. According to EE News, “This week, the IG said it would assemble a record of the Pruitt-NMA meeting. In a letter this week, Inspector General Arthur Elkins wrote ‘that while developing the requested factual record may require extensive work, we can employ a methodology and pursue a scope that will accomplish the project with a manageable level of resources’ despite budget constraints. The record will be given to Pallone, who would provide it to GAO.” [EE News, [12/6/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/12/06/stories/1060068267)]

**Request Was Made To Investigate Whether Pruitt Or His Staff Violated Federal Lobbying Laws By Urging NMA And Other Groups To Publicly Support President Trump’s Decision To Pull The United States Out Of The Paris Climate Accord**. According to EE News, “Pallone has asked the Government Accountability Office to provide a legal opinion about whether Pruitt or his staff violated federal lobbying laws by urging NMA and other groups to publicly support President Trump’s decision to pull the United States out of the Paris climate accord.” [EE News, [12/6/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/12/06/stories/1060068267)]

**Top Hit: Pruitt’s Actions Are For His Own Political Gain**

Scott Pruitt’s actions have shown that his biggest goal is not to protect the health and safety of the American people, but to advance his own personal political career. He meets almost exclusively with the corporations he is supposed to be overseeing–hearing and addressing their interests and concerns–and barely at all with groups who represent Americans on health issues. He’s given top jobs to friends–including a former banker who had been banned from the banking industry for life for repeated ethical violations–while sidelining scientists.

Pruitt Meets Almost Exclusively With Corporations and Polluters

**Pruitt Held Less Than 1% Of His Meetings With Environmental Groups; Met Frequently With Industry Representatives**. According to CNN, “Of all of the meetings Pruitt has held in person or on the phone, the majority have been with fossil fuel industry stakeholders. He's held more than 100 meetings with industry representatives, about 25% of meetings overall, according to a recently public copy of his schedule from April to early September. In comparison, he's held five meetings with environmentalist or science groups, which is less than 1%.” [CNN, [10/6/17](https://www.cnn.com/2017/10/06/politics/pruitt-industry/index.html)]

**Pruitt Denied Environmental Group Request To Join Meeting With EPA.** According to the Washington Post, “Despite Pruitt’s claims that his door is open, advocacy groups such as the Sierra Club and Environmental Working Group have not bothered to request meetings. But when Earthjustice asked to attend a May session with state officials about how EPA planned to give them more authority over storing toxic coal ash, the agency refused. It also denied access to a 247-page guidance document it was drafting.” [Washington Post, [12/31/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/under-scott-pruitt-a-year-of-tumult-and-transformation-at-epa/2017/12/26/f93d1262-e017-11e7-8679-a9728984779c_story.html?utm_term=.3d4c458369e3)]

**Top Hit: Pruitt Actions at EPA have Real Consequences**

The actions that Scott Pruitt has taken at the EPA have real consequences in everyday Americans’ lives. Under Pruitt, EPA scientists and staff can’t even ask companies for information about pollutants they release without permission from Washington, DC. The EPA has brought far fewer cases against polluters over the past nine months than the Obama administration did during the same period. And since Pruitt became the EPA administrator, hundreds of employees have retired or quit and not been replaced, making it impossible to keep an eye on all of the industries it is supposed to oversee.

Civil Enforcement Is Down Under Pruitt

**Under Pruitt, Civil Cases Filed Were One-Third Fewer Than Under President Obama And One-Quarter Fewer Than Bush Administration**. According to the New York Times, “The Times built a database of civil cases filed at the E.P.A. during the Trump, Obama and Bush administrations. During the first nine months under Mr. Pruitt’s leadership, the E.P.A. started about 1,900 cases, about one-third fewer than the number under President Barack Obama’s first E.P.A. director and about one-quarter fewer than under President George W. Bush’s over the same time period. In addition, the agency sought civil penalties of about $50.4 million from polluters for cases initiated under Mr. Trump. Adjusted for inflation, that is about 39 percent of what the Obama administration sought and about 70 percent of what the Bush administration sought over the same time period.” [New York Times, [12/10/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/10/us/politics/pollution-epa-regulations.html)]

**EPA Enforcement Of Injunctive Relief Fell To 12 Percent Of What Was Sought Under President Obama And 48 Percent Under President Bush**. According to the New York Times, “The E.P.A., turning to one of its most powerful enforcement tools, also can force companies to retrofit their factories to cut pollution. Under Mr. Trump, those demands have dropped sharply. The agency has demanded about $1.2 billion worth of such fixes, known as injunctive relief, in cases initiated during the nine-month period, which, adjusted for inflation, is about 12 percent of what was sought under Mr. Obama and 48 percent under Mr. Bush.” [New York Times, [12/10/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/10/us/politics/pollution-epa-regulations.html)]

**NYT: “Confidential Internal E.P.A. Documents Show That The Enforcement Slowdown Coincides With Major Policy Changes Ordered By Mr. Pruitt’s Team After Pleas From Oil And Gas Industry Executives.”** According to the New York Times, “After this article was posted, the E.P.A. issued a statement criticizing the report, and saying that ‘Administrator Scott Pruitt is committed to enforcement,’ and that ‘there is no reduction in E.P.A.’s commitment to ensure compliance with our nation’s environmental laws.’ (The full statement is here.) Confidential internal E.P.A. documents show that the enforcement slowdown coincides with major policy changes ordered by Mr. Pruitt’s team after pleas from oil and gas industry executives.” [New York Times, [12/10/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/10/us/politics/pollution-epa-regulations.html)]

**Requests For Information On Polluting Companies Dropped Under Pruitt.** According to the New York Times, “At least two of the agency’s most aggressive regional offices, requests for information involving companies suspected of polluting have fallen significantly under Mr. Trump, according to internal E.P.A. data.” [New York Times, [12/10/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/10/us/politics/pollution-epa-regulations.html)]

**Top Penalties Were Smaller Than Those In The Previous Two Administrations**. According to the New York Times, “Some enforcement experts suggested that the E.P.A. under Mr. Pruitt might have filed fewer cases because it was going after larger penalties. But according to the Times analysis, most of the top penalties were smaller than those in the previous two administrations. And the nine-month window included the single largest civil case filed by the E.P.A., against Exxon Mobil.” [New York Times, [12/10/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/10/us/politics/pollution-epa-regulations.html)]

EPA Employees Must Seek Approval From Washington For Enforcement

**EPA Employees Told To Limit How They Communicate With Public**. According to the Reuters, “Employees at the Environmental Protection Agency, the Interior Department, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) have seen directives from the newly minted leadership seeking to limit how they communicate to the public, according to multiple sources.” [Reuters, [1/24/17](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-epa/trump-administration-seeks-to-muzzle-u-s-agency-employees-idUSKBN15822X)]

**EPA Enforcement Officers Need Permission From Washington To Order Certain Air And Pollution Tests**. According to the New York Times, “The documents, which were reviewed by The Times, indicate that E.P.A. enforcement officers across the country no longer have the authority to order certain air and water pollution tests, known as requests for information, without receiving permission from Washington. The tests are essential to building a case against polluters, the equivalent of the radar gun for state highway troopers.” [New York Times, [12/10/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/10/us/politics/pollution-epa-regulations.html)]

Staffing Levels Dropped At Pruitt EPA

**NYT: “Enforcement Slowdown Has Been Compounded By The Departure Of More Than 700 Employees At The E.P.A. Since Mr. Trump’s Election.”** According to the New York Times, “The enforcement slowdown has been compounded by the departure of more than 700 employees at the E.P.A. since Mr. Trump’s election, many of them via buyouts intended to reduce the agency’s size, and high-level political vacancies at the E.P.A. and the Justice Department. The agency’s top enforcement officer — Susan Bodine — was confirmed only late last week.” [New York Times, [12/10/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/10/us/politics/pollution-epa-regulations.html)]

**Staffing Levels At EPA Lowest Since The Reagan Years**. According to The Hill, “The Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) staffing is now lower than it was in former President Reagan’s final year in office. An EPA spokeswoman said Tuesday that, as of Jan. 3, the agency had 14,162 employees, down from about 15,000 at the beginning of last year. That’s even lower than the 14,400 employees the agency had in fiscal year 1988, Reagan’s final year.” [The Hill, [1/9/18](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/368090-epa-staffing-hits-reagan-levels)]

**200 Scientists Have Quit EPA Under Pruitt**. According to the New York Times, “Of the employees who have quit, retired or taken a buyout package since the beginning of the year, more than 200 are scientists.” [New York Times, [12/22/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/22/climate/epa-buyouts-pruitt.html)]

**96 Environmental Protection Specialists Have Left EPA Under Pruitt**. According to the New York Times, “An additional 96 are environmental protection specialists, a broad category that includes scientists as well as others experienced in investigating and analyzing pollution levels.” [New York Times, [12/22/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/22/climate/epa-buyouts-pruitt.html)]

**Nine Department Directors And Dozens Of Attorneys Have Left The EPA Under Pruitt.** According to the New York Times, “Nine department directors have departed the agency as well as dozens of attorneys and program managers. Most of the employees who have left are not being replaced.” [New York Times, [12/22/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/22/climate/epa-buyouts-pruitt.html)]

# Top Hit: Pruitt EPA Suppressed Science

Scott Pruitt has spent the past year trying to eliminate science entirely from the EPA–an agency whose work is BASED on science. Pruitt has had references to scientific data removed from the EPA’s website. He has removed dozens of scientists from boards that advise the EPA. And when one agency staff member wanted to meet with him to discuss the science behind limiting the use of a pesticide that causes brain damage in children and Parkinson’s disease, Pruitt’s chief of staff said that he was successful in “scaring” the staff member.

## Pruitt Staff Bullied Scientists And Staff At EPA

**EPA Chief Of Staff Pressured Scientist To Alter Congressional Testimony**. According to the New York Times, “The Environmental Protection Agency’s chief of staff pressured the top scientist on the agency’s scientific review board to alter her congressional testimony and play down the dismissal of expert advisers, his emails show. Deborah Swackhamer, an environmental chemist who leads the E.P.A.’s Board of Scientific Counselors, was to testify on May 23 before the House Science Committee on the role of states in environmental policy when Ryan Jackson, the E.P.A.’s chief of staff, asked her to stick to the agency’s ‘talking points’ on the dismissals of several members of the scientific board.” [New York Times, [6/26/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/26/us/politics/epa-official-pressured-scientist-on-congressional-testimony-emails-show.html?mcubz=0)]

* **“I Was Factual, And He Was Not. I Felt Bullied.”** According to the New York Times, “‘I was stunned that he was pushing me to ‘correct’ something in my testimony,’ said Dr. Swackhamer, a retired University of Minnesota professor. ‘I was factual, and he was not. I felt bullied.’ Dr. Swackhamer’s testimony came two weeks after the dismissals, which were met with fierce pushback from a scientific community that saw it as evidence that the Trump administration is seeking to weaken the role of academic science in environmental policy.” [New York Times, [6/26/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/26/us/politics/epa-official-pressured-scientist-on-congressional-testimony-emails-show.html?mcubz=0)]

**Pruitt Chief Of Staff Wrote That He ‘Sacred’ EPA Employee Who Disagreed With His Orders**. According to the New York Times, “But the reaction from her superiors was not about the science or the law, she said. Instead, they queried her about Dow Chemical, the pesticide’s largest manufacturer, which had been lobbying against a ban. The clash is recorded in [Wendy Cleland-Hamnett]’s notebook as well as in emails among Mr. Pruitt’s top political aides, which were obtained by The Times. ‘They are trying to strong arm us,’ Mr. Jackson wrote after meeting with Ms. Hamnett, who presented him with a draft petition to ban the pesticide. Mr. [Ryan] Jackson, Ms. Hamnett’s notebook shows, then asked her to come up with alternatives to a ban. He asserted, her notes show, that he did not want to be ‘forced into a box’ by the petition. ‘I scared them,’ Mr. Jackson wrote in an email to a colleague about his demands on Ms. Hamnett and her team.” [New York Times, [10/21/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/21/us/trump-epa-chemicals-regulations.html)]

## EPA Scientists Quit Agency Because Of Pruitt

**Scientist That Worked At EPA For Three Decades Quit Because Of Scott Pruitt**. According to the Washington Post, “Elizabeth ‘Betsy’ Southerland loved her work at the Environmental Protection Agency. Then Donald Trump and Scott Pruitt came along. Now Southerland, who was director of science and technology in the agency’s Office of Water, said she is ‘heartbroken about the impact of the new administration on environmental protection in this country.’ After 30 years at EPA, her last day was Monday. Southerland becomes the latest in a series of protesting federal scientists. She denounced the destructive environmental policies of President Trump and EPA Administrator Pruitt. Family concerns played an important role in her decision to leave, but she also can’t stomach the current direction of an agency that answers to a White House wallowing in disarray and disgrace.” [Washington Post, [8/1/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2017/08/01/epa-doing-the-right-thing-is-not-possible-under-trump-says-resigning-official/?utm_term=.a9bfdeca73ab)]

**38 Science Advisers Received Pink Slips — Internal Email.**According to E&E News, “U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt continues to clear out a key advisory committee, signaling plans to drop several dozen current members of the Board of Scientific Counselors (BOSC), according to an email yesterday from a senior agency official. All board members whose three-year appointments expire in August will not get renewals, Robert Kavlock, acting head of EPA’s Office of Research and Development, said in the email, which was obtained by E&E News. Because of the need to reconstitute the board, EPA is also canceling all subcommittee meetings planned for late summer and fall, Kavlock said. ‘We are hopeful that an updated BOSC Executive Committee and the five subcommittees can resume their work in 2018 and continue providing ORD with thoughtful recommendations and comments,’ he wrote in urging departing members to reapply.” [E&E News, [6/20/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/06/20/stories/1060056308)]

## Pruitt Dismissed Members Of Science Boards

**May: EPA Dismissed Members Of Major Scientific Review Board**. According to the New York Times, “The Environmental Protection Agency has dismissed at least five members of a major scientific review board, the latest signal of what critics call a campaign by the Trump administration to shrink the agency’s regulatory reach by reducing the role of academic research. A spokesman for the E.P.A. administrator, Scott Pruitt, said he would consider replacing the academic scientists with representatives from industries whose pollution the agency is supposed to regulate, as part of the wide net it plans to cast. ‘The administrator believes we should have people on this board who understand the impact of regulations on the regulated community,’ said the spokesman, J. P. Freire.” [New York Times, [5/7/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/07/us/politics/epa-dismisses-members-of-major-scientific-review-board.html?_r=0)]

**EPA Suspended Science Committee's Work, Mulled Replacing Most Members.** According to Politico, “EPA is suspending meetings of a key scientific advisory committee for the rest of this year while the agency considers whether to replace most of its members. The agency told members of the Board of Scientific Counselors that they would have to reapply for their seat if their first term expires this August or next March, rather than being automatically reappointed for a second three-year term as has traditionally been the case. Acting Administrator for the Office of Research and Development Robert Kavlock’s email to BOSC members on Monday announcing the change follows a previous decision not to automatically re-up members whose term ended in April of this year.” [Politico, [6/20/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/story/2017/06/epa-almost-completely-wipes-out-research-advice-committee-158543)]

## Pruitt Suppressed Science At EPA

**Pruitt: EPA Will Review 'Politicized' Climate Science Report**. According to Politico, “Environmental Protection Agency chief Scott Pruitt said his staff will gauge the ‘accuracy’ of a major federal science report that blames human activity for climate change — just days after researchers voiced their fears to The New York Times that the Trump administration would alter or suppress its findings. ‘Frankly this report ought to be subjected to peer-reviewed, objective-reviewed methodology and evaluation,’ Pruitt told a Texas radio show Thursday. ‘Science should not be politicized. Science is not something that should be just thrown about to try to dictate policy in Washington, D.C.’” [Politico, [8/11/17](http://www.politico.com/story/2017/08/11/pruitt-climate-report-epa-241546)]

**Workers Said Climate Work Quashed Under Pruitt And Trump.**According to E&E News, “Climate change work has been largely halted at U.S. EPA under Administrator Scott Pruitt, according to current and former agency employees. Climate work has been systematically eliminated and the relevant staff either fired or relocated, according to Alyssa Hall, the agency’s New England climate change adaption coordinator until a month ago. ‘I felt like we were being attacked on a daily basis from headquarters. A lot of my projects were being canceled or postponed indefinitely, so I was left with nothing to do,’ Hall said. Many scientists worry the agency will no longer fulfill its mission under the Trump administration. ‘All action at the agency on climate has effectively stopped; the only thing that hasn’t is the collection of emissions data,’ said a scientist who wanted to remain anonymous. ‘Climate work has been de-emphasized and halted.’” [E&E News, [6/6/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/06/06/stories/1060055596)]

**Pruitt Feared “Questionable” Climate Models.**According to Politico, “Speaking Tuesday on Fox Business, Pruitt acknowledged human activity contributed to climate change but questioned the validity of modeling on the impacts of the problem. ‘The modeling that has been used over the last several years has absolutely been questionable,’ he alleged. ‘What we do know is human activity contributes to warming, what we do know is it’s very difficult to measure with precision the amount of human activity contributing to the warming.’” [Politico, 6/7/17]

**Pruitt Withdrew Decision-Making Powers From Senior Officials, Email Shows.**According to Inside EPA, “EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt has since March 2 rescinded delegated authority for acting assistant administrators and regional administrators to take ‘significant’ actions on his behalf, according to an internal email obtained by Inside EPA, centralizing decision-making for many high-profile issues despite Pruitt’s lack of agency experience and minimal staff. The instruction is already raising concerns from industry officials, who fear it could delay decisions they are seeking. ‘Ironically I can imagine a lot of industry people getting stressed about this if they need certain permits/approvals etc. to move forward with projects, financing, etc. . . . There could be a lot of screaming,’ says one industry attorney. ‘Because the Presidentially-appointed Assistant Administrators and Regional Administrators have yet to assume their duties, for the next 30 days, the Administrator wishes to retain approval authority for Agency actions having significant regulatory and enforcement effect,’ says the March 2 email from David Schnare, a former EPA attorney whom the Trump administration added as a senior adviser at the agency soon after inauguration.” [Inside EPA, [3/15/17](https://insideepa.com/daily-news/pruitt-withdraws-decision-making-powers-senior-officials-email-shows)]

**EPA Website Removed Climate Science Site From Public View After Two Decades.**According to Washington Post, “The Environmental Protection Agency announced Friday evening that its website would be ‘undergoing changes’ to better represent the new direction the agency is taking, triggering the removal of several agency websites containing detailed climate data and scientific information. One of the websites that appeared to be gone had been cited to challenge statements made by the EPA’s new administrator, Scott Pruitt. Another provided detailed information on the previous administration’s Clean Power Plan, including fact sheets about greenhouse gas emissions on the state and local levels and how different demographic groups were affected by such emissions. … ‘As EPA renews its commitment to human health and clean air, land, and water, our website needs to reflect the views of the leadership of the agency,’ J.P. Freire, the agency’s associate administrator for public affairs, said in a statement. ‘We want to eliminate confusion by removing outdated language first and making room to discuss how we’re protecting the environment and human health by partnering with states and working within the law.’ The agency also said it would carefully archive pages from the past administration.” [Washington Post, [4/29/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/04/28/epa-website-removes-climate-science-site-from-public-view-after-two-decades/?utm_term=.2466659798a5)]

* **EPA Said Website Underwent Makeover To Match Views Of Trump And Pruitt.**According to Reuters, “The website of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA.gov, is getting a makeover to reflect the views of President Donald Trump and EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, the agency said on Friday. ‘As EPA renews its commitment to human health and clean air, land and water, our website needs to reflect the views of the leadership of the agency,’ it said in a statement. … ‘Language associated with the Clean Power Plan, written by the last administration, is out of date,’ it said. ‘Similarly, content related to climate and regulation is also being reviewed.’ … ‘We want to eliminate confusion by removing outdated language first and making room to discuss how we’re protecting the environment and human health by partnering with states and working within the law,’ J.P. Freire, associate administrator for public affairs at the agency, said in the statement.” [Reuters, [5/1/17](http://www.reuters.com/article/usa-trump-epa-idUSL1N1I319U)]

**EPA Canceled Talk On Climate Change By Agency Scientists**. According to the New York Times, “The Environmental Protection Agency has canceled the speaking appearance of three agency scientists who were scheduled to discuss climate change at a conference on Monday in Rhode Island, according to the agency and several people involved. John Konkus, an E.P.A. spokesman and a former Trump campaign operative in Florida, confirmed that agency scientists would not speak at the State of the Narragansett Bay and Watershed program in Providence. He provided no further explanation.” [New York Times, [10/22/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/22/climate/epa-scientists.html)]

**Draft Of EPA Strategic Plan Dropped All Reference To Climate Change**. According to Politico, “The Trump administration has dropped all mention of climate change or rules to reduce carbon emissions from a strategic plan outlining EPA’s priorities for the next four years, according to a draft obtained by POLITICO. The draft was circulated around EPA for comment earlier today along with an accompanying one-page graphic. The document creates a new framework for EPA’s mission that reflects the management style of Administrator Scott Pruitt. It defines EPA’s ‘core mission’ as ensuring clean air, water and land. It calls for more ‘cooperative federalism’ to empower state governments. And it touts the ‘rule of law and process,’ which is meant to ‘refocus the Agency on its statutory obligations under the law.’” {Politico Prom, [10/4/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/10/draft-epa-strategic-plan-drops-all-reference-to-climate-change-093937)]

# Top Hit: Pruitt Runs EPA Like He Is Paranoid

Pruitt does not act like someone in charge of a major government agency–instead, he acts like a paranoid conspiracy theorist. He is the first EPA administrator in history to have a 24-hour personal security detail, one that consists of 30 people and costs the American people $2 million per year. He spent $25,000 of taxpayers’ money to build a soundproof phone booth in his office, and has his office regularly swept for listening devices. And he wanted to spend $120,000 to hire a Republican political consulting firm to identify, monitor, and dig up dirt on EPA employees who are critical of Pruitt or Donald Trump. These are the kinds of actions you would expect from a paranoid foreign dictator, not from the head of the EPA.

## Pruitt Pulled Enforcement Officers To Join 24/7 Security Detail

**The Hill: EPA Pulls Officers From Other Duties To Protect Pruitt: Report**. According to The Hill, “The Environmental Protection Agency is pulling EPA law enforcement officers away from other duties to protect Administrator Scott Pruitt, according to a new report. Officers from outside Washington have had to serve two-week stints on Pruitt’s security detail since he started at the EPA in February, taking them away from environmental crime responsibilities, The Washington Post reported Wednesday, citing current and former employees. Unlike his predecessors, Pruitt has around-the-clock security that requires of team of up to 18 officers, the Post reported.” [The Hill, [9/20/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/351526-epa-pulls-officers-from-other-duties-to-protect-pruitt)]

**CNN: “Security Costs Skyrocket At ‘Lightning Rod’ EPA.”** According to CNN, “Pruitt’s security detail is in the process of expanding by hiring a dozen more agents, according to a source with knowledge of the situation, as the number of threats against the agency leader increase. The incoming agents will grow the team that works in shifts to provide him around-the-clock protection, something unheard of for Pruitt’s predecessors. Salaries alone for the full team will cost at least $2 million per year, according to figures compiled by CNN from public documents. The numbers do not include costs such as training, equipment, and travel.” [CNN, [10/23/17](http://www.cnn.com/2017/10/23/politics/epa-pruitt-security-costs/index.html)]

**CNN: EPA Administrators “Haven't Had Anywhere Close To The Level Of Security Being Assembled For Pruitt.”** According to CNN, “EPA administrators, whose public profiles and security arrangements are typically smaller than other members of the Cabinet, haven't had anywhere close to the level of security being assembled for Pruitt.” [CNN, [10/23/17](http://www.cnn.com/2017/10/23/politics/epa-pruitt-security-costs/index.html)]

**Agency Had Special Security Installed At Administrator Pruitt’s Office For More Than $15,000**. According to CNN, “Security enhancements are also being added to Pruitt’s third-floor office inside the EPA’s Washington headquarters, where sources have previously described restricted access to even the hallway near his office. The agency recently made arrangements with a security vendor to have ‘two access control card readers’ installed for his office, according to federal contracting documents reviewed by CNN. That security system, including an additional access card reader for the security office and an alarm in the office to alert agents, costs $15,780, the documents showed.” [CNN, [10/23/17](http://www.cnn.com/2017/10/23/politics/epa-pruitt-security-costs/index.html)]

**Pruitt Limited Access To Entire Hallway Near Office**. According to CNN, “Access to Pruitt’s office appears to be a longstanding concern. Publicly released schedules show that, starting in early April, an aide to Pruitt was responsible for opening his office at 7 a.m. on weekdays for cleaning staff, rather than allowing them to enter on their own. In the hallway around Pruitt’s office, security employees check government IDs against a list of employees who are approved for access, according to individuals who work at and have visited the building.” [CNN, [10/23/17](http://www.cnn.com/2017/10/23/politics/epa-pruitt-security-costs/index.html)]

**Security Detail Normally Tasked With Investigating Environmental Crimes.** According to CNN, “The positions on Pruitt’s detail pay between $103,000 and nearly $162,000, according to the job posting and a source familiar with the positions, who described how the role is called criminal investigator or agent, and said it qualifies for a 25% bonus paid to federal law enforcement officers, who work unusual hours. The position of criminal investigator at the EPA that usually involves investigating environmental crimes involving pollution or waste dumping.” [CNN, [10/23/17](http://www.cnn.com/2017/10/23/politics/epa-pruitt-security-costs/index.html)]

## EPA Spent $25,000 on Secure Phone Booth

**Washington Post: EPA spending almost $25,000 to install a secure phone booth for Scott Pruitt**. According to the Washington Post, “The Environmental Protection Agency is spending nearly $25,000 to construct a secure, soundproof communications booth in the office of Administrator Scott Pruitt, according to government contracting records. The agency signed a $24,570 contract earlier this summer with Acoustical Solutions, a Richmond-based company, for a ‘privacy booth for the administrator.’ The company sells and installs an array of sound-dampening and privacy products, from ceiling baffles to full-scale enclosures like the one purchased by the EPA. The project’s scheduled completion date is Oct. 9, according to the contract.” [Washington Post, [9/26/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/09/26/epa-spending-almost-25000-to-install-a-secure-phone-booth-for-scott-pruitt/?utm_term=.1c38af9aa0c7)]

## EPA Spent $120,000 On Media Monitoring Firm

**Washington Post: EPA To End Controversial Contract With Conservative ‘Media Monitoring’ Firm.** According to the Washington Post, “The Environmental Protection Agency is canceling a $120,000 ‘media tracking’ contract it recently signed with a Republican public affairs and opposition-research firm amid questions about the firm’s political work and outrage from lawmakers on Capitol Hill. The EPA had defended the contract with Definers Public Affairs, saying it hired the firm merely to act as a sophisticated news clipping service. An agency spokesman confirmed Tuesday that the EPA and the company had agreed to terminate the contract. In a separate conversation, the company’s president, Joe Pounder, said the decision was a mutual one.” [Washington Post, [12/19/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/12/19/epa-to-end-controversial-contract-with-conservative-media-monitoring-firm/?utm_term=.a4a75ebf5473)]

**New York Times: E.P.A. Contractor Has Spent Past Year Scouring The Agency For Anti-Trump Officials**. According to the New York Times, “A vice president for the firm, Allan Blutstein, federal records show, has submitted at least 40 Freedom of Information Act requests to the E.P.A. since President Trump was sworn in. Many of those requests target employees known to be questioning management at the E.P.A. since Scott Pruitt, the agency’s administrator, was confirmed.” [New York Times, [12/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/15/us/politics/epa-scott-pruitt-foia.html)]

**NYT: Employees At EPA Targeted By Records Requests After Making Critical Statements**. According to the New York Times, “Three different agency employees, in different jobs, from three different cities, but each encountered a similar outcome: Federal records show that within a matter of days, requests were submitted for copies of emails written by them that mentioned either Mr. Pruitt or President Trump, or any communication with Democrats in Congress that might have been critical of the agency.” [New York Times, [12/17/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/17/us/politics/epa-pruitt-media-monitoring.html)]

* **“Requests Came From A Virginia-Based Lawyer Working With America Rising, A Republican Campaign Research Group.”** According to the New York Times, “The requests came from a Virginia-based lawyer working with America Rising, a Republican campaign research group that specializes in helping party candidates and conservative groups find damaging information on political rivals, and which, in this case, was looking for information that could undermine employees who had criticized the E.P.A.” [New York Times, [12/17/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/17/us/politics/epa-pruitt-media-monitoring.html)]
* **“Company Affiliated With America Rising, Named Definers Public Affairs, Has Been Hired By The E.P.A. To Provide ‘Media Monitoring.’”** According to the New York Times, “Now a company affiliated with America Rising, named Definers Public Affairs, has been hired by the E.P.A. to provide “media monitoring,” in a move the agency said was intended to keep better track of newspaper and video stories about E.P.A. operations nationwide.” [New York Times, [12/17/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/17/us/politics/epa-pruitt-media-monitoring.html)]

**Definers VP Submitted 40 FOIAs Targeting Employees Critical Of Pruitt**. According to the New York Times, “A vice president for the firm, Allan Blutstein, federal records show, has submitted at least 40 Freedom of Information Act requests to the E.P.A. since President Trump was sworn in. Many of those requests target employees known to be questioning management at the E.P.A. since Scott Pruitt, the agency’s administrator, was confirmed.” [New York Times, [12/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/15/us/politics/epa-scott-pruitt-foia.html)]

**Definers VP “Was Taking Aim At ‘Resistance’ Figures In The Federal Government.”** According to the New York Times, “Mr. Blutstein, in an interview, said he was taking aim at ‘resistance’ figures in the federal government, adding that he hoped to discover whether they had done anything that might embarrass them or hurt their cause. ‘I wondered if they were emailing critical things about the agency on government time and how frequently they were corresponding about this,’ he said. ‘And did they do anything that would be useful for Republicans.’” [New York Times, [12/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/15/us/politics/epa-scott-pruitt-foia.html)]

**Definers Signed $120,000 No Bid Contract**. According to the New York Times, “Jahan Wilcox, a spokesman at the E.P.A., said the decision to hire Definers, which signed a $120,000 no-bid contract to monitor and collect news coverage about the agency, was solely financial. The E.P.A. previously contracted with Bulletin Intelligence L.L.C. for media services at a rate of $207,000 a year. That contract was open to other bids.” [New York Times, [12/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/15/us/politics/epa-scott-pruitt-foia.html)]

## Superfund Taskforce Took No Meeting Minutes

**Pruitt Superfund Taskforce Claimed To Take No Minutes In Meeting**. According to the Washington Post, “Other organizations have come up against similar walls. In response to a Freedom of Information Act request from a public watchdog group, government lawyers said Pruitt’s Superfund Task Force took no minutes of its meetings. On one of the administrator’s top priorities, the task force apparently produced just one document — a list of final recommendations.” [Washington Post, [12/31/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/under-scott-pruitt-a-year-of-tumult-and-transformation-at-epa/2017/12/26/f93d1262-e017-11e7-8679-a9728984779c_story.html?utm_term=.3d4c458369e3)]

**Top Hit: Pruitt Is Bad For Public Health**

As EPA administrator, one of Pruitt’s first actions was to allow continued use of chlorpyrifos, a pesticide that has long-term harmful effects on children. When he was attorney general of Oklahoma, Scott Pruitt used his position of power to attack lifesaving measures established by the EPA, including restrictions on dangerous mercury pollution, industrial methane pollution from the oil and gas companies, carbon pollution and other toxic substances. Pruitt even disputes the Clean Air Act, which has provided the bipartisan bedrock of our public health and environmental protections for decades.

Pruitt Would Not Commit To Protecting Public Health At EPA

**Pruitt Would Not Say If He Would Consider Economic And Job Benefits Of Clean Air Protections**. When asked, “As Administrator, will you take into account the full economic and job benefits that result from clean air protections such as the economic benefits to communities from clean air and American leading businesses that manufacture advanced technologies?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I stated at the hearing, the EPA should consider the benefits of cleaner air for the public. The Clean Air Act prescribes certain instances where the EPA is obligated to conduct a cost-benefit analysis as part of the rulemaking process. If confirmed, I commit to faithfully execute the law as enacted by Congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Did Not Say If He Believed EPA Should Set National Minimum Standards To Protect Health Of Nation**. When asked, “Mr. Pruitt, the Clean Air Act recognizes that air pollution does not respect state boundaries and directs EPA to set minimum national standards to protect the health of the nation, including protecting downwind states. •Do you agree that EPA should set minimum national standards? •Do you agree that EPA must protect downwind states?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I indicated during my nomination hearing, I believe the Cross State Air Pollution Rule is important and should be enforced by the EPA. An upwind state that contributes to a downwind state's nonattainment should take responsibility for that contribution.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said AG Office Had No Role In Protecting Children From Soot And Smog Pollution**. When asked, “Are you concerned about the impacts of soot and smog pollution on Oklahoma citizens? What efforts have you undertaken as Oklahoma Attorney General to protect Oklahomans from soot and smog pollution?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “While I am concerned about children’s health, matters of the sort you reference would be handled by Oklahoma's environmental regulators at the Department of Environmental Quality and the Oklahoma Water Resources Board.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Could Not Say How He Has Protected Children From Air Pollution**. When asked, “What specific actions have you taken as Oklahoma Attorney General to protect Oklahoma’s children from exposure to air pollution?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “While I am also concerned about children’s health, environmental regulation in Oklahoma is the responsibility of Oklahoma's environmental regulators at agencies like the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality. That agency would likely be better situated to answer your question by actions taken by the State with regard to air pollution.”[Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said Costs, Not Human Health, Would Be His Primary Goal When Crafting Regulations At EPA**. When asked, “How will you take into consideration the cost of pollution on human health when taking regulatory action?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I stated in my testimony, if confirmed, my primary goal would be to protect the American people through lawful regulations. I also indicated at the hearing that costs are very important in the rulemaking process and the Courts have recognized that important factor. I understand environmental statutes, such as the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act, prescribe when costs should be considered in the rulemaking process. If confirmed, I commit to fully follow the law as provided by Congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

Pruitt Dodged Answers on Public Health at EPA

**Wallace Asked Pruitt How He Would Deal With Carbon Pollution Related Health Risks Without Clean Power Plan.** According to Fox News Sunday, “Wallace: When the Obama EPA announced its Clean Power Plan, it said that the reduction in carbon pollution would have the following health benefits. I want to put them up on the screen. By 2030, it said there would be 90,000 fewer asthma attacks a year, 300,000 fewer missed work and school days, and 3,600 fewer premature deaths a year. Without the Clean Power Plan, how are you going to prevent those terrible things?” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

**Wallace Drilled Pruitt With Facts From American Lung Association’s State Of The Air Report And Pushed Him To Discuss How To Protect Citizens.** According to Fox News Sunday, “Wallace: But, sir, you’re giving me a regulatory answer, a political answer. You’re not giving me a health answer. I talked about 90,000 fewer asthma attacks, 300,000 fewer missed days in school and work. The Obama Clean Power Plan called -- said that carbon pollution from the power sector would be reduced by 30 percent. It would be one-third lower than it was in 2005. Here’s what the American Lung Association says, ‘Half of all Americans now live in counties with unhealthy air.’ You talk about all the regulatory overreach, but the question is, there are 166 million people living in unclean air and you are going to remove some of the pollution restrictions, which will make the air even worse.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

**Pruitt Dodged Question A Second Time And Discussed America’s Reduction In CO2 Footprint.** According to Fox News Sunday, “Pruitt: Well, Chris, a couple things, we are actually pre-1994 levels with respect to our CO2 footprint. So, this country is doing far better than most across the globe. As you know, also since 1980, we’ve got a 65 percent reduction in those key air pollutants, SOx and NOx and particulate matter and ozone, while at the same time growing our economy. I think what’s happened the last several years is that we’ve adapted to and adopted this previous administration’s views that if your pro-jobs and pro-growth, you can’t be pro-environment. If you’re pro-environment, you can’t be pro-growth and pro-jobs. And that simply is not the way we’ve done business as a country.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

Would Not Commit to Addressing Public Health at EPA

**Pruitt Would Not Say Congress Had Constitutional Authority To Direct EPA To Protect Public Health.** Senator Carper asked, “Do you think it is constitutional for Congress to direct EPA to set national standards that protect public health?” According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “The constitutionality of laws enacted by Congress depends on the particulars of the particular law, and will typically be decided by a court. Courts have generally recognized that Congress has the authority to create the EPA and vest certain powers in it.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would Not Say That He Would Take Into Account Health And Environmental Impacts On States Affected By Upwind Pollution**. When asked, “will you take into account the true costs of air pollution including the adverse health and environmental impacts on states that are adversely affected by upwind pollution sources?” According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I stated at the hearing, costs are important in the rulemaking process and the Courts have recognized that important factor. The Clean Air Act prescribes when costs should be considered and to what extent in a rulemaking. If confirmed, I commit to faithfully executing the law as enacted by Congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would Not Say If He Would Consider Economic And Job Benefits Of Clean Air Protections**. When asked, “As Administrator, will you take into account the full economic and job benefits that result from clean air protections such as the economic benefits to communities from clean air and American leading businesses that manufacture advanced technologies?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I stated at the hearing, the EPA should consider the benefits of cleaner air for the public. The Clean Air Act prescribes certain instances where the EPA is obligated to conduct a cost-benefit analysis as part of the rulemaking process. If confirmed, I commit to faithfully execute the law as enacted by Congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: Science Linking Adverse Health Impacts And Fine Particulate Matter Pollution Is Well Established.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “The science linking adverse health impacts and fine particulate matter pollution is well established. Accordingly, EPA has promulgated a National Ambient Air Quality Standard for particulate matter pollution that limits the concentration of small particulates, including those smaller than 2.5 microns, in the ambient air that at the level that the agency has determined is requisite to protect public health and welfare from adverse effects, while allowing an adequate margin of safety.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Did Not Say If He Believed EPA Should Set National Minimum Standards To Protect Health Of Nation**. When asked, “Mr. Pruitt, the Clean Air Act recognizes that air pollution does not respect state boundaries and directs EPA to set minimum national standards to protect the health of the nation, including protecting downwind states. •Do you agree that EPA should set minimum national standards? •Do you agree that EPA must protect downwind states?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I indicated during my nomination hearing, I believe the Cross State Air Pollution Rule is important and should be enforced by the EPA. An upwind state that contributes to a downwind state's nonattainment should take responsibility for that contribution.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said AG Office Had No Role In Protecting Children From Soot And Smog Pollution**. When asked, “Are you concerned about the impacts of soot and smog pollution on Oklahoma citizens? What efforts have you undertaken as Oklahoma Attorney General to protect Oklahomans from soot and smog pollution?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “While I am concerned about children’s health, matters of the sort you reference would be handled by Oklahoma's environmental regulators at the Department of Environmental Quality and the Oklahoma Water Resources Board.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Could Not Say How He Has Protected Children From Air Pollution**. When asked, “What specific actions have you taken as Oklahoma Attorney General to protect Oklahoma’s children from exposure to air pollution?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “While I am also concerned about children’s health, environmental regulation in Oklahoma is the responsibility of Oklahoma's environmental regulators at agencies like the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality. That agency would likely be better situated to answer your question by actions taken by the State with regard to air pollution.”[Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said Costs, Not Human Health, Would Be His Primary Goal When Crafting Regulations At EPA**. When asked, “How will you take into consideration the cost of pollution on human health when taking regulatory action?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I stated in my testimony, if confirmed, my primary goal would be to protect the American people through lawful regulations. I also indicated at the hearing that costs are very important in the rulemaking process and the Courts have recognized that important factor. I understand environmental statutes, such as the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act, prescribe when costs should be considered in the rulemaking process. If confirmed, I commit to fully follow the law as provided by Congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Unfamiliar With Study Outlining Public Health Impacts Of Clean Air Act.** When asked, “Do you agree the Clean Air Act health benefits significantly outweigh costs? For example, a peer-reviewed study found that in 2010 alone the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, which reduced fine particulate pollution and ozone, avoided more than 160,000 premature deaths, 130,000 heart attacks, prevented 13 million missed workdays, and avoided 3.2 million missed school days by children.” Scott Pruitt wrote, “Based on the limited information provided, it is unclear as to the specific study referenced. However, as I indicated in my testimony, I am incredibly proud of the progress the U.S. has made to provide public health protections and improve our environmental stewardship while also growing our economy. If confirmed, I commit to continue this progress and protect the American people through commonsense and lawful regulations. [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

### Cancelled Methane Emissions Reporting Requirement

**Cancelled Methane Emission Reporting Requirement**. According to the New York Times, “Canceled a requirement for reporting methane emissions. March 2 Who wanted it changed? Republican officials from 11 states wrote a letter to Scott Pruitt, the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, saying the rule added costs and paperwork for oil and gas companies. The next day, Mr. Pruitt revoked the rule.” [New York Times, [5/2/17](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/05/02/climate/environmental-rules-reversed-trump-100-days.html?_r=0)]

**Ordered Review Of Rule Limiting Methane Emissions At New Oil And Gas Drilling Sites**. According to the New York Times, “Ordered review of rule limiting methane emissions at new oil and gas drilling sites. April 18 Who wanted it changed? Lobbyists for the oil and gas industries petitioned Mr. Pruitt to reconsider the rule, which went into effect last August, limiting emissions of methane, smog-forming compounds and other toxic pollutants from new and modified oil and gas wells. They argued the rule was technologically infeasible.” [New York Times, [5/2/17](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/05/02/climate/environmental-rules-reversed-trump-100-days.html?_r=0)]

Pruitt Sued Over EPA Rules that protected Public Health

**Pruitt Opposed Clean Power Plan; Sued To Prevent Implementation.** According to an article in the Oklahoman, “Oklahoma's attorney general filed another legal challenge Friday to the Obama administration's Clean Power Plan to reduce greenhouse gases from power plants. The Environmental Protection Agency published the final rule in the Federal Register on Friday, and Attorney General Scott Pruitt said his office immediately filed a lawsuit in the federal appeals court for the District of Columbia. Pruitt called the plan unlawful and said it threatens the reliability and affordability of power generation across the nation.” [Oklahoman, [10/24/15](http://www.oklahoman.com/article/5455659?access=1827ceda39b2b458772560722b29995f)]

* **Clean Power Plan Would Prevent 3,600 Premature Deaths; 1,700 Heart Attacks.** According to the EPA, “Because carbon pollution comes packaged with other dangerous air pollutants, the Clean Power Plan will also protect public health, avoiding each year: 3,600 premature deaths 1,700 heart attacks 90,000 asthma attacks 300,000 missed work days and school days.” [EPA, Clean Power Plan Fact Sheet, [8/3/15](https://www.epa.gov/cleanpowerplan/fact-sheet-overview-clean-power-plan)]

**Pruitt Sued The EPA Over The Mercury And Air Toxics Standards Rule.** According to Utility Dive, “The D.C. Circuit Court is currently reviewing the rules, which Trump has promised to scrap during his first 100 days in office. During his tenure, Pruitt also sued the EPA over its Cross-State Air Pollution Rules and the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards.” [Utility Dive, [12/7/16](http://www.utilitydive.com/news/updated-trump-taps-fossil-fuel-ally-scott-pruitt-to-head-epa/431892/)]

* **EPA: Mercury And Air Toxics Standards Will “Avert Up To 11,000 Premature Deaths, 4,700 Heart Attacks And 130,000 Asthma Attacks Every Year.”** According to the EPA, “Continuing to improve our air quality with the new Mercury and Air Toxics Standards means the difference between being sick and being healthy - in some cases, life and death - for hundreds of thousands of people. These new standards will avert up to 11,000 premature deaths, 4,700 heart attacks and 130,000 asthma attacks every year.” [EPA, accessed [1/4/17](https://www.epa.gov/mats/healthier-americans)]

|  |
| --- |
| **Public Health Benefits of Rules Pruitt Opposed** |
| **Rule** | **Public Health Benefit** | **Citation** |
| Cross-State Air Pollution | Up to 34,000 lives saved annually starting in 2014 | Environmental Defense Fund, accessed [1/4/17](https://www.edf.org/climate/fact-sheets/epa-cross-state-air-pollution-rule) |
| Regional Haze | 1,600 fewer premature fatalities annually starting in 2015 | EPA Regional Haze Regulations and Guidelines, [7/6/05](https://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2005-07-06/pdf/05-12526.pdf) |
| Clean Power Plan | 1,500 to 3,600 premature deaths annually starting in 2030 | EPA, [7/14/16](https://www.epa.gov/cleanpowerplan/fact-sheet-clean-power-plan-numbers) |
| Ozone | 320 to 660 premature deaths annually starting in 2025 | EPA National Ambient Air Quality Standards, [10/1/15](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-10/documents/overview_of_2015_rule.pdf) |
| Mercury and Air Toxics Standards | Up to 11,000 premature deaths annually starting in 2017 | EPA, accessed [1/4/17](https://www.epa.gov/mats/healthier-americans) |

Pruitt Opposed Clean Power Plan

**October 2017: EPA Announced Repeal Of Clean Power Plan.** According to the New York Times, “The Environmental Protection Agency announced on Tuesday that Scott Pruitt, the chief of the agency, had signed a measure to repeal President Barack Obama’s signature policy to curb greenhouse gas emissions from power plants, setting up a bitter fight over the future of America’s efforts to tackle global warming. Mr. Pruitt, who had signaled the move at an event with coal miners in eastern Kentucky on Monday, said in a news release that his predecessors had departed from regulatory norms in writing the Clean Power Plan, which was finalized in 2015 and would have pushed states to move away from coal in favor of sources of electricity that produce fewer carbon emissions.” [New York Times, [10/9/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/09/climate/clean-power-plan.html?_r=0)]

**Pruitt: Clean Power Plan Is “One Of The Most Ambitious Ever Proposed, Will Shutter Coal-Fired Power Plants, Significantly Increase The Price Of Electricity For American Consumers, And Enact By Executive Fiat The Very Same Cap-And-Trade System Congress Has Rejected.”** According to an op-ed written by Scott Pruitt in Tulsa World, “Sadly, this isn’t the first time we’ve seen this tactic of advancing the climate change agenda by any means necessary. President Obama’s Clean Power Plan is a particularly noteworthy example. This EPA regulation, one of the most ambitious ever proposed, will shutter coal-fired power plants, significantly increase the price of electricity for American consumers, and enact by executive fiat the very same Cap-and-Trade system Congress has rejected.” [Tulsa World, [5/21/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/opinion/othervoices/scott-pruitt-and-luther-strange-an-un-american-prosecution-of/article_eff77ff4-8f6c-5646-84da-1f3204b89f54.html)]

**Pruitt: “I Think At The End Of The Day, The Supreme Court Has Indicated That We're Going To Win On The Merits.”** According to a press release by Attorney General Scott Pruitt, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt said granting the stay gives states some clarity. His office joined in the stay appeal on behalf of Oklahoma and the Department of Environmental Quality. ‘They can sit back, take a breath and let the legal process work,’ Pruitt said Tuesday. ‘I think at the end of the day, the Supreme Court has indicated that we're going to win on the merits, as well. It's a huge step, and something that illustrates how seriously the Supreme Court is taking these types of issues.’” [Attorney General Scott Pruitt, [2/10/16](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=18424)]

**As Oklahoma Attorney General, Pruitt Filed Challenge To Clean Power Plan.**According to an article in the Oklahoman, “Oklahoma's attorney general filed another legal challenge Friday to the Obama administration's Clean Power Plan to reduce greenhouse gases from power plants. The Environmental Protection Agency published the final rule in the Federal Register on Friday, and Attorney General Scott Pruitt said his office immediately filed a lawsuit in the federal appeals court for the District of Columbia. Pruitt called the plan unlawful and said it threatens the reliability and affordability of power generation across the nation.” [Oklahoman, [10/24/15](http://www.oklahoman.com/article/5455659?access=1827ceda39b2b458772560722b29995f)]

* **Pruitt, On The Clean Power Plan: “The EPA Does Not Possess The Authority Under The Clean Air Act To Do What It Is Seeking To Accomplish In The So-Called Clean Power Plan.”** According to Testimony Attorney General Scott Pruitt gave to the Environment and Public Works Committee, “This is an issue of major importance to states like Oklahoma. Quite simply, Madam Chairwoman, the EPA does not possess the authority under the Clean Air Act to do what it is seeking to accomplish in the so-called Clean Power Plan. The EPA, under this administration, treats states like a vessel of federal will. The EPA believes the states exist to implement the policies the Administration sees fit, regardless of whether laws like the Clean Air Act permit such action. In their wisdom, Congress gave states a primary role in emissions regulation, noting in the statement of policy of the Clean Air Act that “air pollution control at its source is the primary responsibility of states and local governments.” That statement respects the constitutional limits on federal regulation of air quality, and the reality that states are best suited to develop and implement such policies.” [Testimony to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, [5/5/15]](http://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.View&FileStore_id=60e46f76-2eb8-4761-bd88-b89b31f7d0ad)
* **Pruitt Sued EPA Over Federal Clean Power Plan**. According to a radio segment in NPR, “When StateImpact reported on President Barack Obama’s proposal to cut carbon emissions 30 percent nationally by 2030, mainly through less reliance on coal-fired power plants, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt’s reaction made it clear a lawsuit was coming. On Tuesday, it became official. Oklahoma joined West Virginia — which is leading the case — and 10 other states to sue the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.” [NPR Oklahoma, [8/6/14](http://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2014/08/06/oklahoma-attorney-general-scott-pruitt-sues-epa-over-federal-clean-power-plan/)]
* **Pruitt Submitted A White Paper To The EPA About Problems With Clean Air Act Regulations**. According to a press release by the House Committee of Energy and Commerce, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt discussed states’ concerns over EPA’s expansive regulatory efforts being undertaken under the guise of the Clean Air Act. Pruitt, along with the attorneys general of 16 other states and one senior environmental regulator, recently submitted a white paper to EPA outlining concerns with EPA’s failure to properly defer to state authority under the Clean Air Act, and the implications of the agency’s planned power plant rules. Pruitt reiterated these concerns in his testimony today, stating, ‘The elimination of coal-based electric generation – which according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration is projected to provide 40 percent of U.S. electricity in 2014 – would result in higher electricity prices for ratepayers, and would be detrimental to the national and state economies, as well as job-creation in general. No doubt, increased electricity prices will hurt the competitiveness of American manufacturing.’” [House Committee of Energy and Commerce, [11/14/13](http://energycommerce.house.gov/press-release/subcommittee-reviews-epa%E2%80%99s-unworkable-power-plant-proposal-and-bipartisan-legislative)]

**Pruitt Claimed Clean Power Plan Was Illegal**. According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “So to the members of this committee who strongly support the Clean Power Plan as a matter of policy, I say to you: pass a bill. Let democracy decide whether the Clean Power Plan is right for America. But we didn't get democracy, we got a regulatory cramdown-- a cramdown done over the objection of no less than 29 States who believe the Plan is unlawful. And to those who claim that the Clean Air Act unambiguously authorizes the EPA to enact the Clean Power Plan, I say to you this: if that were so, how do you explain the extraordinary, unprecedented step the United States Supreme Court took to stay the implementation of the plan? That stay was entered because five members of that court thought it likely that the Plan was unlawful.” [Congressional Testimony, Committee on House Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Environment, 5/26/16]

Pruitt’s First Action At EPA was to lift ban on harmful pesticide

**NYT: Dow Chemical Submitted Request To Reject Petition Ban On Chlorpyrifos**. According to the New York Times, “Three days before Donald J. Trump’s inauguration, Dow Chemical had separately submitted a request to the agency to reject the petition to ban chlorpyrifos, calling the scientific link between the childhood health issues and the pesticide unclear, agency records show. Amy Graham, an E.P.A. spokeswoman, said the denial of the petition to ban chlorpyrifos was justified. ‘Taking emails out of context doesn’t change the fact that we continue to examine the science surrounding chlorpyrifos,’ she said in a written statement. She added that the agency was examining ‘scientific concerns with the methodology used by the previous administration.’” [New York Times, [8/18/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/18/us/politics/epa-agriculture-industry.html?mcubz=3)]

**Industry Pressed EPA To Drop Chlorpyrifos Ban In Meeting With EPA And American Farm Bureau Federation**. According to the New York Times, “At a March 1 meeting at E.P.A. headquarters with members of the American Farm Bureau Federation from Washington State, industry representatives pressed the E.P.A. not to reduce the number of pesticides available. They said there were not enough alternative pesticides to chlorpyrifos. They also said there was a need for ‘a reasonable approach to regulate this pesticide,’ which is widely used in Washington State, and that they wanted ‘the farming community to be more involved in the process.’” [New York Times, [8/18/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/18/us/politics/epa-agriculture-industry.html?mcubz=3)]

* **Pruitt Told Industry It Was A “New Day, A New Future, For A Common-Sense Approach To Environmental Protection.”** According to the documents, Mr. Pruitt “stressed that this is a new day, a new future, for a common-sense approach to environmental protection.” He said the new administration “is looking forward to working closely with the agricultural community.” [New York Times, [8/18/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/18/us/politics/epa-agriculture-industry.html?mcubz=3)]

**Pruitt Denied Petition To Ban Widely Used Pesticide**. According to the EPA, “U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Scott Pruitt signed an order denying a petition that sought to ban chlorpyrifos, a pesticide crucial to U.S. agriculture. ‘We need to provide regulatory certainty to the thousands of American farms that rely on chlorpyrifos, while still protecting human health and the environment,’ said EPA Administrator Pruitt. ‘By reversing the previous Administration’s steps to ban one of the most widely used pesticides in the world, we are returning to using sound science in decision-making – rather than predetermined results.’” [EPA, [3/29/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-administrator-pruitt-denies-petition-ban-widely-used-pesticide-0)]

**Pruitt Ignored EPA Scientists To Lift Ban On Pesticide Deemed Harmful To Children**. According to an article in the New York Times, “Scott Pruitt, the head of the Environmental Protection Agency, moved late on Wednesday to reject the scientific conclusion of the agency’s own chemical safety experts who under the Obama administration recommended that one of the nation’s most widely used insecticides be permanently banned at farms nationwide because of the harm it potentially causes children and farm workers.”

[New York Times, [3/29/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/29/us/politics/epa-insecticide-chlorpyrifos.html?_r=0)]

**Move Was One Of Pruitt’s “First Formal Actions As The Nation’s Top Environmental Official.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “The ruling by Mr. Pruitt, in one of his first formal actions as the nation’s top environmental official, rejected a petition filed a decade ago by two environmental groups that had asked that the agency ban all uses of chlorpyrifos. The chemical was banned in 2000 for use in most household settings, but still today is used at about 40,000 farms on about 50 different types of crops, ranging from almonds to apples.” [New York Times, [3/29/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/29/us/politics/epa-insecticide-chlorpyrifos.html?_r=0)]

**NYT: “E.P.A. Scientists Concluded That Exposure To The Chemical That Has Been In Use Since 1965 Was Potentially Causing Significant Health Consequences.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “Late last year, and based in part on research conducted at Columbia University, E.P.A. scientists concluded that exposure to the chemical that has been in use since 1965 was potentially causing significant health consequences. They included learning and memory declines, particularly among farm workers and young children who may be exposed through drinking water and other sources.” [New York Times, [3/29/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/29/us/politics/epa-insecticide-chlorpyrifos.html?_r=0)]

**Pruitt Said Agency Needed To Study Science More**. According to an article in the New York Times, “Mr. Pruitt, in an announcement issued Wednesday night, said the agency needed to study the science more.” [New York Times, [3/29/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/29/us/politics/epa-insecticide-chlorpyrifos.html?_r=0)]

**Pruitt: “We Need To Provide Regulatory Certainty To The Thousands Of American Farms That Rely On Chlorpyrifos.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “‘We need to provide regulatory certainty to the thousands of American farms that rely on chlorpyrifos, while still protecting human health and the environment,’ Mr. Pruitt said in his statement. ‘By reversing the previous administration’s steps to ban one of the most widely used pesticides in the world, we are returning to using sound science in decision-making — rather than predetermined results.’” [New York Times, [3/29/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/29/us/politics/epa-insecticide-chlorpyrifos.html?_r=0)]

**Pruitt: We Are Returning To Using Sound Science In Decision-Making — Rather Than Predetermined Results.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “‘We need to provide regulatory certainty to the thousands of American farms that rely on chlorpyrifos, while still protecting human health and the environment,’ Mr. Pruitt said in his statement. ‘By reversing the previous administration’s steps to ban one of the most widely used pesticides in the world, we are returning to using sound science in decision-making — rather than predetermined results.’” [New York Times, [3/29/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/29/us/politics/epa-insecticide-chlorpyrifos.html?_r=0)]

**EPA Chief Met With Dow CEO Before Deciding On Pesticide Ban.**According to Associated Press, “The Trump administration’s top environmental official met privately with the chief executive of Dow Chemical shortly before reversing his agency’s push to ban a widely used pesticide after health studies showed it can harm children’s brains, according to records obtained by The Associated Press. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt’s schedule shows he met with Dow CEO Andrew Liveris for about a half hour on March 9 during a conference held at a Houston hotel. Twenty days later Pruitt announced his decision to deny a petition to ban Dow’s chlorpyrifos pesticide from being sprayed on food, despite a review by his agency’s scientists that concluded ingesting even minuscule amounts of the chemical can interfere with the brain development of fetuses and infants. EPA released a copy of Pruitt’s March meeting schedule earlier this month following several Freedom of Information Act requests. Asked by the AP in April whether Pruitt had meet with Dow executives or lobbyists before his decision, EPA spokesman J.P. Freire replied: ‘We have had no meetings with Dow on this topic.’ … Liveris has close ties to the Trump administration. He heads a White House manufacturing working group, and Dow wrote a $1 million check to help underwrite the president’s inaugural festivities.” [Associated Press, [6/27/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/epa-chief-met-with-dow-ceo-before-deciding-on-pesticide-ban/2017/06/27/a31a4d18-5b61-11e7-aa69-3964a7d55207_story.html?utm_term=.92f61acaa837)]

* **EPA And DOW Chemical Denied Meeting Took Place.** According to the Associated Press, “The Environmental Protection Agency and Dow Chemical said Friday that a planned meeting in March between EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt and the company’s CEO never took place. The meeting was listed on Pruitt’s schedule and reported by The Associated Press on Tuesday. EPA spokeswoman Liz Bowman said in a statement that Pruitt and Dow’s Andrew Liveris did have ‘a brief introduction in passing’ during an energy conference in Houston. She said ‘no substantive issues’ were discussed. Rachelle Schikorra, a spokeswoman for Dow, said the formal meeting ‘never happened due to schedule conflicts.’” [Associated Press, [6/30/17](https://apnews.com/feb0fb4603a04b2cba91a02f2c682edb)]

Emails Showed EPA Involvement in Decision

**March 1: Chlorpyrifos highlighted by EPA staff as an “urgent focus” for regulatory action.** On March 1, 2017, Sarah Rees, the EPA’s Director of the Office of Regulatory Policy & Management emailed two other EPA employees with a list of regulatory items that required immediate attention. Among them, Rees said, “The action that I believe needs urgent focus and attention is chlorpyrifos as we discussed yesterday. We have to take final action on revoking the tolerance for this insecticide (basically whether to ban it or not) by March 31.” [EPA, Email Correspondence on Chlorpyrifos, 8/17/17]

**March 7: Chief of Staff Ryan Jackson stated that EPA’s Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention was trying to “strong arm” him and said that he had “scared them.”** In an email exchange on March 7, 2017, Ryan Jackson, Pruitt’s Chief of Staff, stated that Wendy Cleland-Hamnett and the EPA’s Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention was “trying to strong arm us” after Cleland-Hamnet asked about the status of a meeting with Pruitt on chlorpyrifos. Jackson then stated, “I scared them Friday.” He then added in a second email, “I’m kidding. Wendy is actually very helpful. I think I did scare them or surprise them Friday. They are getting us information from Friday but they know where this is headed and they are documenting it well.” [EPA, Email Correspondence on Chlorpyrifos, 8/17/17]

* **Jackson blocked Cleland Hammett from meeting with Pruitt on chlorpyrifos.** In a March 7 email, Wendy Cleland-Hammett emailed Dravis asking for help getting a meeting with Pruitt on chlorpyrifos. Dravis offered to help Cleland-Hammett get time, and then emailed Jackson asking if Pruitt needed a briefing. Jackson replied, “No they owe me some information.” [EPA, Email Correspondence on Chlorpyrifos, 8/17/17]

**March 9: Changes to EPA’s definition of “best available” science.** On March 9, in am email to Byron Brown and Samantha Dravis, Al McGartland raised concerns about the characterization of “best available science,” stating “One could make a case that if the data are not available so others can replicate and reproduce results then it doesn’t qualify as ‘available’. Chlorpyrifos is the latest example (Columbia Children’s Center Study). There are other studies where no one can have access to the underlying data. We just had a upsetting case where we could not reproduce results of a well-used economic study and I had to quickly change our guidance and tell program offices to stop using the study.” [EPA, Email Correspondence on Chlorpyrifos, 8/17/17]

**March 13: OMB involvement.** In a March 13 email between Sarah Rees, the EPA Director at OIRA, Samantha Dravis, Shannon Kenny, Robin Kime, and William Nickerson on March 13, 2017, Rees stated that OMB “want[ed] [an] interagency review if we [EPA] do anything other than a full denial” of PANNA and NRDC’s petition to limit the use of chlorpyrifos. [EPA, Email Correspondence on Chlorpyrifos, 8/17/17]

**March 30: Discussions began within EPA on the use of epidemiology in risk assessment.** On March 30, Al McGartland sent an email to Samantha Dravis and Byron Brown with the subject line, “FYI. EPA’s use of epidemiology.” In the email McGartland wrote, “Samantha asked that I send you a note about ongoing activities on the use of epidemiology in risk assessment. (This came up in the chlorpyrifos discussions.” The note was redacted under Exemption 5 (Deliberative Process.) The issue was also raised in a meeting on March 30 with a group of agriculture CEOs. [EPA, Email Correspondence on Chlorpyrifos, 8/17/17]

**March 30: After EPA’s decision, the Farm Bureau praised EPA staff and wanted to “swing by” and meet with EPA staff.** On March 30, after the EPA’s announcement that they would reject a petition asking the agency to ban the use of the pesticide Chlorpyrifos, Farm Bureau director Paul Schlegal sent an email to EPA’s David Kreutzer and Samantha Dravis applauding Pruitt’s decision and asking Dravis if he could “swing by with a couple of folks.” [EPA, Email Correspondence on Chlorpyrifos, 8/17/17]

**Top Hit:** **Pay To Play**

When Pruitt was attorney general of Oklahoma, his campaigns and political organizations received more than $3 million from fossil fuel interests–and he repeatedly took actions to benefit corporations within days of their checks being delivered. Now that he's at the EPA, polluting industries have an open door. Pruitt met with a huge trash collection company, and within weeks announced that the EPA was going to hold off on air quality rules at landfills. He met with representatives of big industrial agriculture companies, and days later announced that the EPA was going to loosen standards for the use of pesticides.

**In 13 Of 14 Lawsuits Filed By Pruitt That Challenged Federal Environmental Rules, Co-Parties Contributed Money To Pruitt Or Pruitt Affiliated Groups**. According to an article in the New York Times, “In total, Mr. Pruitt filed 14 lawsuits challenging federal environmental regulations. In 13 of those cases, the co-parties included companies that had contributed money to Mr. Pruitt or to Pruitt-affiliated political campaign committees.” [New York Times, [1/14/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/14/us/scott-pruitt-trump-epa-pick.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&_r=0)]

**NYT: “Energy Industry Lobbyists Drafted Letters For Him To Send To The E.P.A., The Interior Department, The Office Of Management And Budget And Even President Obama.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “Mr. Pruitt has responded aggressively, and with a lot of helping hands. Energy industry lobbyists drafted letters for him to send to the E.P.A., the Interior Department, the Office of Management and Budget and even President Obama, The Times found.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](https://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/07/us/politics/energy-firms-in-secretive-alliance-with-attorneys-general.html)]

**OGE Held Fundraiser For Pruitt Four Days Before He Filed Appeal In EPA Court Fight**. According to an article in the New York Times, “The fund-raising has taken place on the state level as well. Oklahoma Gas & Electric — a for-profit utility that Mr. Pruitt joined with in federal court to fight the E.P.A. — invited its employees to the Petroleum Club in downtown Oklahoma City late last year for a fund-raising event for Mr. Pruitt, drawing donations from about 45 company employees, including the chief executive. Four days later, Mr. Pruitt filed a new appeal in the case — timing that the utility said was a coincidence.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](https://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/07/us/politics/energy-firms-in-secretive-alliance-with-attorneys-general.html)]

**NYT: “The Email Exchange From October 2011, Obtained Through An Open-Records Request, Offers A Hint Of The Unprecedented, Secretive Alliance That Mr. Pruitt And Other Republican Attorneys General Have Formed With Some Of The Nation’s Top Energy Producers.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “The email exchange from October 2011, obtained through an open-records request, offers a hint of the unprecedented, secretive alliance that Mr. Pruitt and other Republican attorneys general have formed with some of the nation’s top energy producers to push back against the Obama regulatory agenda, an investigation by The New York Times has found.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](https://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/07/us/politics/energy-firms-in-secretive-alliance-with-attorneys-general.html)]

**Pruitt Office Worked With Lobbyist To Intervene On EPA Regulation**. “On March 31, 2014, Devon Energy made a $125,000 contribution to RAGA; on April 2, 2014, Pruitt authored a letter to the EPA protesting the agency’s plan to study the environmental impacts of fracking.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](https://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/07/us/politics/energy-firms-in-secretive-alliance-with-attorneys-general.html)]

* *March 31, 2014: Devon Energy Donated $125,000 to RAGA.* [CQ Moneyline, Republican Attorneys General Association, Accessed 12/22/16; IRS, 527 Report of Contribution and Expenditures, [4/15/14](https://forms.irs.gov/app/pod/basicSearch/search?_eventId_displayForm=true&formId=79050&formtype=e8872&execution=e1s3)]
* *April 2, 2014: Scott Pruitt Sent Letter to EPA Inspector General Asking Him to Reconsider Fracking Study.*  [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [4/2/14](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/0/3A6652E7A13E767A86257CAE006F7A4B%21OpenDocument)]

**New York Times: “Energy Lobbyists Drafted Letters For Mr. Pruitt To Send, On State Stationery, To The E.P.A.”** According to the New York Times, “As Mr. Pruitt has sought to use legal tools to fight environmental regulations on the oil and gas companies that are a major part of his state’s economy, he has also worked with those companies. A 2014 investigation by The Times found that energy lobbyists drafted letters for Mr. Pruitt to send, on state stationery, to the E.P.A., the Interior Department, the Office of Management and Budget and even President Obama, outlining the economic hardship of the environmental rules.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/07/us/politics/scott-pruitt-epa-trump.html?_r=0)]

**New York Times Headline: Scott Pruitt, Trump’s E.P.A. Pick, Backed Industry Donors Over Regulators**. [New York Times, [1/14/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/14/us/scott-pruitt-trump-epa-pick.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&_r=0)]

* **Pruitt Stopped Legal Fight To Clean Up Illinois River**. According to an article in the New York Times, “A legal fight to clean up tons of chicken manure fouling the waters of Oklahoma’s bucolic northeastern corner — much of it from neighboring Arkansas — was in full swing six years ago when the conservative lawyer Scott Pruitt took office as Oklahoma’s attorney general. His response: Put on the brakes. Rather than push for a federal judge to punish the companies by extracting perhaps tens of millions of dollars in damages, Oklahoma’s new chief law enforcement officer quietly negotiated a deal to simply study the problem further.” [New York Times, [1/14/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/14/us/scott-pruitt-trump-epa-pick.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&_r=0)]
* **“Move Came After He Had Taken Tens Of Thousands Of Dollars In Campaign Contributions.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “The move came after he had taken tens of thousands of dollars in campaign contributions from executives and lawyers for the poultry industry.” [New York Times, [1/14/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/14/us/scott-pruitt-trump-epa-pick.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&_r=0)]
* **NYT: “Least $40,000 In Contributions Poured Into His Campaign From Nearly 30 Executives At Poultry Companies Named In The Lawsuit Or Attorneys At Law Firms Representing Them.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “As Mr. Pruitt ran for election, at least $40,000 in contributions poured into his campaign from nearly 30 executives at poultry companies named in the lawsuit or attorneys at law firms representing them, including Mark Simmons, the founder of Simmons Foods; Donald J. Smith, then the chief executive of Tysons Foods; and Gary Weeks, a lawyer listed on the court papers as representing George’s, another company targeted in the lawsuit, according to data assembled by the nonprofit Environmental Working Group and confirmed by The New York Times. That money represents about 4 percent of the total $1 million he raised in the 2010 campaign, records show.” [New York Times, [1/14/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/14/us/scott-pruitt-trump-epa-pick.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&_r=0)]

Fossil Fuel Industry Connections

**Pruitt Set Up The Rule Of Law Defense Fund That “Allows Companies Benefiting From The Actions Of Mr. Pruitt And Other Republican Attorneys General To Make Anonymous Donations, In Unlimited Amounts.”** According to the New York Times, “In addition to the American Petroleum Institute, major energy companies — ConocoPhillips, the oil and gas company; Alpha Natural Resources, a coal mining giant; and American Electric Power, the nation’s biggest coal consumer — have recently joined the Republican Attorneys General Association, bringing in hundreds of thousands of additional dollars to the group, internal documents show. By last year, the association was starting to pull in so much money under Mr. Pruitt’s leadership that it decided to break free from its partnership with the Republican State Leadership Committee, a group that represents state elected officials. Within months, the association also set up the Rule of Law Defense Fund, yet another legal entity that allows companies benefiting from the actions of Mr. Pruitt and other Republican attorneys general to make anonymous donations, in unlimited amounts. Fund-raising skyrocketed.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/07/us/politics/energy-firms-in-secretive-alliance-with-attorneys-general.html)]

**New York Times: “[Pruitt] Expected To Shelve The Obama Administration’s Aggressive Environmental Enforcement And Embrace A More Collaborative Approach With The Industries.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “Now, Mr. Pruitt, tapped to head Donald J. Trump’s Environmental Protection Agency, will have the opportunity to engineer a radical shift in Washington. If confirmed by the Senate, he is expected to shelve the Obama administration’s aggressive environmental enforcement and embrace a more collaborative approach with the industries that the agency is charged with policing, many of which have helped him advance his political career.” [New York Times, [1/14/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/14/us/scott-pruitt-trump-epa-pick.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&_r=0)]

**Pruitt Is Backed By Nearly Two Dozen Conservative Groups Who Praised Pruitt’s Opposition To EPA**. According to a letter from 23 groups, “Attorney General Pruitt has consistently fought for Oklahoma families and communities and has been a stalwart defender against federal intrusion into state and individual rights. Notably, Mr. Pruitt led a multi-state effort opposing the EPA’s unlawful attempt to take over the nation’s electricity grid under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act. The EPA’s plan would shutter an estimated 40 GW of reliable and affordable energy, unnecessarily harming American families for little to no environmental benefit.” [Letter, [1/12/17](https://cei.org/sites/default/files/Pruitt-Coalition-Letter.pdf)]

The groups were:

Thomas Pyle, American Energy Alliance

Michael Needham, Heritage Action for America

Grover Norquist, Americans for Tax Reform

Kent Lassman, Competitive Enterprise Institute

Adam Brandon, FreedomWorks

David McIntosh, Club for Growth

Phil Kerpen, American Commitment

Craig Richardson, Energy and Environment Action Team

David Williams, Taxpayers Protection Alliance

Harry Alford, National Black Chamber of Commerce

Jim Martin, 60 Plus

Andrew Langer, Institute for Liberty

Heather Higgins, Independent Women’s Voice

Independence Institute

Richard Martin, Americans for Limited Government Coalition Opposed to Additional Spending and Taxes (COAST)

Brett Healy, MacIver Institute

Joseph Bast, Heartland Institute

George Landrith, Frontiers of Freedom

Randy Eminger, Energy Policy Network

Paul Gessing, Rio Grande Foundation

Mike Nasi, Balanced Energy for Texas

Brent Mead, Montana Policy Institute

Forest Thigpen, Mississippi Center for Public Policy

**In 13 Of 14 Lawsuits Filed By Pruitt That Challenged Federal Environmental Rules, Co-Parties Contributed Money To Pruitt Or Pruitt Affiliated Groups**. According to an article in the New York Times, “In total, Mr. Pruitt filed 14 lawsuits challenging federal environmental regulations. In 13 of those cases, the co-parties included companies that had contributed money to Mr. Pruitt or to Pruitt-affiliated political campaign committees.” [New York Times, [1/14/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/14/us/scott-pruitt-trump-epa-pick.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&_r=0)]

* **BakerHostetler Law Firm Gave 5 Pro Bono Attorneys To Help Oklahoma Overturn CPP**. According to an article in the New York Times, “BakerHostetler, the Cleveland-based law firm whose clients have included dozens of energy industry players, assigned five of its lawyers to help Oklahoma overturn President Obama’s Clean Power Plan, intended to combat climate change. The law firm did not charge Oklahoma anything for the work, Mr. Pruitt’s office confirmed.” [New York Times, [1/14/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/14/us/scott-pruitt-trump-epa-pick.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&_r=0)]
* **Lead Attorney Said It Was Charitable Work**. According to an article in the New York Times, “David B. Rivkin Jr., the lead attorney from BakerHostetler who handled the matter, said that the work was considered charitable, similar to when major law firms give free legal advice to inmates at the Guantánamo Bay military prison.” [New York Times, [1/14/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/14/us/scott-pruitt-trump-epa-pick.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&_r=0)]

Devon Energy

**2014: “Records Also Show That Devon Contributed $125,000 To RAGA, Led By Pruitt On March 31, Two Days Before Pruitt Wrote His Letter To The EPA Protesting A Proposed Fracking Regulation.”** According to Tulsa World, “Hundreds of emails reviewed by the World show frequent communication among Devon’s top lobbyist, other company officials and Pruitt’s office on a variety of state and federal regulatory issues. Records also show that Devon contributed $125,000 to an association led by Pruitt on March 31, two days before Pruitt wrote his letter to the EPA protesting a proposed fracking regulation. For the contribution to the Republican Attorneys General Association, Devon received special access to attorneys general during four annual conferences and other perks. Pruitt is a two-time past chairman of the association and continues to serve on its executive committee.” [Tulsa World, 12/16/14]

* **Pruitt Falsely Claimed There Was No Link Between Fracking And Water Contamination**. According to FactCheck.org, “He implied in April 2014 that’s there’s no evidence to support a link between fracking and water contamination. There is some evidence to support a link in certain instances, but not enough to definitively conclude that contamination is widespread, as we wrote in early December.” [FactCheck.org, [12/14/16](http://www.factcheck.org/2016/12/facts-trumps-epa-nominee/)]

OG&E

**2013: Oklahoma Gas & Electric Held A Fundraiser For Pruitt, Four Days Later Pruitt Filed A New Appeal In Their Case Against The EPA.** According to the New York Times, “The fund-raising has taken place on the state level as well. Oklahoma Gas & Electric — a for-profit utility that Mr. Pruitt joined with in federal court to fight the E.P.A. — invited its employees to the Petroleum Club in downtown Oklahoma City late last year for a fund-raising event for Mr. Pruitt, drawing donations from about 45 company employees, including the chief executive. Four days later, Mr. Pruitt filed a new appeal in the case — timing that the utility said was a coincidence.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/07/us/politics/energy-firms-in-secretive-alliance-with-attorneys-general.html)]

Exxon Mobil

**Pruitt Penned An Op-Ed In Response To “Democratic Attorneys General In New York And Other States Who Were Investigating Whether Exxon Mobil Had Quashed Its Internal Research On Climate Change.”** According to Politico, “His LinkedIn biography boasts that he is ‘a leading advocate against the EPA’s activist agenda,’ and says that as chairman of the Republican Attorneys General Association he ‘led the charge with repeated notices and subsequent lawsuits against the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for their leadership’s activist agenda and refusal to follow the law.’ Pruitt’s op-ed with Strange, which asserted that scientists disagree about climate science, was written to criticize Democratic attorneys general in New York and other states who were investigating whether Exxon Mobil had quashed its internal research on climate change. That dispute — known as ‘#ExxonKnew’ after the Twitter hashtag — quickly escalated into a battle between Democrats looking for evidence of fraud at the oil and gas giant and Republican attorneys general who argued the Democrats were stomping on Exxon’s free speech rights. Various court battles related to that dispute are ongoing.” [Politico, [12/7/16](http://www.politico.com/blogs/donald-trump-administration/2016/12/oklahoma-ag-pruitt-epa-chief-232319); National Review, [5/17/16](http://www.nationalreview.com/article/435470/climate-change-attorneys-general)]

**Exxon Mobil Donated $160,000 to RAGA Between 2014 and 2016.** [CQ MoneyLine, Republican Attorneys General Association 527, accessed 12/20/16]

**April 26, 2016: Exxon Mobil Donated $50,000 to RAGA.** [CQ MoneyLine, Republican Attorneys General Association 527, accessed 12/20/16]

Emails Showed Pruitt Ran EPA Arm in Arm With Industry

**Washington Post: Pruitt “Closely Coordinated With Major Oil And Gas Producers, Electric Utilities And Political Groups.”** According to the Washington Post, “As Oklahoma’s attorney general, Scott Pruitt, now the Environmental Protection Agency administrator, closely coordinated with major oil and gas producers, electric utilities and political groups with ties to the libertarian billionaire brothers Charles G. and David H. Koch to roll back environmental regulations, according to over 6,000 pages of emails made public on Wednesday.” [Washington Post, [2/22/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/22/us/politics/scott-pruitt-environmental-protection-agency.html?mcubz=3)]

**Americans For Prosperity Thanks Pruitt For Pushing Back Against Obama Policies**. According to the Washington Post, “‘Thank you to your respective bosses and all they are doing to push back against President Obama’s E.P.A. and its axis with liberal environmental groups to increase energy costs for Oklahomans and American families across the states,’ said one email sent to the offices of Mr. Pruitt and an Oklahoma congressman in August 2013 by Matt Ball, an executive at Americans for Prosperity. That nonprofit group is funded in part by the Kochs, the Kansas-born business executives who spent much of the past decade combating federal regulations, particularly in the energy sector. ‘You both work for true champions of freedom and liberty!’ the note said.” [Washington Post, [2/22/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/22/us/politics/scott-pruitt-environmental-protection-agency.html?mcubz=3)]

## Pruitt and His Affiliated Organizations Have Received $3 Million From Fossil Fuel Interests

**Pruitt and His Affiliated Organizations Have Received $3 Million From Fossil Fuel Interests**. Attorney General Scott Pruitt has received a total of $348,246 from fossil fuel industries as a candidate for state office in Oklahoma. Additionally, two PACs affiliated with Attorney General Scott Pruitt have received $147,500 from fossil fuel interests. This includes $36,500 given to Pruitt’s leadership PAC Oklahoma Strong and an additional $111,000 given to the Liberty 2.0 Super PAC. The Republican’s Attorney General raised $3,443,491 from fossil fuel interests between 2013 and 2016 while Scott Pruitt was chairman, a member of the executive committee, and in the leadership of the Rule of Law Defense Fund. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/21/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668&d-cci=36,34,33#[{1|gro=d-cci); CQ MoneyLine, Super PAC Donors, accessed 1/9/17; CQ MoneyLine, Oklahoma Strong Donors, accessed 1/9/17; CQ MoneyLine, Republican Attorneys General, accessed 12/20/16]

Breakdown:

**Scott Pruitt Has Received More Than $348,246 In Campaign Contributions From Fossil Fuel Interests**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, in his career, Scot Pruitt has received $348,246 from fossil fuel industries. This total includes $42,385 from electric utilities; $24,250 from mining; and $250,361 from oil and gas. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/21/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668&d-cci=36,34,33#[{1|gro=d-cci)]

**Pruitt Affiliated PACs Have Received More Than $147,000 From Dirty Energy Interests**. Two PACs affiliated with Attorney General Scott Pruitt have received $147,500 from dirty energy interests. This includes $36,500 given to Pruitt’s leadership PAC Oklahoma Strong and an additional $111,000 given to the Liberty 2.0 Super PAC. [CQ MoneyLine, Super PAC Donors, accessed 1/9/17; CQ MoneyLine, Oklahoma Strong Donors, accessed 1/9/17]

**RAGA Raised $3,443,491 from Fossil Fuel Interests While Pruitt Was In Leadership, Between 2013 and 2016.** [CQ MoneyLine, Republican Attorneys General, accessed 12/20/16]

* **2012-2014: Scott Pruitt Elected Twice As Chairman of the Republican Attorneys General Association.**  [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [2/25/13](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/3E67F1CEE13BC090862572B2005AD559/D7D0CEB8FCE468C886257B1D007738BE)]
* **2014-2015: Scott Pruitt Was on the Executive Committee of RAGA.** [RAGA, accessed [12/20/16](http://www.republicanags.com/raga_announces_leadership)]
* **Pruitt Was Rule Of Law Defense Fund Chairman From November 2015 Until November 2016**. According to the Executive Branch Personnel Public Financial Disclosure Report, Scott Pruitt was a member of the Board of Directors of the Rule of Law Defense Fund from November 2016 to December 2016 and Chairman from November 2015 until November 2016. Pruitt was also a board member from April 2014 until November 2015. [Executive Branch Personnel Public Financial Disclosure Report, OGE Form 278e, [12/16/16](https://extapps2.oge.gov/201/Presiden.nsf/PAS%2BIndex/AF6B16678D423328852580A1002C747F/%24FILE/Pruitt%2C%20Edward%20Scott%20%20%20final278.pdf)]

Pruitt Met With Waste Management Before Administrative Stay For Greenhouse Emissions In Landfills

**March 31: Pruitt Met With Waste Management To Discuss Landfills**. According to schedules released by the EPA, “Topic: opportunities for regulatory innovation and Improvement; very active with the rest of the business community and with municipal government on ways EPA programs could become more efficient and closely aligned with statutory goals; hoping we can be a resource for the Administrator, particularly in terms of ideas for ways to meet his goal of facilitating progress In working through the Superfund pipeline, sustaining some essential research and educational functions for RCRA, and improving the roll-out of recently promulgated air standards for municipal landfills; this would be a policy discussion about some key EPA programs.” [Pruitt Schedule, pg 138, 3/31/17]

* **May: EPA Stays Landfill Methane Rules**. According to an EPA press release, “Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) announced a 90-day administrative stay for the August 2016 New Source Performance Standards and Emissions Guidelines for municipal solid waste landfills. In a May 5th letter, EPA notified industry petitioners that the agency was granting their reconsideration request. This stay will allow EPA to reconsider certain aspects of the new source standards and emission guidelines for existing landfills. Consistent with President Trump’s Energy Independence Executive Order Energy Independence Executive Order, EPA will continue to review these actions to ensure that they protect the environment and enable a growing economy. ‘EPA is continuing to ensure that the public has the opportunity to comment on agency actions,’ said Administrator Scott Pruitt. ‘Reconsidering portions of the landfill rules will give stakeholders the opportunity to review these requirements, assess economic impacts and provide feedback to the agency through the reconsideration process.’” [EPA, [5/23/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-stays-landfill-methane-rules)]

Pruitt Met With Crop Association Before Extending Pesticide Applicators Rule

**May 4: Pruitt Met With Southern Crop Production Association To Discuss “Intersection Of Pesticide Policy And The ESA.”** According to schedules released by the EPA, Pruitt met with Southern Crop Production Association to reaffirm “FIFRA’s risk-based approach to regulating pesticides, regulatory reform at the intersection of pesticide policy and the ESA, and reauthorizing the industry’s fee for service program.” [Pruitt Schedule, pg 262, 5/4/17]

* **May 11: EPA Extended Timeline for Pesticide Applicators Rule**. According to an EPA press release, “U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt today announced a 12-month extension for implementation of the revised final Certification and Training of Pesticide Applicators (C&T) rule. EPA received feedback from states and stakeholders that more time and resources are needed to prepare for compliance with the rule. The extended timeline will enable EPA to work with states and provide adequate compliance and training resources. ‘In order to achieve both environmental protection and economic prosperity, we must give the regulated community, which includes farmers and ranchers, adequate time to come into compliance with regulations. Extending the timeline for implementation of this rule will enable EPA to consult with states, assist with education, training and guidance, and prevent unnecessary burdens from overshadowing the rule’s intended benefits,’ said Administrator Pruitt.” [EPA, [5/11/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-extends-timeline-pesticide-applicators-rule)]

Pruitt Staffed EPA With Lobbyists

**Business Insider: 7 Of 45 New EPA Top Staff Come From The Coal, Oil, And Chemical Industries**. According to Business Insider, “Business Insider obtained a list of 45 official senior leadership hires for the EPA, and it’s filled with people who have coal and oil industry connections. Many new hires worked close with EPA administrator Pruitt or other Oklahoma politicians – not an abnormal pick for someone like Pruitt. A bit more surprising: seven of the hires come from the coal, oil, and chemical industries.” [Business Insider, [6/27/17](http://www.businessinsider.com/epas-top-staff-filled-with-coal-and-oil-industry-connections-2017-6)]

* **Tate Bennett, Deputy Associate Administrator For Intergovernmental Relations Was Lobbyist For NRECA**. According to Business Insider, “Bennett was a coal utility lobbyist as recently as this year, according to Inside Climate News. Her role as a coal lobbyist may actually violate Trump's ethics order. According to Inside Climate News, Sens. Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I.) and Jeff Merkley (D-Ore.) sent a letter to Pruitt arguing that "Because of her activities as a registered federal lobbyist she cannot work on legislation, communicate with Congress, or coordinate and monitor regional, state and local responses to a wide-range of major issues faced by EPA." Inside Climate News reported Bennett lobbied for National Rural Electric Cooperative Association — whose members are primarily reliant on coal – for two years.” [Business Insider, [6/27/17](http://www.businessinsider.com/epas-top-staff-filled-with-coal-and-oil-industry-connections-2017-6)]
* **Christian Palich, Deputy Associate Administrator For Congressional Relations Was President Of Coal Trade Association**. According to Business Insider, “Palich is president of the Ohio Coal Association, which describes itself as ‘a trade association representing Ohio’s coal industry and committed to advancing the development and utilization of Ohio Coal.’” [Business Insider, [6/27/17](http://www.businessinsider.com/epas-top-staff-filled-with-coal-and-oil-industry-connections-2017-6)]

**EPA Top Toxic Chemical Unit Is Lead By Former American Chemistry Council Executive.** According to the New York Times, “So scientists and administrators in the E.P.A.’s Office of Water were alarmed in late May when a top Trump administration appointee insisted upon the rewriting of a rule to make it harder to track the health consequences of the chemical, and therefore regulate it. The revision was among more than a dozen demanded by the appointee, Nancy B. Beck, after she joined the E.P.A.’s toxic chemical unit in May as a top deputy. For the previous five years, she had been an executive at the American Chemistry Council, the chemical industry’s main trade association.” [New York Times, [10/21/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/21/us/trump-epa-chemicals-regulations.html)]

**EE News: 15 Energy Lobbyists Hired Using Trump's Weakened Rule**. According to EE News, “E&E News identified seven officials at EPA, Interior and DOE who had recently lobbied those agencies. They include Elizabeth ‘Tate’ Bennett, who lobbied on the Clean Power Plan for the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA), Senate lobbying disclosures show. NRECA opposed EPA’s proposed carbon caps on power plants (Greenwire, Jan. 4, 2016). Bennett initially joined the agency to work in EPA’s congressional office but was moved to a public engagement role after Democratic senators questioned whether her past work violated the administration’s ethics rules.” [EE News, [11/17/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060066839)]

## Pruitt Met With Industry Insiders Before Major EPA Actions

### Pruitt Met With Murray Energy CEO Before Criticizing Paris Deal

**March 30: Pruitt Met With Bob Murray.** According to schedules released by the EPA, Scott Pruitt, Byron Brown, and Ryan Jackson met with Bob Murray on March 30, 2017 for thirty minutes. [Pruitt Schedule, 3/30/17]

* **April 2: Pruitt Called Paris Accord A Bad Deal; Pushed For United States To Pull Out**. According to Reuters, “The United States should continue to be ‘engaged’ in international climate change discussions but the Paris climate change agreement is a ‘bad deal’ for the country, the head of the Environmental Protection Agency said Sunday. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt did not confirm whether the United States would remain in the global climate change pact, under which nearly all countries agreed in 2015 to halt or curb their greenhouse gas emissions, even as the world’s biggest emitter China reaffirmed its commitment to the agreement.” [Reuters, 4/2/17]

### Pruitt Met With Gas Association Before Withdrawing Guidance

**April 5: Pruitt Met With Members Of American Gas Association To Discuss Greenhouse Gas Emission Guidance**. According to schedules released by the EPA, Scott Pruitt met with Dave McCurdy of the American Gas Association to discuss White House Council on Environmental Quality final guidance of greenhouse Gas Emissions in NEPA reviews. [Pruitt Schedule, 4/5/17]

* **April 5: Withdrew Guidance For Federal Agencies To Include Greenhouse Gas Emissions In Environmental Reviews**. According to the New York Times, “[EPA] Withdrew guidance for federal agencies to include greenhouse gas emissions in environmental reviews. April 5 Who wanted it changed? Republicans in Congress opposed the guidelines, which advised federal agencies to account for greenhouse gas emissions and potential climate effects in environmental impact reviews. They argued that the government lacked the authority to make such recommendations, and that it would be impossible to plan for the uncertain effects of climate change.” [New York Times, [5/2/17](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/05/02/climate/environmental-rules-reversed-trump-100-days.html?_r=0)]

### Pruitt Held Meetings On WOTUS Prior To Rescinding Rule

**March 30: Pruitt Held Meeting With Crop For Life To Discuss WOTUS**. According to schedules released by the EPA, Pruitt held a meeting with Crop for Life America to discuss WOTUS. [Pruitt Schedule, 3/30/17]

**April 5: Pruitt Met With National Alliance Of Forest Owners on WOTUS**. According to EPA Schedules, Pruitt met with the National Alliance of Forest Owners on April 5, 2017 on WOTUS. [Pruitt Schedule, pg 163, 4/5/17]

**April 25: Pruitt Met With National Turfgrass Association To Repeal WOTUS**. According to EPA Schedules, “To discuss EPA's Water Sense initiative; Repeal Clean Water Rule (WOTUS) (Expand role of energy savings through turf research, and continue making environmental decisions based on sound peer review science, versus emotional politics).” [Pruitt Schedule, pg 215, 4/25/17]

**April 27: Pruitt Met With Members Of The Alliance To Restore Our Waterways**. According to schedules released by the EPA, Pruitt met with members of the Alliance to Restore our Waterways. [Pruitt Schedule, pg 233, 4/27/17]

**May 18: Pruitt Met With Egg Producers On WOTUS**. According to EPA Schedules, “Topic: environmental issues and regulations as they affect agriculture, including WOTUS and other timely topics” [Pruitt Schedules, pg 310, 5/18/17]

EPA Moved To Rescind Rule In June

**June: EPA Moved To Rescind WOTUS**. According to a press release, “The Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Army, and Army Corps of Engineers (the agencies) are proposing a rule to rescind the Clean Water Rule and re-codify the regulatory text that existed prior to 2015 defining ‘waters of the United States’ or WOTUS. This action would, when finalized, provide certainty in the interim, pending a second rulemaking in which the agencies will engage in a substantive re-evaluation of the definition of ‘waters of the United States.’ The proposed rule would be implemented in accordance with Supreme Court decisions, agency guidance, and longstanding practice. ‘We are taking significant action to return power to the states and provide regulatory certainty to our nation’s farmers and businesses,’ said Administrator Scott Pruitt. ‘This is the first step in the two-step process to redefine ‘waters of the U.S.’ and we are committed to moving through this re-evaluation to quickly provide regulatory certainty, in a way that is thoughtful, transparent and collaborative with other agencies and the public.’” [EPA, [6/27/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-us-army-move-rescind-2015-waters-us)]

### Pruitt Met With Congressman Lamar Smith On Legislation To Reform Science Advisory Board

**April 5: Pruitt Met With Congressman Lamar Smith About Science Advisory Board Bill**. According to schedules released by the EPA, Scott Pruitt met with Congressman Lamar Smith on April 5, 2017 to discuss the Science Advisory Board and the Honest Act Bill. [Pruitt Schedule, 4/5/17]

* **Smith Cosponsored H.R.1431 - EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act Of 2017**. [House of Representatives, HR 1431, [3/8/17](https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/1431/cosponsors)]
* **Smith Sponsored H.R.1430 - HONEST Act**. [House of Representatives, [3/8/17](https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/1430)]
* **EPA Science Reform Act Would Change Membership Requirements Of Science Advisory Board To Include More Industry Voices**. According to The Hill, “The legislation from Rep. Frank Lucas (R-Okla.) would change membership requirements for the EPA’s Science Advisory Board to include more industry voices, expanding financial and conflict of interest disclosure requirements and giving the public the chance to more readily comment on the board’s actions.” [The Hill, [3/30/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/326472-house-approves-epa-science-committee-overhaul)]

**May: Pruitt Dismissed Members Of The Board Of Scientific Counselors**. According to Science Mag, “The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) fired members of a scientific advisory board yesterday. The agency quietly forced out some members of the Board of Scientific Counselors just weeks after leaders told them their tenure would be renewed, said Robert Richardson, an ecological economist at Michigan State University and one of those dismissed. The board is tasked with reviewing the work of EPA scientists and provides feedback that can be a powerful voice in shaping the agency’s future research. The cuts ‘just came out of nowhere,’ Richardson said. ‘The role that science has played in the agency in the past, this step is a significant step in a different direction,’ he said today.’” [Science Mag, [5/6/17](http://www.sciencemag.org/news/2017/05/epa-fires-members-science-advisory-board)]

**October: Pruitt Blocks Scientists With EPA Funding From Serving As Agency Advisers**. According to the Washington Post, “The head of the Environmental Protection Agency upended the agency’s key advisory groups on Tuesday, announcing plans to jettison scientists who have received EPA grants. The move sets in motion a fundamental shift, one that could change the scientific and technical advice that historically has guided the agency as it crafts environmental regulations. The decision to bar any researcher who receives EPA grant money from serving as an adviser appears to be unprecedented. ‘It is very, very important to ensure independence, to ensure that we’re getting advice and counsel independent of the EPA,’ Administrator Scott Pruitt told reporters Tuesday.” [Washington Post, [10/31/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/scott-pruitt-blocks-scientists-with-epa-funding-from-serving-as-agency-advisers/2017/10/31/959d91ac-be5a-11e7-959c-fe2b598d8c00_story.html?utm_term=.429c0710c0ac)]

### Pruitt held meetings with Oil and Gas

**April 3: Met With Magellan Midstream.** According to schedules released by the EPA, Pruitt met with Bruce Heine and Mike Mears of Magellan Midstream to discuss oil pipeline issues. [Pruitt Schedule, 4/3/17]

**April 26 Pruitt Had Lunch With Southern Company Executives**. According to the New York Times, “For lunch on April 26, Scott Pruitt, the new administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, dined with top executives from Southern Company, one of the nation’s largest coal-burning electric utilities, at Equinox, a white-tablecloth favorite of Washington power brokers.” [New York Times, [10/3/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/03/us/politics/epa-scott-pruitt-calendar-industries-coal-oil-environmentalists.html?_r=0)]

**April 26: Pruitt Had Dinner With Members Of Alliance Resource Partners Board Of Directors**. According to the New York Times, “That evening, it was on to BLT Prime, a steakhouse inside the Trump International Hotel in Washington, for a meal with the board of directors of Alliance Resource Partners, a coal-mining giant whose chief executive donated nearly $2 million to help elect President Trump.” [New York Times, [10/3/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/03/us/politics/epa-scott-pruitt-calendar-industries-coal-oil-environmentalists.html?_r=0)]

**April 26: Pruitt Met With Interstate Oil And Gas Compact Commission To Discuss Oil And Gas Regulation**. According to schedules released by the EPA, on April 26 Pruitt met with the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission. According to the schedule they met to “discuss exploring a new approach for state regulations of oil and gas.” [Pruitt Schedule, 4/26/17]

**May 10 Meeting With Shell Was To Discuss “Priority EPA Issues.”** According to schedules released by the EPA, Pruitt met with Shell to discuss “Shell views on priority EPA issues.” [Pruitt Schedule, pg. 286, 5/10/17]

**May 15: Pruitt Met With CEO Of Shell Oil**. [New York Times, [10/3/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/03/us/politics/epa-scott-pruitt-calendar-industries-coal-oil-environmentalists.html?_r=0)]

### Pruitt Held Meetings With Auto Executives

**April 26: Pruitt Met With GM To “Talk About Their Request To Block An Obama Administration Move To Curb Emissions That Contribute To Climate Change.”** According to the New York Times, “Before those two agenda items, Mr. Pruitt met privately with top executives and lobbyists from General Motors to talk about their request to block an Obama administration move to curb emissions that contribute to climate change.” [New York Times, [10/3/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/03/us/politics/epa-scott-pruitt-calendar-industries-coal-oil-environmentalists.html?_r=0)]

**April 26: Pruitt Met With GM To Discuss CAFE Standards**. According to schedules released by the EPA, Pruitt met with General Motors to discuss CAFE mid-term review. [Pruitt Schedule, 4/26/17]

**April 27: Pruitt Met With Automakers To Discuss “Key EPA Priorities.”** According to schedules released by the EPA, Pruitt met with CEOs from Ford, GM, FCA, Toyota, VW, Mercedes Benz, BMV, Jaguar Land rover, Mazda, Mitsubishi, Porsche, and Volvo to discuss “key EPA priorities affecting the Auto Industry. [Pruitt Schedule, 4/27/17]

### Pruitt Held Meetings On RFS

**March 30: Pruitt Met With Holly Frontier And Valero CEO To Discuss RFS**. According to schedules released by the EPA, Pruitt met with Holly Frontier CEO George Damiris and Valero CEO Joe Gorder. According to the schedule, “MR. Damiris would like to discuss the renewable fuel standard and point of obligation issue, as well as the broader EPA policies that impact the company.” [Pruitt Schedule, 3/30/17]

**April 5: Pruitt Met With Industry Members on Renewable Fuel Standards**. According to schedules released by the EPA, Pruitt met with Jan Koninckx of DuPont, Craig Williams of ADM, Brooke Coleman of Advanced Biofuels Business Council, Jon Doggert of Corn Growers, Emily Skor of Growth and two members of Cassidy and Associates to discuss renewable fuel standards. [Pruitt Schedule, 4/5/17]

### Pruitt Met With Candidates For EPA Positions

**April 6: Pruitt Met With Bill Wehrum**. According to schedules released by the EPA, Scott Pruitt along with Many Gunasekaran and Byron Brown met with Bill Wehrum, no topic was disclosed. [Pruitt Schedule,

* **July: Trump Picked Wehrum To Lead EPA’s Office Of Air And Radiation**. According to the Washington Post, “Trump will nominate Bill Wehrum as associate administrator for the Office of Air and Radiation.” [Washington Post, [7/21/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/07/21/trump-to-tap-longtime-coal-lobbyist-for-epas-number-two-spot/?utm_term=.3e929e845e76)]

**April 28: Pruitt Met With Steve Koonin.** According to schedules released by the EPA, Pruitt met with Steve Koonin on April 28. No topic is listed on the schedule. [Pruitt Schedule, pg 237, 4/28/17]

* **Koonin Pitched Red Team Blue Team To Wall Street Journal**. [Wall Street Journal, [4/20/17](https://www.wsj.com/articles/a-red-team-exercise-would-strengthen-climate-science-1492728579)]

**May 8: Pruitt Met With Michael Dourson**. According to schedules released by the EPA, Pruitt met with Michael Dourson on May 5, 2017. [Pruitt Schedule, pg 269, 5/5/17]

* **Trump Announced Intention to Nominate Dourson as Head of EPA’s Chemical and Pesticides Office.** “Today, President Donald J. Trump announced his intention to nominate Dr. Michael Dourson of Ohio, head EPAs chemical and pesticides office.” [TendersInfo, 7/18/17]

**May 2: Pruitt Met With Matt Leopold**. According to schedules released by the EPA, Pruitt met with Matt Leopold on May 2, 2017. [Pruitt Schedule, pg 248, 5/2/17]

* **Leopold Nominated As EPA General Counsel**. [EE News, [7/26/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060057926)]

# Biography and Timeline

Edward Scott Pruitt was born on May 9, 1968 in Danville, Kentucky, he was the oldest of three siblings (brother Derek and sister Tracy). His Mother was Linda Pruitt Warner and his father was Edward Pruitt. Edward Pruitt owned ‘several steak restaurants’ and his mother was a homemaker. Pruitt attended Lafayette High School in Lexington before attending the University of Kentucky in 1986. After a year, Pruitt transferred to Georgetown College in Kentucky where he earned a bachelor’s degree in communications and political science in 1990. In 1990 Pruitt married Marlyn Lloyd, a nurse, at Southeast Christian Church in Louisville, Kentucky. Pruitt attended the University of Tulsa College of Law from 1990-1993. During law school, Pruitt’s mother said he had worked for an oil company in Oklahoma. Pruitt is the father of two children, a daughter McKenna born in 1996 and a son Cade born in 1999.

Following law school, Pruitt opened Christian Legal Services in 1993 a private practice that specialized in constitutional and employment law. In describing his work at his private practice Pruitt said, “The simple fact is we need an attorney general that knows how to fight the reach of the federal government. I’ve been doing that since the first day I got out of law school and initially opened Christian Legal Services Inc. I have successfully defended the rights of individuals to practice their faith when government tries to tell them no.”

In 1998, Pruitt was elected to the 54th Senate District in Oklahoma, defeating Democrat Shannan Clark. In 2000, Pruitt was elected by the Republican Caucus as Minority Whip, a position he was reelected to in 2004. In 2001, Pruitt decided to run for the first congressional district in Oklahoma but failed to make a runoff election with only 23 percent of the vote. Pruitt returned to the state senate where he ran unopposed in 2002. Pruitt would serve in the state senate until 2006.

In 2005, at the urging of local Republicans declared himself as a candidate for Lieutenant Governor. Pruitt was considered the underdog in the race and finished with 33% in a three-way vote, forcing a runoff. Pruitt lost the primary runoff election by less than a percentage point. Pruitt did not seek another term in the Oklahoma Senate in 2006 and left the legislature after his term expired. According to a Tula World Profile in 2017, “he kept a relatively low profile until announcing his candidacy for attorney general in March 2010.”

In 2003, State Senator Scott Pruitt and other investors purchased the Oklahoma City RedHawks. An Oklahoma City Businessman owned 51 percent of the team, while Pruitt had a 25 percent ownership stake; based on the reported sale price of more than $11.5 million, Pruitt's reported 25 percent stake could have been worth more than $2 million. Pruitt's financial disclosure forms from 2003 to 2010 indicate that Pruitt received a salary for serving as the team's general manager in addition to distributions linked to his ownership stake in the team that were worth more than $5,000 per year. The team was sold to Mandalay Baseball Properties in September 2010.

Pruitt announced in March 2010 that he would run for Attorney General after sitting out of state politics for three years. Pruitt won with 65% of the vote defeating Democrat Jim Priest. Pruitt would serve as Oklahoma’s Attorney General from 2011 until his confirmation as EPA Administrator in February 2017. As Attorney General Pruitt would go on to sue the EPA fourteen times, first in May 2011 over regional haze. In June of 2012 Pruitt would be elected Chairman of the Midwestern Region of the National Association of Attorneys General. That same year Pruitt was elected Chairman of the Republican Attorneys General Association, a position to which he was reelected in 2013. Pruitt also served on RAGA’s Executive Committee from November 2014 until February 2016. Pruitt also served as Rule of Law Defense Fund Chairman from November 2015 until November 2016.

Pruitt was nominated by Donald Trump to serve as EPA Administrator on December 8, 2016 and confirmed by the Senate on February 17, 2017.

## Scott Pruitt Timeline

**May 9, 1968: Pruitt Was Born In Danville, KY.** According to Daily Oklahoman, “Occupation: Attorney. Age: 30. Born: Danville, Ky.” [Daily Oklahoman, 8/16/98]

* **Mother Was Linda Pruitt Warner**. According to the Lexington Herald Leader, “What’s not so well known is that Pruitt is a Kentucky native who attended Lafayette High School in Lexington, the University of Kentucky and Georgetown College. “It’s pretty exciting,” said his mother, Linda Pruitt Warner, who still lives in Lexington. “He was called up there last week (to meet with Trump), but we didn’t know the news until today.” [Lexington Herald Leader, [12/8/16](http://www.kentucky.com/news/local/counties/fayette-county/article119508878.html)]
* **Father Was Edward Pruitt**. According to EE News, “Pruitt — who goes by Scott — was born in Danville, Ky., but grew up in Lexington as the oldest of three siblings. His father, Edward, owned several steak restaurants and a convenience store, and his mother was a homemaker, he told The Oklahoman.” [EE News, [1/4/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060047801)]
* **Pruitt’s Father Owned Several Steak Restaurants; His Mother Was A Home Maker**. According to EE News, “His father, Edward, owned several steak restaurants and a convenience store, and his mother was a homemaker, he told The Oklahoman.” [EE News, [1/4/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060047801)]
* **Pruitt Was Oldest Of Three Siblings**. According to EE News, “Pruitt — who goes by Scott — was born in Danville, Ky., but grew up in Lexington as the oldest of three siblings.” [EE News, [1/4/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060047801)]
* **Brother Derek And Sister Tracy**. [WL Pruitt Funeral Home, accessed [1/9/18](http://www.wlpruitt.com/obituaries/print?o_id=670643)]

**1980s: Pruitt Attended Lafayette High School in Lexington, Kentucky**. [Lexington Herald Leader, [12/8/16](http://www.kentucky.com/news/local/counties/fayette-county/article119508878.html)]

**1986: Pruitt Was Freshman on Kentucky Baseball Team College Nickname Was “The Possum.”** [EE News, [1/4/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060047801)]

* **Pruitt Lettered One Year As A Second Baseman At The University Of Kentucky Before Finishing At Nearby Georgetown College**. According to Tulsa World, “A high school baseball and football star in Lexington, Kentucky, Pruitt lettered one year as a second baseman at the University of Kentucky before finishing at nearby Georgetown College.” [Tulsa World, [1/16/17](http://www.tulsaworld.com/homepagelatest/scott-pruitt-politics-baseball-and-jesus/article_30ae4ff2-afeb-5384-ae05-bec00dae4ebe.html)]

**1990: Pruitt Earned A Bachelor’s Degree In Communications And Political Science At Georgetown College**. According to the Oklahoma Attorney General’s office, “He earned a bachelor’s degree in communications and political science at Georgetown College before being accepted to the University of Tulsa College of Law.” [Oklahoma Attorney General, about Scott Pruitt, accessed [3/15/17](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/profile.html); LinkedIn, accessed [3/15/17](https://www.linkedin.com/in/e-scott-pruitt-3b771653/)]

**1990: Pruitt Married Marlyn Lloyd At Southeast Christian Church In Louisville**. According to the Lexington Herald Leader, “Pruitt married Marlyn Lloyd at Southeast Christian Church in Louisville in 1990.” [Lexington Herald Leader, [12/8/16](http://www.kentucky.com/news/local/counties/fayette-county/article119508878.html)]

* **Marlyn Pruitt Was A Nurse**. [EE News, [1/4/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060047801)]

**1990-1993: Pruitt Earned His Juris Doctor (J.D.) From University Of Tulsa College Of Law.** According to Scott Pruitt’s LinkedIn, Pruitt earned his Juris Doctor (J.D.) from University of Tulsa College of Law from 1990 to 1993. [Scott Pruitt LinkedIn, accessed [11/28/16](https://www.linkedin.com/in/e-scott-pruitt-3b771653)]

* **Pruitt Worked For Oil Company While Attending Law School.** According to the Lexington Herald Leader, “[Pruitt] moved to Oklahoma to attend the University of Tulsa College of Law, and ended up staying there, his mother said... ‘He had worked for an oil company there, and when he came out of school, he wanted to come back to Kentucky, but he had a path already laid out,’ Warner said. ‘He’s just a go-getter, he takes every day as a challenge.’” [Lexington Herald Leader, [12/8/16](http://www.kentucky.com/news/local/counties/fayette-county/article119508878.html)]

**1991: Pruitt Opened Christian Legal Services After Passing Bar Exam.** According to the Oklahoman, “Pruitt passed the Oklahoma Bar exam in 1991 and opened Christian Legal Services shortly after.” [Oklahoman, 7/22/10]

* **Pruitt: “We Need An Attorney General That Knows How To Fight The Reach Of The Federal Government. I’ve Been Doing That Since The First Day I Got Out Of Law School And Initially Opened Christian Legal Services Inc.”** According to the Oklahoman, “Pruitt’s response to ad: ‘The simple fact is we need an attorney general that knows how to fight the reach of the federal government. I’ve been doing that since the first day I got out of law school and initially opened Christian Legal Services Inc. I have successfully defended the rights of individuals to practice their faith when government tries to tell them no.’” [Oklahoman, 7/22/10]

**1993-1998: Pruitt Was An Attorney With A Private Practice Called Christian Legal Services.** According to Scott Pruitt’s LinkedIn, Pruitt was an Attorney with a Private Practice from 1993 to 1998. According to his LinkedIn, “Worked in private practice, specializing in constitutional and employment law.” [Scott Pruitt LinkedIn, accessed [11/28/16](https://www.linkedin.com/in/e-scott-pruitt-3b771653)]

* **“Pruitt Worked In Private Practice Five Years Specializing In Constitutional And Employment Law In A Firm Called Christian Legal Services.”** “After passing the Oklahoma bar exam Pruitt worked in private practice five years specializing in constitutional and employment law in a firm called Christian Legal Services. He served eight years in the state Senate before becoming co-owner and managing general partner of the Oklahoma City Redhawks Triple-A baseball team for seven years.” [Baptist News, [12/8/16](https://baptistnews.com/article/trump-picks-a-southern-baptist-to-run-the-epa/%22%20%5Cl%20%22.WE7vTOYrJhE)]
* **1993: “Pruitt Was Assigned A Case Involving A Tahlequah Woman Who Worked With The State Department Of Human Services. She Wanted To Hold Bible Study In Her Home But Was Prohibited Because Of A Federal Regulation Saying That She Couldn’t.”** According to Tulsa World, “In 1993, his first year out of law school, Pruitt was assigned a case involving a Tahlequah woman who worked with the state Department of Human Services. She wanted to hold Bible study in her home but was prohibited because of a federal regulation saying that she couldn’t because it was possible those attending the Bible study might be her clients seeking welfare from the state. ‘We won the federal lawsuit,’ Pruitt said.” [Tulsa World, 8/13/06]
* **1994: Pruitt Defended An Organization That Engaged In “Spreading The Gospel Of Jesus Christ.”** According to Daily Oklahoman, “A Midwest City minister, dubbed the ‘Bible Man’ for his Bible lessons in public schools, must pay $ 253 in damages to a Seminole County family who had sued New Lima schools for allowing the lessons, a federal jury ruled Thursday. The jury found that George Warrington and Bible Fellowship Inc., a religious organization associated with Warrington, were liable for damages to Karen and Harold Hughes. The trial, which began Monday in Oklahoma City federal court, was to determine only the amount of any damages. It already had been decided that Warrington’s activities were unconstitutional. In 1992, the New Lima school district entered into an out-of-court settlement with the Hughes and banned the ‘Bible Man’ from making any religious presentations at the school. The Hughes’ attorney, Micheal Salem, said he was happy with the award. The trial was not about money, he said. Salem said his clients objected both to the content of Warrington’s presentations and that they were occurring in school. Warrington used the King James version of the Bible while the Hughes used the Revised American Standard Bible, he said. ‘The jury held Bible Fellowship was liable for an indifference to my clients’ constitutional rights,’ Salem said. ‘My clients wanted Bible Fellowship to accept responsibility for their actions. They had an opportunity to settle it for $ 1. We made that offer to them. ‘Warrington and Bible Fellowship had denied that they were liable for any damages. The Hughes, who are legal guardians of their two grandsons, accepted $ 25 in damages from the school district in that settlement. Bible Fellowship is an independent, non-profit corporation in Dallas engaged in ‘spreading the gospel of Jesus Christ,’ said Scott Pruitt, attorney for Warrington and the organization. The jury found that Bible Fellowship’s general director, Oliver Price, was not individually liable for damages.” [Daily Oklahoman, 1/28/94]
* **1997: Pruitt Represented Former Clerk-Treasurer Who Was Charged With Embezzling More Than $250,000.**  According to Tulsa World, “Linda Surmount, the former clerk-treasurer for the town of Kiefer, was charged Monday with embezzling more than $ 250,000 from town accounts. Surmount, 49, was charged with four counts of embezzlement by trustee and one count of false accounts by a trustee. An affidavit by Creek County Sheriff Larry Fugate said Surmount admitted Aug. 14 that ‘she did take money’ from town accounts. Surmount, who resigned in April after 17 years in office, surrendered late Monday, accompanied by her attorneys, Scott Pruitt and Jack Gordon. She was released on $ 5,000 bail pending a district court arraignment Oct. 13, when she will enter a plea. ‘Linda is responding well and handling it as well as could be expected,’ said Pruitt.” [Tulsa World, 10/7/97]

**1996: Daughter McKenna Born**. [Tulsa World, 8/05/98]

* **2013-2017: McKenna Pruitt Attended University Of Oklahoma**. [LinkedIn, accessed [1/9/18](https://www.linkedin.com/in/mckenna-pruitt-48b56a100/)]
* **2015: McKenna Pruitt Was Intern For Senator James Inhofe**. [LinkedIn, accessed [1/9/18](https://www.linkedin.com/in/mckenna-pruitt-48b56a100/)]
* **2016: McKenna Pruitt Was Board Relations And President Office Intern At Freedom House**. [LinkedIn, accessed [1/9/18](https://www.linkedin.com/in/mckenna-pruitt-48b56a100/)]
* **2017: McKenna Pruitt Was Intern At Gable Gotwals**. [LinkedIn, accessed [1/9/18](https://www.linkedin.com/in/mckenna-pruitt-48b56a100/)]
* **May – August 2017: McKenna Pruitt Was Clerk For White House Counsel**. [LinkedIn, accessed [1/9/18](https://www.linkedin.com/in/mckenna-pruitt-48b56a100/)]
* **2017: McKenna Pruitt Began Law School At The University Of Virginia**. [LinkedIn, accessed [1/9/18](https://www.linkedin.com/in/mckenna-pruitt-48b56a100/)]

**1998: Pruitt Was The Vice President For The Special Grounds Committee For The Broken Arrow Public Schools.** [Tulsa World, 8/05/98]

### 1990s

**1998**: Pruitt elected to 54th Senate District. On November 3, Scott Pruitt defeated Shannon Clark for the Oklahoma Senate. Pruitt had 9,971 votes and Clark 5,728. [State of Oklahoma, Official Election Results, [11/3/98](https://www.ok.gov/elections/documents/1998_General_Official_Results.pdf)]

* **1998-2006**: Pruitt Served Eight Years in the Oklahoma State Senate.
* **2001-2003**: Pruitt Was Republican Whip.

**1999: Cade Pruitt Is Born**. [Max Preps, accessed [1/9/17](http://www.maxpreps.com/athlete/cade-pruitt/HCJ_axsSEeOZ5AAmVebBJg/default.htm)]

* **2017: Cade Graduated From Cascia Hall High School In Tulsa**. [Max Preps, accessed [1/9/17](http://www.maxpreps.com/athlete/cade-pruitt/HCJ_axsSEeOZ5AAmVebBJg/default.htm)]

**1999: Pruitt Listed As A Trustee For The Sina Family Trust**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 1999]

### 2000

**2000: Pruitt Listed As A Trustee For The Sina Family Trust**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2000]

**2000: Pruitt Was Elected By Republican Caucus As Republican Whip.** According to a press release, “Members of the Senate Republican Caucus have elected their new officers for the 48th Legislature. The members of the caucus selected Senator Jim Dunlap, R-Bartlesville to the office of Senate Minority Leader. Senator James A. Williamson, R-Tulsa will serve as Assistant Minority Leader. Senator Scott Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow is the incoming Minority Whip while Senator Glenn Coffee, R-Oklahoma City will serve as Caucus Chair.” [Oklahoma State Senate, Press Release, [6/1/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/news/press_releases/press_releases_2000/PR000601.html)]

* **Pruitt Said Oklahomans “Deserve A Voice Here At The Capitol.”** According to a press release, “Minority Whip-elect Scott Pruitt said the caucus members were looking forward to the next legislature. ‘There are many concerns shared by thousands of Oklahomans across the state, whether it is about economic development issues, public safety, or religious freedom. They deserve a voice here at the Capitol,’ commented Senator Pruitt.” [Oklahoma State Senate, Press Release, [6/1/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/news/press_releases/press_releases_2000/PR000601.html)]
* **Term Began In 2001, Lasted Two Years.** According to a press release, “The caucus officials will formally begin their terms on January 2, 2001, and will each serve in those offices for a two-year term.” [Oklahoma State Senate, Press Release, [6/1/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/news/press_releases/press_releases_2000/PR000601.html)]

### 2001

**2001: Pruitt Listed As A Trustee For The Sina Family Trust**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2001]

**2001: Pruitt Lost GOP Primary For Congressional Seat, Failed To Make Runoff With Only 23 Percent Of The Vote.** According to Tulsa World, “State Rep. John Sullivan, in a stunning upset, fell just short Tuesday of winning the 1st District Republican primary outright over first lady Cathy Keating and state Sen. Scott Pruitt. ‘I’m shocked,’ Sullivan said. ‘I was just hoping to get into the runoff.’ Sullivan and Keating will now battle it out in a Jan. 8 runoff. Meanwhile, Tulsa attorney and former school board member Doug Dodd, who faced only token opposition, easily won the Democratic nomination. With all 259 precincts counted, unofficial returns showed Sullivan, R-Tulsa, captured 19,018 or 46 percent of the vote, compared to 12,736 (30 percent) for Keating and 9,513 (23 percent) for Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow.” [Tulsa World, 12/12/01]

**2001: Pruitt Said Environmental Protection Agency Should Be ‘More Flexible’ On Its Regulations**. According to Tulsa World, “[Pruitt] said the Environmental Protection Agency should be ‘more flexible’ on its regulations.” [Tulsa World, 11/25/01]

### 2002

**2002: Pruitt Targeted School Land Commission Mineral Rights To Raise Revenue For The State**. According to Tulsa World, “Into this bleak picture comes state Sen. Scott Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow, with a plan that at least deserves serious consideration. Pruitt’s idea is this: Legislators should not limit their thinking to spending cuts or tax increases. In times of incredible shrinking revenues and increasing funding needs, it makes sense to maximize existing revenue sources. He is thinking in particular about the $1.3 billion in real estate, mineral rights and investments held in trust by the Commissioners of the Land Office, better known as the school land commission.” [Tulsa World, 1/6/02]

**2002**: **Pruitt Reelected To State Senate (Unopposed).** [Oklahoma State Election Results, 2002]

**2002: Pruitt Was Elected By Republican Caucus As Assistant Republican Floor Leader.** “Pruitt was elected to the State Senate in November of 1998, where he completed two four-year terms. After winning his bid to the Oklahoma State Senate over a 16-year incumbent, Pruitt became one of the most respected and influential voices in the Senate on crucial economic and social policies. He was elected by the Republican caucus to serve as Republican Whip in 2000 and as Assistant Republican Floor Leader in 2002, a position he held until 2006.” [MiLB, accessed [11/28/16](http://www.milb.com/content/page.jsp?sid=t238&ymd=20080408&content_id=382335&vkey=team4)]

* **2003-2006**: Pruitt Was Republican Assistant Floor Leader.

**2002: Pruitt Listed As A Trustee For The Sina Family Trust**. In 2002, Pruitt filed a yearly report that claimed there “has been no change in any information reported in my Statement of Financial Interests for the calendar year prior to the calendar year for which this statement is due to be filed.” [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2002]

### 2003

**2003: Pruitt Formed the Oklahoma Baseball Club LLC, Which Bought RedHawks**. According to an article in the Daily Oklahoman, “Oklahoma City Blazers owner…and Scott Pruitt, a state senator from Broken Arrow, have assured that Oklahoma City’s pro baseball team won’t be New York-owned for the second time in a decade. The Oklahoma Baseball Club LLC, formed by Funk and Pruitt, bought the RedHawks on Wednesday from Gaylord Entertainment Co.” [Daily Oklahoman, 7/3/03]

* **2003-2010**: Pruitt Was Co-Owner and Managing General Partner of the Oklahoma City Redhawks.
* **Pruitt Claimed Income From RedHawks From 2003-2012**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 1998-2015]

**2003: Pruitt Lists Oklahoma RedHawks As Source Of Income Greater Than $5,000**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2003]

**2003: Pruitt Listed As A Trustee For Oklahoma RedHawks**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2003]

**2003: Pruitt Listed As A Trustee For The Sina Family Trust**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2003]

### 2004

**2004: Pruitt Re-Elected To Position Of Assistant Floor Leader**. According to a press release, “Scott Pruitt of Broken Arrow was re-elected to the position of Assistant Floor Leader. Pruitt was elected to the Senate in 1998, and has served on the leadership team since November 2000, first as Republican Whip and then as an Assistant Republican Leader.” [Oklahoma State Senate, Press Release, [6/15/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/news/press_releases/press_releases_2004/pr20040615b.html)]

**2004: Pruitt Served On Seven Committees In The State Senate**. According to a press release, Pruitt served on Education, Judiciary, General Government & Transportation, Health & Human Resources, Agriculture & Rural Development, Public Safety & Homeland Security, and Rules Committees. [Oklahoma State Senate, Press Release, [11/29/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/news/press_releases/press_releases_2004/pr20041129.html)]

**2004: Pruitt Sponsored Senate Version Of Workers Comp Bill HB 2619**. According to an article in Claims Journal, “HB 2619 was sponsored in the Senate by Senator Scott Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow. It passed the House of Representatives by a 95 to 1 vote.” [Claims Journal, [3/30/04](http://www.claimsjournal.com/news/southcentral/2004/03/30/40688.htm)]

* **November 2004: House Workers Comp Bill Passed House 95-1; Failed In Senate**. According to an article in the Journal Record, “House Bill 2619, by Rep. Ron Peterson, R-Tulsa, and Sen. Scott Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow, included reforms supporters said would encourage early settlement without lawsuits, a requirement of ‘objective evidence’ of injury for ‘sprains and strains’ awards, and a section allowing civil liability if a worker attempts to fraudulently obtain a workers’ comp award. Workers’ compensation experts estimated the measure would have saved Oklahoma businesses $100 million annually without reducing benefits to injured workers and the bill passed the state House on a 95-1 vote.” [Journal Record, 11/22/04]

**2004: Pruitt Sponsored Bill That Included Provisions To Force Rural Water Districts To Negotiate With The Oklahoma Municipal League To Resolve Water Disputes**. According to Journal Record Legislative Report, “Senate Bill 898, by state Sen. Scott Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow, included provisions to force rural water districts to negotiate with the Oklahoma Municipal League to resolve water disputes. The committee defeated the bill on a 2-7 vote. ‘It’s my understanding that there is ongoing litigation across the state on this particular issue, that there are great monies being spent on both sides,’ Pruitt said. ‘If that continues, it is very possible that one of the sides will be completely dissatisfied with the out-come, because it may be an all-or-nothing proposition when the courts determine these types of issues.’” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 2/20/04]

**2004: Pruitt Purchased a Home in the Lakes at Indian Springs Community in Broken Arrow for $605,000.** According to The Intercept, “Pruitt earned only $38,400 as an Oklahoma state senator. Even with a $35,000 profit from selling his previous home, that was not enough on its own to buy a house in the Lakes at Indian Springs community in Broken Arrow, the suburb of Tulsa that Pruitt represented in the legislature. Yet in 2004, Pruitt purchased a sprawling ranch house in the upscale gated community for $605,000. Located on a half-acre corner lot in the Lakes, his stately Tudor looked out on a manmade lake and had a stone fireplace, parking for five cars, and a storm-safe room.” [The Intercept, 12/28/17]

* **2004: Pruitt Financed The Purchase With Mortgage Loans From SpiritBank.** According to The Intercept, “To help pay for it, Pruitt turned to SpiritBank — a community bank that Kelly’s family had run since the 1930s. SpiritBank gave Pruitt and his wife three mortgage loans: one for $81,000, another for $359,000, and a third for $533,000. His wife, Marlyn Pruitt, has reported no assets or income.” [The Intercept, 12/28/17]

**2004: Pruitt Named Legislative Advocate Of The Year For 2004 By The Oklahoma Professional Economic Development Council**. According to a press release, “He chaired the American Legislative Exchange Council’s Civil Justice Task Force, was selected as part of a delegation to Israel in an exchange program with the American Council of Young Political Leaders and received a Henry Toll Fellowship. He was also named Legislative Advocate of the Year for 2004 by the Oklahoma Professional Economic Development Council.” [Oklahoma State Senate, Press Release, [5/16/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/news/press_releases/press_releases_2006/pr20060516e.html)]

**2004: Pruitt Used Interest And Revenue In Oklahoma Redhawks As Collateral**. Edward Scott Pruitt filed a UCC Financing Statement with Spirit Bank on February 23, 2004. According to the filing, “Edward Scott Pruitt pledges and herby assigns all of his interests in and to the revenue of the Oklahoma City Athletic Club, including those from operation of the Oklahoma Redhawks, including but not limited to parking, advertising, concessions and gate admissions.” [Oklahoma County Clerk, UCC Financing Statement, 2/23/04]

* **Pruitt Filed Termination Papers In 2010.** Scott Pruitt filed a termination of the Spirit Bank UCC filing #2004002042923. Termination was filed on September 3, 2010. [Oklahoma County Clerk, UCC Financing Statement, 9/3/10]

**2004: Pruitt Listed As A Trustee For The Sina Family Trust**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2004]

**2004: Pruitt Lists Oklahoma RedHawks As Source Of Income Greater Than $5,000**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2004]

**2004: Pruitt Listed As A Trustee For Oklahoma RedHawks**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2004]

### 2005

**2005: Pruitt Considered Running For Lieutenant Governor**. According to the Journal Record Legislative Report, “State Sen. Scott Pruitt, R-Tulsa, confirmed Tuesday that he is considering a run for lieutenant governor. ‘We have heard from Republicans in Tulsa, Oklahoma City and other parts of the state that they’re very interested in having a strong conservative voice seek that office,’ said Pruitt. ‘And they had approached me about that office, and it is something that we are prayerfully considering at this time.’” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 10/5/05]

**2015: Pruitt Decided To Run For Governor In October; Called Himself A “True Conservative.”** According to the Associated Press, “Calling himself a ‘true conservative,’ state Sen. Scott Pruitt stood in front of a statute of baseball great Mickey Mantle on Thursday to announce he is running for lieutenant governor. Pruitt, accompanied by his wife, Marilyn, and their two young children, kicked off his campaign in Tulsa, then went to the SBC Bricktown Ballpark in Oklahoma City, before a news conference in Lawton.” [Associated Press, 10/20/05]

* **Pruitt Said He Would Use Office To Promote Conservative And Family Values**. According to the Associated Press, “As lieutenant governor, he said he would be fighting for smaller government, ‘protecting taxpayers’ money,’ and using the office as a platform for promoting conservative and family values. He said he favors expansion of faith-based initiatives to solve problems, rather than relying solely on government-run programs.” [Associated Press, 10/20/05]
* **Pruitt Was Considered The Underdog In The Race**. According to the Associated Press, “Pruitt will be the underdog in the GOP race because Hiett already has raised more than $600,000 and says he will spend between $1 million and $2 million on the contest.” [Associated Press, 10/20/05]

**2005: Pruitt Lists Oklahoma RedHawks As Source Of Income Greater Than $5,000**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2005]

**2005: Pruitt Listed As Officer For Oklahoma RedHawks**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2005]

### 2006

**2006**: **Pruitt Lost GOP Primary For Lt. Governor.**

**Pruitt Received 33% Of Vote In Three Way Primary; Qualified for Runoff.** According to the Oklahoma Secretary of State, Scott Pruitt received 33.73% of the vote in a three-way primary for Lt. Governor. Fellow Republican Todd Hiett won with 42.82% while Nancy Riley received 23.46% of the vote. [Oklahoma Secretary of State, Primary Election Results, [7/25/06](https://www.ok.gov/elections/Election_Info/Election_Results/2006_Primary_Election.html)]

* **2006: Oil And Gas Industry Was A Major Contributor To Pruitt’s Lieutenant Governor Campaign**. According to Tulsa World, “Other major Pruitt contributors included several in the oil and gas industry, physicians and attorneys.” [Tulsa World, 8/19/06]

* **Pruitt: “The Reason I’m Leaving This Body Is I Hope To Be A Part Of It In A Different Way Starting Next Year.”** According to a press release, “‘Leaving the Senate was a hard decision. The reason I’m leaving this body is I hope to be a part of it in a different way starting next year. To be able to work with each of you to focus again on one thing, focus on passing big ideas that will move the state of Oklahoma forward,’ said Pruitt. ‘I appreciate you and will always cherish my eight years in the Senate.’” [Oklahoma State Senate, Press Release, [5/16/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/news/press_releases/press_releases_2006/pr20060516e.html)]

**2006: Pruitt Lost Runoff Election For Lieutenant Governor**. According to the Oklahoma Secretary of State, Scott Pruitt lost the Republican primary runoff election for Lieutenant Governor to Todd Hiett. Hiett received 66,220 (50.92%) while Pruitt received 63,817 votes (49.08%). [Oklahoma Secretary of State, Runoff Primary Election, [8/22/06](https://www.ok.gov/elections/Election_Info/Election_Results/2006_Runoff_Primary_Election.html)]

**2006: Pruitt’s Brother Derek Married To Amy Glenn Candler**. [Tulsa World, [7/2/06](http://www.tulsaworld.com/archives/pruitt-candler/article_22ba7aaa-3e37-5aaa-be99-92d9ef91b2c5.html)]

**2006: Pruitt Sponsored Legislation To Reduce The State Income Tax From 6.25 Percent To 4.9 Percent**. According to The Journal Record, “Republicans in both houses of the Oklahoma Legislature on Wednesday advocated further tax cuts be implemented this year. State Sen. Scott Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow, said he has filed legislation to reduce the state income tax from 6.25 percent to 4.9 percent. ‘Last year, state government grew by 12 percent,’ Pruitt said. ‘Politicians set a record by spending $200 a second, and then sent taxpayers a $45 rebate check. I believe their priorities are backwards.’” [The Journal Record, 1/26/06]

**2006: Pruitt Lists Oklahoma RedHawks As Source Of Income Greater Than $5,000**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2006]

**2006: Pruitt Listed As Officer For Oklahoma RedHawks**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2006]

**Tulsa World: Pruitt Kept Low Profile From 2006-2010.** According to Tulsa World, “Pruitt contented himself with running his and Funk’s baseball team after the 2006 runoff loss. Except for serving as chairman of former Arkansas Gov. Mike Huckabee’s presidential campaign in Oklahoma, he kept a relatively low profile until announcing his candidacy for attorney general in March 2010.” [Tulsa World, [1/16/17](http://www.tulsaworld.com/homepagelatest/scott-pruitt-politics-baseball-and-jesus/article_30ae4ff2-afeb-5384-ae05-bec00dae4ebe.html)]

### 2007

**2007: Pruitt Was Named an Executive Partner of Giant Partners in June.** According to The Journal Record, “Oklahoma City-based Giant Partners recently added four names to its list of executives - Pattye Moore, Richard Christman, Taylor Keen and Scott Pruitt. All four were hired as executive partners. Moore is the former president of Sonic Corp. and current owner of Pattye More and Associates, a business consulting company. Christman spent 30 years as chief executive officer of Case New Holland, and the last two years heading up The GSI Group, an agriculture equipment company. Keen was executive vice president of Cherokee Nation Enterprises Inc. Currently, he serves as a legislator for the Cherokee Nation. Pruitt is general managing partner of the Oklahoma RedHawks and a former state senator. Executive partners work with Giant Partners in Oklahoma City and their Atlanta-based company, Giant Impact, to offer strategic planning and leadership services designed to impact the heads and hearts of chief executive officers, their management teams and their companies. Giant Partners is a growth firm offering strategic planning and advisory services, as well as leadership conferences and resources to select companies dedicated to growth.” [The Journal Record, 6/1/07]

**2007: Pruitt Chaired Mike Huckabee’s Oklahoma Leadership Committee**. According to The Oklahoman, “Former state Sen. Scott Pruitt will chair presidential candidate Mike Huckabee’s Oklahoma Leadership Committee. Huckabee, who has been surging among Republican presidential candidates, said Thursday he and Pruitt share conservative values. ‘He is well-respected within the Republican Party and throughout Oklahoma,’ said Huckabee, the former governor of Arkansas. ‘I welcome him to our organization and am thrilled that he is chairing our efforts in this important state.’” [The Oklahoman, 12/21/07]

**2007: Pruitt Lists Oklahoma RedHawks As Source Of Income Greater Than $5,000**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2007]

**2007: Pruitt Listed As Officer For Oklahoma RedHawks**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2007]

### 2008

**2008: Pruitt Lists Oklahoma RedHawks As Source Of Income Greater Than $5,000**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2007]

**2008: Pruitt No Longer Lists Oklahoma RedHawks Under Fiduciary Relationship**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2008]

### 2009

**2009: Pruitt Lists Oklahoma RedHawks As Source Of Income Greater Than $5,000**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2009]

**July: Pruitt Was Considering Running For AG As Early As July**. According to the Oklahoman, “Former state Sen. Scott Pruitt said he hopes to make a decision "in the near future" about running for state attorney general in the 2010 election. Pruitt, a Broken Arrow Republican, served two terms in the Senate before running for lieutenant governor. He narrowly lost the GOP nomination in a runoff to then-House Speaker Todd Hiett. Pruitt, 41, is an attorney and managing partner of the Oklahoma City RedHawks minor league baseball team.” [Oklahoman, 7/30/09]

### 2010

**March: Pruitt Announced He Would Run For Attorney General**. According to the Norman Transcript, “A former state senator and current co-owner of the Oklahoma City RedHawks minor-league baseball team says he plans to launch a campaign for attorney general. Republican Scott Pruitt released a statement Monday indicating he will seek the post being vacated by Democratic Attorney General Drew Edmondson, who is running for governor.” [Norman Transcript, 3/9/10]

**2010: Pruitt Elected Oklahoma Attorney General.**

* **Pruitt Won Primary With 56% Of Vote**. Pruitt defeated Ryan Leonard in the Republican primary for Attorney General with 134,335 (56.05%) to 105,343 (43.95%). [Oklahoma Primary Election Results, 7/27/10]
* **Pruitt Won General Election With 65% Of Vote.** Pruitt won 65.1% of vote compared to 34.9% for Democrat Jim Priest. [Oklahoma Election Results, 11/2/10]

**September 2010: Mandalay Baseball Properties Purchased Oklahoma City RedHawks**. According to an article in the Journal Record, “Investment in ballpark entertainment and new ticket packages are among the plans that the new ownership of the Oklahoma City RedHawks is planning for the future of the franchise. Mandalay Baseball Properties LLC was officially announced as the new owner of the RedHawks on Wednesday. Art Matin, chief executive officer of Mandalay Baseball Properties, said he looks forward to continuing the momentum of the RedHawks and building the team's entertainment value and attendance.” [Journal Record, 9/15/10]

**2010: Pruitt Announced Intention to Use “New Office of Federalism” to Undermine Clean Air Protections.** Pruitt’s 2010 website stated that “In addition to bringing suit against the Obama Administration’s newly passed health care mandates, the new Office of Federalism will defend Oklahomans against agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency when its regulations seek to establish climate and energy policy absent congressional action, and the Nat'l Highway Traffic & Safety Administration in setting new fuel-economy standards.” [Pruitt for Attorney General, 2010, Accessed 12/7/16]

**2010: Pruitt Lists Oklahoma Athletic Cub Limited Partnership As Source Of Income Greater Than $5,000**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2010]

* **Address Listed Is Oklahoma RedHawks Ballpark**. According to his 2010 Statement of Financial Interests form, Scott Pruitt claimed income from the Oklahoma Athletic Club Limited Partnership located at 2 S Mickey Mantle Drive, Oklahoma City, 73104. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2010; Oklahoma Dodgers Ballpark, accessed [1/25/17](http://www.milb.com/content/page.jsp?ymd=20070406&content_id=41086482&fext=.jsp&sid=t238&vkey=)]

### 2011

**2011: Pruitt Stopped Legal Fight To Clean Up Illinois River**. According to an article in the New York Times, “A legal fight to clean up tons of chicken manure fouling the waters of Oklahoma’s bucolic northeastern corner — much of it from neighboring Arkansas — was in full swing six years ago when the conservative lawyer Scott Pruitt took office as Oklahoma’s attorney general. His response: Put on the brakes. Rather than push for a federal judge to punish the companies by extracting perhaps tens of millions of dollars in damages, Oklahoma’s new chief law enforcement officer quietly negotiated a deal to simply study the problem further.” [New York Times, [1/14/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/14/us/scott-pruitt-trump-epa-pick.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&_r=0)]

**2011: AG Pruitt Filed Suit Against Obamacare**. According to an article in the Journal Record, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt filed a lawsuit against the Obama administration's federal health care law late Friday afternoon, saying it violated the state constitution. Pruitt's lawsuit makes Oklahoma the 28th state to challenge the individual mandate provision of the federal health care act. Pruitt said he filed the lawsuit because Oklahomans passed State Question 756 in November, and that new amendment to the state constitution could not coexist with the federal health care law.” [Journal Record, 1/21/11]

**May 2011: Pruitt Sued US EPA Over Regional Haze Plan.** According to an article in the Journal Record, “Saying that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency violated its own procedural rules by moving to reject Oklahoma's plan for reducing regional haze in the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt filed a federal lawsuit this morning against the federal agency.” [Journal Record, 5/31/11]

**2011: Scott Pruitt Elected Vice-Chairman Of The Midwestern Region Of The National Association Of Attorneys General**. According to a press release, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt was elected vice-chairman of the Midwestern Region of the National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG) by his colleagues during the association’s meeting this week in Chicago. Pruitt will serve with Midwestern Region Chairman Greg Zoeller, of Indiana.” [Press Release, [6/24/11](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/0/F7F23EAD915A7D56862578B90065B920%21OpenDocument)]

**2011: Pruitt Signed a Mortgage for 2834 S Utica Ave in Tulsa for $420,000.** [Tulsa County Clerk, Doc#2011078589, Received 9/9/11]

**2011: Pruitt’s Opinion Changed Oklahoma Open Meetings Act To Decrease Transparency**. According to an article in the Claremore Daily Progress, “Municipalities now will have greater freedom to hold closed-door sessions following an Attorney General's opinion that apparently changes the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act. Oklahoma Attorney General E. Scott Pruitt is giving municipalities the authority to conduct more business behind closed doors in secret. Municipalities will have sweeping authority to meet in executive session, following Pruitt's view as a ‘common sense’ interpretation, "Although we have concluded that a common sense reading of the statute makes it unnecessary to apply ‘nonprofit’ to every entity, even if ‘nonprofit’ did apply to all entities listed in 25 O.S. Supp 2010, 307,’ said Pruitt.” [Claremore Daily Progress, 11/30/11]

**2011: Pruitt Lists Oklahoma Athletic Cub Limited Partnership As Source Of Income Greater Than $5,000**. Scott Pruitt signed a statement of no change for 2011. He agreed that, “I hereby certify that there has been no change in any information reported in my Statement of Financial Interests for the calendar year prior to the calendar year for which this statement is due to be filed.” [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Statement of No Change, 2011]

### 2012

**2012: Pruitt Elected Chairman Of The Midwestern Region Of The National Association Of Attorneys General**. According to a press release, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt was elected chairman of the Midwestern Region of the National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG) by his colleagues during the association’s meeting this week in Anchorage, Alaska. He also will serve on the NAAG Executive Committee. ‘I am honored to play a leading role among the nation’s attorneys general to target some of the critical issues we face,’ Pruitt said. ‘As the new chairman, I very much look forward to working with my fellow attorneys general to tackle concerns important to Oklahomans and the nation.’” [Press Release, [6/22/12](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/3E67F1CEE13BC090862572B2005AD559/27E7C5E72C0110FE86257A250060D0BF)]

* **March 2012 – January 2014: Scott Pruitt Served As Chairman Of RAGA.** Scott Pruitt was elected chairman of the Republican Attorneys General Association in March 2012, and re-elected to that position in February 2013. South Carolina Attorney General Alan Wilson took over the role in 2014. [Journal Record, 3/7/12; OK Atty Gen’s Office, [2/25/13](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/3E67F1CEE13BC090862572B2005AD559/D7D0CEB8FCE468C886257B1D007738BE); Associated Press, 11/29/13]

**2012: Pruitt Elected As A Trustee For The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary In Louisville**. According to the Lexington Herald Leader, “In 2012, he was elected as a trustee for the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville.” [Lexington Herald Leader, [12/8/16](http://www.kentucky.com/news/local/counties/fayette-county/article119508878.html)]

**2012: “Pruitt Led 12 Other State Attorneys General In Filing A Freedom Of Information Request In August Designed To Find Out What Behind-The-Scenes Communication Has Been Going On Between The EPA And The National Environmental Groups.”** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Pruitt now wants to know whether the EPA has been secretly coordinating with national environmental groups that have filed a series of what appear to have been friendly lawsuits alleging violations of the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act. The EPA agreed to quick settlements in many such cases, paying huge attorneys fees and agreeing to consent decrees that have resulted in stringent standards while usurping the role of states as partners with the federal government in developing and implementing antipollution standards, Pruitt said. ‘This hasn’t just happened once or twice,’ he said. ‘This has happened dozens of times .... If they’re doing this as a strategy to try to adopt policies and impose substantive requirements on the states that they couldn’t get passed through the regulatory process or through the legislative process, it’s wrong and we’ll take corrective steps.’ Pruitt led 12 other state attorneys general in filing a Freedom of Information request in August designed to find out what behind-the-scenes communication has been going on between the EPA and the national environmental groups.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 10/7/12]

**2012: As Oklahoma Attorney General, Pruitt “Opted Out Of A Federal Program That Would Have Helped Some Of These Foreclosure Victims,” Saying It Penalized Financially Responsible Homeowners.** According to The Intercept, “When he was Oklahoma attorney general, Pruitt opted out of a federal program that would have helped some of these foreclosure victims. In 2012, when the federal government and 49 state attorneys general launched the National Mortgage Settlement to offer relief to people who lost their homes in the crisis, Oklahoma became the only state to reject its share of $1.5 billion earmarked for individuals. Pruitt, who had been elected the state’s attorney general in 2010, declined more than $10 million that would have gone to foreclosure victims in Oklahoma on the grounds that it penalized financially responsible homeowners.” [The Intercept, 12/28/17]

**2012: Pruitt Lists Oklahoma Athletic Cub Limited Partnership As Source Of Income Greater Than $5,000**. Scott Pruitt signed a statement of no change for 2012. He agreed that, “I hereby certify that there has been no change in any information reported in my Statement of Financial Interests for the calendar year prior to the calendar year for which this statement is due to be filed.” [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Statement of No Change, 2012]

### 2013

**2013: Pruitt Reelected As Chairman Of The Republican Attorneys General Association.** According to the Oklahoma GOP, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt Sunday was re-elected chairman of the Republican Attorneys General Association, a rare second term for the head of the RAGA executive committee. The nation’s 25 Republican attorneys general selected the chairman and executive committee members during RAGA’s winter annual meeting in Washington D.C.” [Oklahoma Republican Party, 2/25/13]

**2013: Pruitt Opposed Regional Water Pact In Oklahoma**. According to The Journal Record, “Pruitt’s brief is the third filed in the Supreme Court case this year. In January, the TRWD filed its argument. A short time later, the U.S. Office of the Solicitor General filed its argument. Both of those documents urge the high court to return the case to the 10th Circuit for another hearing. In Oklahoma’s brief, Pruitt said arguments from the TRWD and the United States were flawed. ‘Tarrant should not get a new opportunity to change positions, not least because the United States’ theory shares many of the same flaws as Tarrant’s,’ Pruitt said in the brief. Pruitt also seeks to shoot down the argument that the Red River Compact allows states to claim water from within the borders of another state.” [The Journal Record, 3/22/13]

**2013: Pruitt Sought Delay For Public Hearing On Electric Utility Environmental Plan**. According to The Journal Record, “A public hearing over a Tulsa electric utility’s environmental plan is still on, despite a request by Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt to delay it. Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality officials said no to Pruitt’s request on Friday. In a letter to Steven A. Thompson, DEQ executive director, Pruitt asked for a delay in a hearing regarding Public Service Company of Oklahoma’s proposed environmental compliance plan with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. ‘The public hearing scheduled for Monday is still on,’ said Skylar McElhaney, DEQ spokeswoman, in an email to The Journal Record.” [The Journal Record, 5/17/13]

### 2014

**2014**: **Pruitt Ran Unopposed For Attorney General For Reelection**. [Oklahoma Election Results, 2014]

**2014: “The New York Times Reported That A Letter Ostensibly Written By Pruitt Alleging That The Agency Over-Estimated Air Pollution From Natural Gas Drilling Was Actually Written By Lawyers For Devon Energy, One Of The State's Largest Oil And Gas Companies.”** According to Washington Post, “In 2014, the New York Times reported that a letter ostensibly written by Pruitt alleging that the agency over-estimated air pollution from natural gas drilling was actually written by lawyers for Devon Energy, one of the state’s largest oil and gas companies.” [Washington Post, 12/7/16]

**Nov. 2014 – Feb. 2016: Pruitt Was On RAGA’s Executive Committee.** [RAGA, [11/17/14](http://www.republicanags.com/news?page=10); Form 8871, [1/29/15](https://forms.irs.gov/app/pod/basicSearch/search?_eventId_displayForm=true&formId=83409&formtype=e8871&execution=e1s10), [2/1/16](https://forms.irs.gov/app/pod/basicSearch/search?_eventId_displayForm=true&formId=83409&formtype=e8871&execution=e1s10)]

**2014: Pruitt Filed Supreme Court Petition Challenging IRS Subsidies Under The ACA**. According to an article in the Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt announced Thursday he has filed a petition for certiorari with the U.S. Supreme Court to review Oklahoma's lawsuit challenging illegal IRS subsidies as part of the Affordable Care Act. Earlier this month, the Supreme Court said an identical case out of Virginia, King v. Burwell, was worthy of review. Pruitt is asking that Oklahoma's case be taken up and heard together with the corresponding case to ensure the high court hears the perspective of a sovereign state.” [Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, 11/21/2014]

### 2015-2017

**Pruitt Was Rule Of Law Defense Fund Chairman From November 2015 Until November 2016**. According to the Executive Branch Personnel Public Financial Disclosure Report, Scott Pruitt was a member of the Board of Directors of the Rule of Law Defense Fund from November 2016 to December 2016 and Chairman from November 2015 until November 2016. Pruitt was also a board member from April 2014 until November 2015. [Executive Branch Personnel Public Financial Disclosure Report, OGE Form 278e, [12/16/16](https://extapps2.oge.gov/201/Presiden.nsf/PAS%2BIndex/AF6B16678D423328852580A1002C747F/%24FILE/Pruitt%2C%20Edward%20Scott%20%20%20final278.pdf)]

**2016: Along With Then-Alabama Attorney General Luther Strange, Pruitt Wrote in Defense of Exxon Mobil on Questions of “Whether The Oil Giant Failed to Disclose Material Information About Climate Change.”** According to Washington Post, “An ally of the energy industry, Pruitt, along with Alabama Attorney General Luther Strange, came to the defense of ExxonMobil when it fell under investigation by attorneys general from more liberal states seeking information about whether the oil giant failed to disclose material information about climate change. ‘We do not doubt the sincerity of the beliefs of our fellow attorneys general about climate change and the role human activity plays in it,’ they wrote at the conservative publication National Review. ‘But we call upon them to press those beliefs through debate, not through governmental intimidation of those who disagree with them.’” [Washington Post, 12/7/16]

**December 2016: Pruitt Nominated By Donald Trump To Be Administrator Of EPA**. According to an article in the Washington Post, “President-elect Donald Trump on Thursday nominated Scott Pruitt, the attorney general of the oil and gas-intensive state of Oklahoma, to head the Environmental Protection Agency, a move signaling an assault on President Obama’s climate change and environmental legacy. Pruitt has spent much of his energy as attorney general fighting the very agency he is being nominated to lead.” [Washington Post, [12/8/16](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2016/12/07/trump-names-scott-pruitt-oklahoma-attorney-general-suing-epa-on-climate-change-to-head-the-epa/?utm_term=.5ad3d447e00c)]

**2017: America Rising Launched ConfirmPruitt.com.** According to Washington Post, “The conservative America Rising Squared, an arm of the Republican super PAC America Rising, recently launched ConfirmPruitt.com, with videos, op-eds, fact sheets and a petition. There also is Protecting America Now, which recently sprang up to support Pruitt. A flier from the group, obtained by Politico, warned that millions of dollars are needed to counter anti-Pruitt efforts from ‘anti-business, environmental extremists.’ Last week, a coalition of nearly two dozen conservative advocacy groups backed his nomination, writing that he has ‘demonstrated his commitment to upholding the Constitution and ensuring the EPA works for American families and consumers.’” [Washington Post, 1/17/17]

**2017: National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) Announced Seven-Figure Ad Buy in Support of Pruitt Confirmation.** According to Washington Post, “And on Friday, frustrated by the latest federal regulation of vehicle fuel standards, the National Association of Manufacturers announced a seven-figure, multistate advertising campaign to press for Pruitt’s confirmation.” [Washington Post, 1/17/17]

**February 2017: Senate Confirmed Pruitt As EPA Administrator**. On February 17, 2017 the United States Senate voted 52-46 to confirm Scott Pruitt as administrator of the EPA. [United States Senate, Roll Call 71, [2/17/17](https://www.senate.gov/legislative/LIS/roll_call_lists/roll_call_vote_cfm.cfm?congress=115&session=1&vote=00071)]

## Religion

Pruitt was born in 1968 in Danville, Kentucky. He grew up in Lexington. According to press reports, Pruitt was a devout Christian. Baptist News wrote that he was a“Southern Baptist layman who sits on the Board of Trustees at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.” Moreover, the publication wrote that Pruitt was “a member and deacon at First Baptist Church in Broken Arrow.

**Pruitts Are Members Of The First Baptist Church Of Broken Arrow.** According to the Oklahoma Attorney General’s office, “The Pruitts are members of the First Baptist Church of Broken Arrow, where Pruitt serves as deacon.” [Oklahoma Attorney General, about Scott Pruitt, accessed [3/15/17](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/profile.html)]

**Pruitts Pruitt Is Deacon At The First Baptist Church Of Broken Arrow.** According to the Oklahoma Attorney General’s office, “The Pruitts are members of the First Baptist Church of Broken Arrow, where Pruitt serves as deacon.” [Oklahoma Attorney General, about Scott Pruitt, accessed [3/15/17](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/profile.html)]

**Pruitt Was A “Southern Baptist Layman Who Sits On The Board Of Trustees At Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.”** [Baptist News, [12/8/16](https://baptistnews.com/article/trump-picks-a-southern-baptist-to-run-the-epa/#.WE7vTOYrJhE)]

**Pruitt Was “A Member And Deacon At First Baptist Church In Broken Arrow, Okla., Elected To The Southern Baptist Convention Seminary’s Trustee Board In 2012.”** [Baptist News, [12/8/16](https://baptistnews.com/article/trump-picks-a-southern-baptist-to-run-the-epa/#.WE7vTOYrJhE)]

**Pruitt Taught Sunday School; Attended Mission Trips To Romania And Israel**. According to EE News, “Pruitt has been a Sunday school teacher and has gone on mission trips to Romania and Israel.” [EE News, [1/4/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060047801)]

**2006: Tulsa World: “Pruitt Said It Was Religion And His Association With The First Baptist Church Of Broken Arrow That Made Him Decide Oklahoma Was Home.”** According to Tulsa World, “Pruitt said it was religion and his association with the First Baptist Church of Broken Arrow that made him decide Oklahoma was home. He grew up in the small town of Danville, Ky., and went to college at Georgetown College in Kentucky. Pruitt selected the University of Tulsa for law school. Shortly after arriving, Pruitt said he telephoned his grandfather. ‘I told him I was scared and wanted to come home.’ Pruitt said his wife, Marlyn, ever the practical one, said that they should stay at least a month since the rent was paid. They started attending the First Baptist Church of Broken Arrow, and the church people became their Oklahoma family. The Pruitts have lived in Broken Arrow ever since. Marlyn, a registered nurse, quit work when their daughter, McKenna, was born. They also have a son, Cade. Pruitt often comments: ‘We are Oklahomans by choice.’” [Tulsa World, 8/13/06]

**1998: Pruitt Was “A Member Of The Largest Baptist Church In Broken Arrow.”** According to Tulsa World, “Scott Pruitt is the 30-year-old lawyer who ousted the veteran Republican state senator, Ged Wright, in the September runoff election. Pruitt, an employment lawyer, now faces Shannon Clark, a state ranger who resigned his post to run for the job. Clark brings desire and an acceptable level of capability to the contest. The forces of Sen. Wright, and now Clark, portray Pruitt as a captive of the radical right wing Christian Coalition. And let’s be clear: Certainly the Christian right wing is supporting Pruitt. But Pruitt is more in the old Southern Baptist school of separation of church and state. A member of the largest Baptist church in Broken Arrow, he is bound to attract supporters from that church and from the broader church community in the district.”

**1998: Pruitt “Said He And His Wife Have Been ‘Pondering And Praying’ About [Running For State Senate] For The Past Two Years.”** According to Tulsa World, “The contest for state Senate District 54, representing parts of Tulsa and Wagoner counties, features two men who are in their first campaign, but who have planned this move for some time. Scott Pruitt, 30, said he and his wife have been ‘pondering and praying’ about the decision for the past two years. It has been a good one so far, as Pruitt moves to the Nov. 3 general election following a convincing defeat of 16-year Republican incumbent Ged Wright in the September runoff. ‘I have a passionate desire to serve the people of this community,’ said Pruitt, who has exhaustively campaigned door-to-door for months. ‘I can’t think of a more fulfilling thing to do.’” [Tulsa World, 10/10/98]

**Baptist News: “Since His Election As 17th Attorney General Of The State Of Oklahoma In 2010, Pruitt Has Gone On Record Opposing Same-Sex Marriage And Abortion.”** “Since his election as 17th attorney general of the state of Oklahoma in 2010, Pruitt has gone on record opposing same-sex marriage and abortion. An LGBT advocate labeled him ‘head bully’ in opposition to 2016 guidelines by the federal government suggesting transgender and gender nonconforming students be permitted to use public restrooms corresponding to their gender identity rather than the sex assigned on their birth certificate.” [Baptist News, [12/8/16](https://baptistnews.com/article/trump-picks-a-southern-baptist-to-run-the-epa/#.WE7vTOYrJhE)]

**Baptist News: “An LGBT Advocate Labeled Him ‘Head Bully’ In Opposition To 2016 Guidelines By The Federal Government Suggesting Transgender And Gender Nonconforming Students Be Permitted To Use Public Restrooms Corresponding To Their Gender Identity Rather Than The Sex Assigned On Their Birth Certificate.”** “Since his election as 17th attorney general of the state of Oklahoma in 2010, Pruitt has gone on record opposing same-sex marriage and abortion. An LGBT advocate labeled him ‘head bully’ in opposition to 2016 guidelines by the federal government suggesting transgender and gender nonconforming students be permitted to use public restrooms corresponding to their gender identity rather than the sex assigned on their birth certificate.” [Baptist News, [12/8/16](https://baptistnews.com/article/trump-picks-a-southern-baptist-to-run-the-epa/#.WE7vTOYrJhE)]

**Baptist News: “Pruitt Fought A 2015 Ruling By The Oklahoma Supreme Court Ordering Removal Of A Ten Commandments Monument On The State Capitol Grounds.”** “Pruitt fought a 2015 ruling by the Oklahoma Supreme Court ordering removal of a Ten Commandments monument on the state Capitol grounds. Bruce Prescott, a retired Baptist minister who filed the lawsuit claiming the monument violated a constitution ban on state-sponsored religion, called Pruitt’s appointment to head up the EPA ‘worse than a fox guarding the hen house.’” [Baptist News, [12/8/16](https://baptistnews.com/article/trump-picks-a-southern-baptist-to-run-the-epa/#.WE7vTOYrJhE)]

Ideology

**Pruitt: “In This Country, That No Matter If You Are President, Senator, Or Oklahoma Attorney General, We Are All Constrained By Something Bigger Than Us, And That’s Called The Law.”** According to The Grove Sun, “Pruitt said that is how socialist and communist countries operated but that the U.S. was not designed to be ruled in that manner. ‘In this country, that no matter if you are president, senator, or Oklahoma Attorney General, we are all constrained by something bigger than us, and that’s called the law,’ Pruitt said.” [The Grove Sun, 4/8/13]

**Pruitt: “Too Much Power Concentrated In The Hands Of Too Few People Directly Affects Your Liberty.”** According to Enid News And Eagle, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt spoke to Enid Noon AMBUCS Friday, sharing his thoughts on federalism, workers’ compensation fraud and the death penalty. Pruitt opened his remarks on the expansion of federal power -- particularly executive power -- with a quote from John Adams: ‘The jaws of power are always open to devour, and her arm is always stretched out, if possible, to destroy the freedom of thinking, speaking and writing.’ ‘Too much power concentrated in the hands of too few people directly affects your liberty,’ Pruitt told the AMBUCS.” [Enid News And Eagle, 3/15/13]

**Pruitt: “The Dysfunction And Partisanship In Washington Is Not Acceptable.”** According to Enid News And Eagle, “Pruitt said he wondered, what is it about us that people look at us with longing? Now, though, Pruitt said the impasse affecting both houses of Congress is damaging to the country. ‘The dysfunction and partisanship in Washington is not acceptable,’ he said. ‘That means attorneys general must respond to government overreach.’” [Enid News And Eagle, 10/21/13]

**Pruitt Called For Civility In Government**. According to Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, “During his remarks, Pruitt called for more understanding be-tween all levels of government, both state and federal, and to come up with compromises on substance, not personal values. ‘I think we need more civility in our political discourse,’ Pruitt said. ‘We need individuals that are more thoughtful in their communication and focus on content, focus on substance, to try to persuade and implore people toward outcomes. Let’s not demonize and get engaged in the lack of civility that we see.’” [Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, 12/8/15]

### Federalism at EPA

**“It's Time To Start Trusting The States” — Pruitt Aide.**According to E&E News, “U.S. EPA should use a lighter touch in its dealings with states, focusing on results instead of procedural requirements, Administrator Scott Pruitt’s top aides told state regulators today. ‘It’s really moving from this very paternalistic view of this agency that was created, you know, 40-plus years ago,’ Ken Wagner, senior adviser to Pruitt on regional and state affairs, told the Environmental Council of the States (ECOS) conference. Likening the EPA-states relationship to that of parents with grown children, Wagner added: ‘Lest you be living in your parents’ basement at 40, it’s time to start trusting the states.’ Troy Lyons, EPA’s associate administrator for congressional and intergovernmental affairs, highlighted the importance of a partnership between the two levels of government, accompanied by ‘an open and honest dialogue.’ The two were part of a panel discussion that also included several state regulators. While much of the conversation was couched in generalities, Wagner suggested EPA could better use its resources to audit, rather than directly review, state permitting decisions and then redirect its staff to more pressing responsibilities.” [E&E News, [7/17/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/07/17/stories/1060057497)]

**Pruitt Wanted To Give Power To States But Not All Of Them Want It.**According to E&E News, “States have had mixed responses to Pruitt’s message. Some argue that local officials are better-equipped to choose regulatory strategies that work best within their borders. Others say EPA has a vital role to play in managing air and water pollution, and it should not limit that role. Now Congress will be taking up the question of how much authority states should have in controlling pollution. The House Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Environment is holding a hearing tomorrow on ways states could play an increased role in EPA regulations. … But states are also leery of the environmental impact of an EPA potentially becoming less involved in pollution control. ‘We believe in a strong partnership between state agencies and EPA,’ said Dennis Schain, communications director for the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. ‘There are cases where involvement of EPA can be critical. We need EPA to be able to weigh in and settle issues that are interstate.’” [E&E News, [5/22/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/05/22/stories/1060054887)]

**Pruitt Talked Up Partnership With State Regulators.**According to E&E News, “U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt spoke to state environmental regulators today, espousing his pitch for ‘cooperative federalism’ as agency chief. In a speech at the Environmental Council of the States’ spring meeting in Washington, Pruitt said he aims to work with state agencies on cutting back pollution as well as rebuilding the country’s water infrastructure. The administrator laid out three principles for what he has planned for EPA, including adhering to the ‘rule of law’ and improving the rulemaking process at the agency. He also looked to appeal to state environmental agency leaders by saying he valued the partnership between EPA and the states. ‘Beyond rule of law, beyond process, is something that’s very near and dear to your heart, and that’s federalism. That’s cooperative federalism. Partnership,’ Pruitt said. Pruitt noted he already has met with several state regulators as well as governors to build up this relationship.” [E&E News, [4/7/17](http://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/04/07/stories/1060052820)]

**Pruitt ECOS Keynote May Detail Plan To Shift Environmental Work To States.**According to Inside EPA, “EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt will give the keynote speech later this week at the Environmental Council of the States’ (ECOS) spring meeting, where he might elaborate for the group of state regulators on his previously announced plan to shift environmental protection work to the states -- despite a proposed cut to EPA grants for states. At the same April 6-7 conference in Washington, D.C., Senate Environment & Public Works Committee (EPW) Chairman John Barrasso (R-WY) will also give a speech on ‘Environment, Energy, & the 115th Congress,’ which will likely address legislative efforts to roll back the Obama EPA’s energy regulations. It could also touch on how the Senate might respond to President Donald Trump’s proposed 31 percent cut to the agency’s budget.” [Inside EPA, [4/4/17](https://insideepa.com/daily-news/pruitt-ecos-keynote-may-detail-plan-shift-environmental-work-states)]

**Faced With Budget Cuts Pruitt Emphasized States’ Role.**According to E&E News, “In an appearance yesterday on ‘Fox News Sunday,’ Pruitt was questioned on whether the Trump administration was committed to protecting the environment, given the president’s budget plan for EPA — a 31 percent cut from the agency’s fiscal 2017 funding. ‘Over the last several years, there has been a lack of commitment to state partnership,’ Pruitt said, saying EPA would be renewing that partnership during his tenure. ‘This attitude in Washington, D.C., that people in Texas and Oklahoma and Kansas and Colorado and the rest of the country don’t care about the water they drink or the air they breathe and are not going to take care of the air and the water locally and states, I just don’t believe that,’ Pruitt said. ‘That narrative is something we reject,’ he said, ‘and we look forward to partnering with states across the country to achieve good outcomes.’” [E&E News, [4/3/17](http://www.eenews.net/eedaily/2017/04/03/stories/1060052479)]

**Pruitt Promoted Goal Of Working Locally To Solve Brownfield Problems.**According to C-Span, “The second thing I would share with you as far as objectives and working locally is in the brownfield area. It’s been a tremendous success as you know with respect to brownfields across this country. It is important that the EPA and us government continue to fund brownfield and some superfund sites that I mentioned to ensure that we have success on the back end. Many of you may not know this, many of you may not know this but I owned a baseball team in Oklahoma City. The mayor is not here today, I saw him last week but that baseball stadium that we leased and managed from Oklahoma City was off work brownfield project and the area in Oklahoma City was a cornerstone to leading to an NBA franchise in making its location a permanent home in Oklahoma City so I believe the brownfield program, the superfund program is extremely important that we focus our attention with funding and outcomes to help citizens at the local level.” [C-Span, [3/14/17](https://www.c-span.org/video/?425351-1/epa-administrator-scott-pruitt-delivers-remarks-national-league-cities-conference)]

**GOP States Urged Pruitt To “Restore” Federalism In New, Existing EPA Rules.**According to Inside EPA, “A coalition of Republican state officials, led by Texas Attorney General (AG) Ken Paxton, is urging EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt to ‘reexamine’ the agency’s delegation of authority to the states in new and existing rules and ‘restore’ the role that Congress envisioned for states in major environmental statutes. The states’ request appears to be a broad call to prioritize the regulatory balance between the agency and the states -- a message that Pruitt has been emphasizing since his confirmation late last month. In a March 7 letter to Pruitt, Paxton and Republican leaders from 18 other states wrote to request the new administrator ‘reexamine delegation of certain environmental regulation authority to the States in accordance with express terms of the Clean Air and Water Acts.’ The states charge that the Obama administration ignored the role of the states in environmental regulation, and they call on Pruitt to ‘restore’ the role of cooperative federalism in the agency’s actions as required by the air and water acts.” [Inside EPA, [3/7/17](https://insideepa.com/daily-news/gop-states-urge-pruitt-restore-federalism-new-existing-epa-rules)]

**State Officials Requested “Collaborative Arrangement” On Regulations.**According to E&E News, “Elected officials from 19 states are calling on U.S. EPA to adopt a more ‘cooperative’ stance in pursuing the goals of two pre-eminent environmental laws. During the last decade, the ‘extensive regulation’ from EPA ‘is directly at odds with the express terms and structure of the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act,’ Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton (R) and 18 other attorneys general and governors said in a letter today to agency Administrator Scott Pruitt. ‘We ask that as you assess the performance of your agency, you do so with a keen eye toward compliance with these governing laws and not repugnance to them.’ The Clean Air Act, for example, envisions a ‘collaborative arrangement’ under which the federal government preferably ‘provides technical and financial assistance’ to state and local regulators, the letter says. Instead, EPA ‘has replaced ‘encourage’ and ‘promote’ with ‘command’ and ‘commandeer,’ the signers add.” [E&E News, [3/7/17](http://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/03/07/stories/1060051093)]

**Pruitt Said DOJ Would Protect Federalism, Not EPA Federalism Unit**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “My understanding is that the Department of Justice, working in coordination with the EPA Office of General Counsel, represents EPA in litigation, and would thus serve to protect such federalism related interests.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “Concept Of Cooperative Federalism Is A Bedrock Principle Of The Clean Air Act.”** According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “The concept of cooperative federalism is a bedrock principle of the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act and other EPA-administered laws. Whether working to improve air quality, water quality or other important environmental objectives, Congress made achieving these a shared responsibility between the EPA and the states. If confirmed, I will respect the intention of Congress and relative statutory framework.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Pledged To Work With States On Climate Regulations**. According to questions submitted to the record Senator Booker asked, “Given the immediate and increasing threat to my constituents and to people everywhere, what is your plan to address climate change?” Pruitt wrote, “If confirmed, I will work to achieve the objectives of EPA-administered laws consistent with the process and framework established by Congress. I will work closely with the states in establishing and implementing regulatory standards to ensure a meaningful and effective advancement of these objectives.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Wanted States To Collaborate On Air Pollution**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I stated in my testimony before the Committee, I agree that the Clean Air Act gives EPA an important role in addressing interstate pollution issues, among many other things. I strongly believe in states working collaboratively to address crossborder environmental challenges and did so when I was the Attorney General of Oklahoma, including negotiating a historic agreement with my Democratic counterpart in the State of Arkansas to reduce pollutants into the scenic Illinois River. As Administrator, I intend to provide assistance to states as they work collaboratively in these issues. Where the Act contemplates a more direct role for EPA, such as with respect to Section 110(a)(2)(D) and the "good neighbor" obligations of Section 110, I intend to engage in a transparent process that will allow states to have a meaningful opportunity to understand their obligations with regard to reducing emissions that cause or contribute to nonattainment or interference with maintenance in other states through the SIP process.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said He Would Not Oppose States Setting Greenhouse Gas Emission Regulations**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “Yes, states are free to pursue regulatory measures to address greenhouse gas emissions under state legal authority.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**When Asked About Greenhouse Gas Reduction Efforts In Pacific Coast States Pruitt Said, “Congress Established A Clear Process By Which States May Set More Stringent Standards Subject To The Approval Of The Administrator.”** When asked, “Several states, including Oregon, Washington, and California, have taken steps to regulate and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Would you, as the leader of the EPA, attempt to undermine state-led attempts to combat climate change?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “I respect and believe the states have a very important role in setting and implementing environmental standards that reflect the needs, challenges and expectations of their local communities. Congress established a clear process by which states may set more stringent standards subject to the approval of the Administrator and based on the specific request made and the corresponding record submitted. If confirmed and if I receive any such requests, I will consider them consistent with applicable statutory framework established by Congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Called Green Infrastructure A “Neighborhood Solution.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “Green infrastructure is a good example of a neighborhood solution that can achieve compliance with national standards. I believe EPA should be supportive of such efforts. If confirmed, I will work to break down barriers within EPA to the use of green infrastructure.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Credited States With Success Of Clean Air Act**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “The success of the Clean Air Act is a direct result of the important partnership between the EPA and the states in developing and implementing its key programs. State regulators best understand the needs and uniqueness of local environmental challenges while the EPA is well positioned to set and adjust environmental safeguards that continue to improve the nation's air, land and water and protect public welfare. If confirmed as Administrator, I will adhere to the clear directives and process set out by Congress so that the agency can once again focus on fulfilling its core mission.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “Federalism Is A Real Concept, Grounded In Our Constitution.”** According to The Daily Ardmoreite, “‘Federalism is a real concept, grounded in our Constitution,’ Pruitt said. ‘What we deal with in our office is giving life to that. It’s important for our work.’” [The Daily Ardmoreite, 7/31/13]

**Pruitt Believed Clean Air And Clean Water Acts Drafted With Intent For States To Be Involved**. According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Pruitt, whose office is involved in several lawsuits against the EPA, said the Clean Air and Clean Water acts were drafted with the idea that states would be involved. ‘There was a recognition that states had to be a viable partner,’ Pruitt said. ‘States had to be the regulators under those acts because, after all, states are concerned about the safety and health of their citizenry and they know better how to balance the competing effects we see in the environmental arena than someone in Washington.’” [The Daily Oklahoman, 8/23/13]

Regulatory Philosophy

**Pruitt: “I Have Not Conducted A Comprehensive Review Of Existing EPA Regulations.”** According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “I have not conducted a comprehensive review of existing EPA regulations. As Attorney General, I have brought legal challenges involving EPA regulations out of concern that EPA has exceeded its statutory authority based on the record and law in that matter.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Could Not Name Any EPA Regulations That He Supported**. When asked, “Are there any other EPA regulations that are on the books today that you do support?” According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “I have not conducted a comprehensive review of existing EPA regulations. As Attorney General, I have brought legal challenges involving EPA regulations out of concern that EPA has exceeded its statutory authority based on the record and law in that matter.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “Regulations That Are Not On Solid Legal Foundation And That Cannot Survive Judicial Review Will Not Result In Environmental Protections.”** According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “I firmly believe that the EPA has a vital role, but it must do so within the bounds of its legal authority. The actions undertaken by the Office of Attorney General have been out of concern that EPA had exceeded its legal authority in those specific actions, not out of animosity toward the mission of the Agency or any specific regulation or statute. Regulations that are not on solid legal foundation and that cannot survive judicial review will not result in environmental protections.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would Not Say If Societal Impacts Would Be Considered In Future EPA Rulemaking**. When asked, “Assuming that costs should be considered in rulemakings, do you believe that externality costs – for example costs to society from impacts of a pollutant -- should be considered in addition to the financial costs of compliance?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I stated at the hearing, costs are important in the rulemaking process and the Courts have recognized that important factor. Environmental statutes, such as the Clean Air Act, prescribe when costs should be considered in a rulemaking. If confirmed, I commit to fully follow the law as provided by Congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Do Not Believe It Is The Mission Of The EPA To Promote One Type Of Energy Source Over Another.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I do not believe it is the mission of the EPA to promote one type of energy source over another. If confirmed as Administrator, I will fairly and equitably enforce the laws within the framework established by Congress and not pick winners and losers.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Regulatory Rollback in a Trump Administration.** In an interview in November of 2016, Pruitt stated that “[W]e have hope there is going to be regulatory rollback…The greatest opportunity that we have heading into this new administration.. is to provide certainty to business industries across this country… Well when you look at the EPA, and the role that it’s played over the last several years, there’s going to be substantial change in that agency. There’s going to be a regulatory rollback, and it needs to occur in the ways that we describe… The leaders of the EPA, the leadership of the Department of Energy, is going to be substantially important as we head in to this new administration. There should be much hope and optimism across the country for jobs and economic growth because Washington is going to be less consequential.” [The Hill, 11/20/16]

**Pruitt: When It Comes To Rule Making, “There Has To Be A Benefit You Are Seeking To Achieve Not Just Pick Winners And Losers And Try And Irradiate Fossil Fuels From The Energy Mix, Which Is Really The Art And Focus Of The EPA.”**[KTOK, Accessed [1/6/17](https://www.ok.gov/oag/Media/Radio_Interviews/)]

**Pruitt Said Agencies Have Become The Fourth Branch Of The Federal Government**. According to The Daily Ardmoreite, “Pruitt said agencies have, in effect, become the fourth branch of the federal government, and some have worked toward broadening their power without respect or consideration for the law or their own rules in place. ‘When you have an agency that says we can do things our way - they don’t say that - but this is how they act,’ Pruitt said. ‘They have rules, and ignore it.’” [The Daily Ardmoreite, 7/31/13]

**Pruitt: “I Believe The EPA Has An Anti-Fossil Fuel Mentality.”** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “‘They rejected it out of hand and they did so because I believe the EPA has an anti-fossil fuel mentality,’ Pruitt said. ‘They started with coal, and now it’s reached natural gas. ... You see that permeating the EPA’s approach to these laws. That’s the reason I think they are rejecting, and dis-missing and not respecting, the role of the states.’” [The Daily Oklahoman, 8/23/13]

**Pruitt: “Agencies Exist To Do One Thing: To Administer The Law As Passed By Congress.”** According to Muskogee Daily Phoenix And Times-Democrat, “‘We ought to care about what the law says, and we ought to care when Congress passes a statute and says agencies are authorized to do a certain thing that they don’t act in excess of the law,’ he said. ‘Agencies exist to do one thing: to administer the law as passed by Congress. If they do anything other than that - act as a super-legislative body or legislate in some way - they are acting inconsistent with their authority under the constitution and representative democracy falters.’” [Muskogee Daily Phoenix And Times-Democrat, 9/8/13]

**Pruitt: “Whether It’s EPA Through (Carbon Standards), EPA Through Regional Haze (Regulations) Or Fish And Wildlife Through Endangered Species, What We See Is A Regulatory Approach That Says ‘Fossil Fuels Are Bad, And We’re Going To Do All We Can To Elevate Renewables.”** According to Tulsa World, “Decisions by the Environmental Protection Agency and other Obama administration regulators are largely driven by an anti-fossil fuel agenda, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt told a meeting of oil and gas executives at the Mayo Hotel on Friday morning. ‘Whether it’s EPA through (carbon standards), EPA through regional haze (regulations) or Fish and Wildlife through endangered species, what we see is a regulatory approach that says ‘Fossil fuels are bad, and we’re going to do all we can to elevate renewables.’” [Tulsa World, 9/20/14]

**Pruitt: “Regulations Issued By Agencies Are Intended To Provide Certainty To Businesses**.” According to Tulsa World, “The Obama administration’s testing of regulatory limits is disrupting business activity, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt said Wednesday. ‘Regulations issued by agencies are in-tended to provide certainty to businesses,’ Pruitt told the Owasso Chamber of Commerce at the Bailey Education Foundation. ‘That’s what they do. They make things regular,’ he said. ‘I might not like a statute ... but if you know what to expect, you can plan. The law is static. It’s stable. It gives you confidence. You know you have to act a certain way.’” [Tulsa World, 8/6/15]

**Pruitt: “That’s What They Do. They Make Things Regular.”** According to Tulsa World, “The Obama administration’s testing of regulatory limits is disrupting business activity, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt said Wednesday. ‘Regulations issued by agencies are in-tended to provide certainty to businesses,’ Pruitt told the Owasso Chamber of Commerce at the Bailey Education Foundation. ‘That’s what they do. They make things regular,’ he said. ‘I might not like a statute ... but if you know what to expect, you can plan. The law is static. It’s stable. It gives you confidence. You know you have to act a certain way.’” [Tulsa World, 8/6/15]

**Pruitt: “Executive Branch Exists To Enforce The Law, The Legislative Branch Exists To Make The Law. I Know That Is Pretty Basic, But Our President Doesn’t Get That.”** According to Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, “With that said, however, Pruitt continued his attack on the Obama administration, saying regulatory agencies - such as the Environmental Protection Agency - do not have the understanding of basic ‘fifth-grade civics.’ ‘The Executive Branch exists to enforce the law, the Legislative Branch exists to make the law. I know that is pretty basic, but our president doesn’t get that,’ Pruitt said. ‘Our president told the EPA administrator, ‘No, we want to expand our authority, we are going to use regulation, executive regulatory action, to change legislative words and statutes.’ And so they did, and over 30 states sued.’” [Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, 12/8/15]

**Pruitt: “We Are Living Under A Regulatory State, We Are Not Living Under A State Where We Have Elected Representatives Making Decisions, And It Is Pretty Frustrating.”** According to Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, “‘We are living under a regulatory state, we are not living under a state where we have elected representatives making decisions, and it is pretty frustrating,’ Pruitt said. ‘Congress has shirked its responsibility and has not done its job in a number of years. What they have done is they... give that authority to an agency, let that agency take control and exercise power.’” [Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, 12/8/15]

**Pruitt: “Regulators Should Make Things Regular For The Industry They Regulate.”** According to Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, “Additionally, Pruitt said that even though legislators have given more power to regulatory agencies, those agencies are abusing that authority, especially when paired with an anti-fossil fuels mentality. ‘This is where regulators engage in wrong action,’ Pruitt said. ‘We have the EPA trying to pick winners and losers. Regulators should never pick winners and losers. Regulators should make things regular for the industry they regulate. They should make sure that it is applied fairly to everyone - whether that be in education, in banking, in energy and healthcare and the rest. It shouldn’t be that they use regulatory muscle to muscle someone out.’” [Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, 12/8/15]

### Rule of Law

**Pruitt: “We Need Government To Make A Commitment To The Rule Of Law. The Opposite Of That Is Anarchy.”** According to Enid News And Eagle, “Attorney General Scott Pruitt said Monday his counterparts across the country must work to make sure the federal government does not overreach its role in society. Pruitt discussed the issue of federalism while explaining two cases he has pending in federal court. The Constitution sets out the role of the federal government and the states, he said. Federalism has a vertical process of checks and balances, but he is concerned about its role in the states. ‘We need government to make a commitment to the rule of law. The opposite of that is anarchy,’ Pruitt said.” [Enid News And Eagle, 10/21/13]

**Pruitt: Federal Agencies Exhibit An Attitude That States Exist Merely To Implement Federal Policies… That Attitude Undermines The Rule Of Law**. According to The Journal Record, “Federal agencies exhibit an attitude that states exist merely to implement federal policies, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt said. States are required to enforce those rules regardless of the efficiency or cost, Pruitt said, as he addressed about 100 people during the annual meeting of the Energy Council on Friday. The two-day conference was at the Mayo Hotel and Convention Center in downtown Tulsa. The council is a legislative organization made up of 11 states and international affiliates from energy-producing regions in the United States, Canada and Venezuela. ‘That attitude undermines the rule of law,’ Pruitt said.” [The Journal Record, 9/19/14]

**Pruitt: “We’re Not Involved In This Litigation To Make A Policy Statement… It’s Not A Political Statement. It’s Something More Fundamental And, I Think, More Transcendent Than That. It’s Rule Of Law.”** According to Tulsa World, “Several Pruitt challenges to federal environmental rules and decisions are pending. As in the past, Pruitt said they are not prompted by ideology or policy but by ‘rule of law.’ ‘We’re not involved in this litigation to make a policy statement,’ Pruitt said. ‘It’s not a political statement. It’s something more fundamental and, I think, more transcendent than that. It’s rule of law.’” [Tulsa World, 9/20/14]

**“Pruitt Said His Job Is To Engage In The Rule Of Law.”** According to Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, “Pruitt said his job is to engage in the rule of law. It is not to file a lawsuit because he disagrees with policy decisions within the confines of authority, he said. ‘If you exceed that, if you disregard a statute and Congress says one thing and you do the other - that’s problematic,’ Pruitt said. ‘That is where rule of law is in jeopardy.’” [Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, 8/26/15]

Environmental Justice

**Pruitt “Familiar With Concept Of Environmental Justice.”** According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am familiar with the concept of environmental justice. As I testified, the Administrator plays an important role regarding environmental justice. I agree that it is important that all Americans be treated equally under the law, including the environmental laws.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would Not Agree With Senator Booker That Minorities Are More Impacted By Environmental Burdens**. According to questions submitted to the record Senator booker asked, “Decades of peer-reviewed academic and government research demonstrate that low-income communities and communities of color disproportionately experience environmental burdens compared to other populations in the United States. Do you agree with this conclusion? If not, why?” Pruitt replied, “As I testified at the hearing, I am familiar with the concept of environmental justice and believe the Administrator plays an important role in this regard. I agree that it is important that all Americans be treated equally under the law, including the environmental laws.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would Not Elaborate On Role Of Civil Rights Act And EPA**. According to questions submitted to the record Senator booker asked, “What do you believe are the legal obligations of EPA to ensure that recipients of EPA funds comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964?” Pruitt replied, “The obligations of recipients of federal funds are defined by the statutes and regulations to which you refer. Those statutes and regulations speak for themselves.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Was Not Familiar With National Environmental Justice Advisory Council**. According to questions submitted to the record Senator booker asked, “As Administrator will you continue to convene and implement the advice and recommendations of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council, a federal advisory committee to EPA since 1993?” Pruitt replied, “As I testified, the Administrator plays an important role regarding environmental justice. I am not personally familiar with the legal authorities or activities concerning this advisory committee but I would expect, if confirmed, to be briefed by staff about ongoing programs and activities before taking any action. If confirmed, I would work to faithfully execute the laws EPA is responsible for administering, in order to protect human health and the environment for all Americans. If confirmed, I would expect EPA to operate in an open and transparent manner, consider the views of stakeholders as appropriate, act based on sound science, and follow the laws as established by Congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Not Familiar With Executive Order 12989 On Environmental Justice**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am not familiar with what steps EPA has or has not taken undertaken to implement this Executive Order [12989]. If confirmed, I will work to ensure that EPA complies with all applicable Executive Orders.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Unfamiliar With Environmental Justice Analysis**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am not familiar with the environmental justice analysis referenced in this question. If confirmed, I will work to ensure EPA conducts the required analysis to support its regulatory actions in accordance with applicable statutory requirements and Executive Orders.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Unfamiliar With Possible EPA Civil Enforcement Litigation Settlements**. When asked, “There are currently some forty pending civil enforcement actions in which EPA is discussing possible settlement terms or pursuit of litigation. In the past during a transition in power such pending actions have proceeded unimpeded. Will you follow this precedent and let them progress at their own pace or will you intervene?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am unfamiliar with the specific details of the actions referenced in the question. I would expect to be briefed by staff, in consultation with the Department of Justice as appropriate, before taking any action.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Had No Plan On How To Address Impact Of Climate Change On Communities Of Color**. When asked, “How will you address the disproportionate effect of environmental contamination on low-income communities of color?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “If confirmed, I will expect to be briefed by staff about EPA's programs and statutory authorities in this area.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would “Adhere To The Applicable Statutory Authorities” To Address Environmental Justice**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “I believe environmental justice for low-income and minority communities is an important role of the EPA Administrator. If confirmed, I will adhere to the applicable statutory authorities to fulfill EPA’s mission to protect human health and the environment for all of our nation's citizens.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “Unfamiliar With EPA’s Role And Statutory Authorities As They Relate To Affordable Housing.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am unfamiliar with EPA’s role and statutory authorities as they relate to affordable housing. I am concerned about the impact regulations can have on the cost of energy for consumers.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

Federalist Philosophy

**2010: Pruitt Announced Intention to Use “New Office of Federalism” to Undermine Clean Air Protections.** Pruitt’s 2010 website stated that “In addition to bringing suit against the Obama Administration’s newly passed health care mandates, the new Office of Federalism will defend Oklahomans against agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency when its regulations seek to establish climate and energy policy absent congressional action, and the Nat'l Highway Traffic & Safety Administration in setting new fuel-economy standards.” [Pruitt for Attorney General, 2010, Accessed 12/7/16]

**The Daily Oklahoman: “Pruitt Said Oklahomans Needn't Be Concerned That All The Time He Has Spent Battling Federal Actions That He Believes Infringe On States' Rights And Individual Liberties Have Distracted Him From Important State Issues.”** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Pruitt said Oklahomans needn’t be concerned that all the time he has spent battling federal actions that he believes infringe on states’ rights and individual liberties have distracted him from important state issues. ‘At the same time that we’re engaged on health care and at the same time we’re engaged on regional haze and these other areas ... , our workers’ comp fraud unit last year prosecuted the most cases it has ever prosecuted and we’re on track to exceed that this year,’ he said. Pruitt said he has an entire criminal appeals unit dedicated to making sure justice is administered to individuals who have harmed Oklahomans. He then proceeded to rattle off a long list of state issues his office has been handling on a day-to-day basis. ‘We’re just doing our job,’ he said. ‘All those things are important and we’re doing all of those things, I think, in a meaningful way.’” [The Daily Oklahoman, 10/7/12]

**2012: Pruitt On Why “He Has Chosen To Devote So Much Of His Time And Office’s Resources To Combating New Federal Laws And Administrative Actions: ‘It’s All About Making Sure The Enumerated Powers - The Limited Powers That Are Vested In The Federal Government - Are There. And If There Is An Expansion Or Overreach Beyond That, The States Step In.’”** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Pruitt sat down with a reporter from The Oklahoman recently to discuss why he has chosen to devote so much of his time and office’s resources to combating new federal laws and administrative actions. The former state senator insists it’s not a matter of partisan politics. ‘It’s all about making sure the enumerated powers - the limited powers that are vested in the federal government - are there. And if there is an expansion or overreach beyond that, the states step in,’ Pruitt said. ‘That’s exactly the role, I would say, of the modern-day AG.’ Pruitt was one of 28 state attorneys general who sued in an effort to stop federally mandated health insurance, commonly referred to as Obamacare.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 10/7/12]

**2012: The Daily Oklahoman: “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt Says Fighting To Make Sure Federal Officials Don’t Exceed Their Constitutional Authority May Be The Most Important Role He Plays As Oklahoma’s Attorney General.”** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt says fighting to make sure federal officials don’t exceed their constitutional authority may be the most important role he plays as Oklahoma’s attorney general. Elected as just the second Republican attorney general in state history in November 2010, Pruitt has quickly gained a national reputation for his Don Quixote-like advocacy of federalism and relentless efforts to challenge any federal law or action that he sees as an infringement on individual liberties or states’ rights.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 10/7/12]

**2012: Pruitt On Overturning EPA Regulations: “That’s An Important Victory For Oklahomans … That’s Federalism In Action.”** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “He also was one of several attorneys general who sued the federal Environmental Protection Agency over its efforts to override state-proposed regional haze standards and impose its own, more stringent, antipollution standards. ‘That federal plan, at the time, was going to force utility companies in the state of Oklahoma to spend approximately $2 billion-plus over a 3-year period, which would have caused utility rates to be raised during that same 3-year period by 15 to 20 percent,’ he said. The 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals recently issued an order preventing the EPA from implementing the plan before the case can be litigated. ‘That’s an important victory for Oklahomans,’ he said. ‘That’s federalism in action.’” [The Daily Oklahoman, 10/7/12]

**2012: The Daily Oklahoman: “Pruitt Led 12 Other State Attorneys General In Filing A Freedom Of Information Request In August Designed To Find Out What Behind-The-Scenes Communication Has Been Going On Between The EPA And The National Environmental Groups.”** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Pruitt now wants to know whether the EPA has been secretly coordinating with national environmental groups that have filed a series of what appear to have been friendly lawsuits alleging violations of the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act. The EPA agreed to quick settlements in many such cases, paying huge attorneys fees and agreeing to consent decrees that have resulted in stringent standards while usurping the role of states as partners with the federal government in developing and implementing antipollution standards, Pruitt said. ‘This hasn’t just happened once or twice,’ he said. ‘This has happened dozens of times .... If they’re doing this as a strategy to try to adopt policies and impose substantive requirements on the states that they couldn’t get passed through the regulatory process or through the legislative process, it’s wrong and we’ll take corrective steps.’ Pruitt led 12 other state attorneys general in filing a Freedom of Information request in August designed to find out what behind-the-scenes communication has been going on between the EPA and the national environmental groups.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 10/7/12]

**The Daily Oklahoman: “Pruitt Said He And The Other Attorneys General Filed Their Court Actions Because They Didn't Believe The Federal Government's Power To Regulate Commerce Granted It The Authority To Compel People To Buy Health Insurance.”**According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Pruitt said many people regard federalism as just a topic for academic discussions, but the regional haze issue illustrates how court battles over federalism can have huge economic consequences for average Oklahomans. Pruitt cited the Supreme Court case over federally mandated health care insurance as another example. Pruitt said he and the other attorneys general filed their court actions because they didn’t believe the federal government’s power to regulate commerce granted it the authority to compel people to buy health insurance. The Supreme Court agreed with that point, but upheld key portions of the health care act under the federal government’s authority to tax. Even so, Pruitt said he regards the limitations the Supreme Court placed on the Commerce Clause as an important partial victory. Pruitt said he is gearing up for another potential federalism fight that could pose a gigantic risk to Oklahoma’s economy.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 10/7/12]

**Pruitt Pushed For State Control Of Fracking.** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “There have been discussions at the federal level about the EPA and federal Bureau of Land Management potentially asserting regulatory authority over hydraulic fracturing, an oil and natural gas drilling technique that Pruitt contends has been regulated successfully for decades at the state level. Technological advancements in hydraulic fracturing have fueled the current oil and gas boom by enabling the commercial extraction of huge reservoirs of oil and natural gas that previously had been locked in massive shale formations. Some of those formations are located near populated areas back East, where residents haven’t had much past experience with oil and gas drilling. Environmentalists in those areas have been calling for increased federal regulation because of concerns about potential water contamination. If federal agencies were to implement regulations curtailing hydraulic fracturing, it would have a huge impact on Oklahoma’s multibillion dollar oil and gas industry. Pruitt said he is prepared to battle to maintain state regulatory control.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 10/7/12]

Political

**Pruitt Would Not Answer Question On Why Trump Statements On EPA Should Be Disregarded**. When asked, “Please tell us why we should disregard the President-elect’s statement on the EPA, disregard your actions and only believe your words that you will support clean air and clean water laws?” According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I testified, I support the EPA's mission to protect human health and the environment. If confirmed, I will faithfully execute the environmental laws enacted by Congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said He Would Not Retaliate Against EPA Employees Who Work On Climate**. When asked, “Pruitt, will you agree that there will be no retaliation against EPA employees who work on climate change issues?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “If confirmed, yes.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would Not Say If Special Interest Money Was Given To Other AGs Or Members Of EPW Committee**. When asked, “Has any of the special interest money gone to other Attorneys General that may or may not sue the EPA if you are confirmed?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “Without additional context to help me understand your question, I cannot answer it.” When asked, “Has any of this special interest money gone to any member of the EPW Committee that will vote on your confirmation and serve as your oversight committee in the Senate if you are confirmed?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “Without additional context to help me understand your question, I cannot answer it. In any event, I have no knowledge of the fundraising activities of the members of this committee.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would Not Provide Senators With List Of Charitable Donations**. When asked, “Please list any deductible or nondeductible charitable donations you made in the last three years, including, for each contribution, the name of the recipient and the amount.” Scott Pruitt wrote, “I have complied with the reporting obligations from the Office of Government Ethics and the EPW Committee.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt “Unaware” Of Role Of Public Affairs In EPA Scientific Data; “I Commit To Thoroughly Reviewing The Policy And To Follow Applicable Laws And Federal Guidance Regarding Scientific Integrity, Information Quality, And Transparency.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “If confirmed, it will be a privilege to work with EPA scientists and the thousands of other public servants at EPA. I have no first-hand knowledge of the role of the public affairs office as referenced in the question and, if confirmed, I expect to learn more about the office. Indeed, I fully believe, as former EPA administrators have stated, that sound, objective science must serve as ‘the backbone’ of EPA actions. I have no first-hand knowledge of the specific scientific integrity policy referenced in the question and, if confirmed, I commit to thoroughly reviewing the policy and to follow applicable laws and federal guidance regarding scientific integrity, information quality, and transparency.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said He Was Unfamiliar With The Removal Of Climate Data From EPA Website**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “I have not been briefed on any changes to the EPA website following the transfer of power from the Obama Administration to the Trump Administration. That being said, I commit to reviewing the materials that are included on the EPA site if I am confirmed.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Claimed No Affiliation With Protecting America Now**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am not affiliated in any way with ‘Protecting America Now,’ and thus have no ability to disband the organization. For the same reason, I have no knowledge of the group’s donors.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Claimed To Have Never Met Rick Berman.** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I do not recall ever having met Mr. Berman. I am not aware of any communications with Mr. Berman, but a request for such information can be made to the Office of Attorney General pursuant to Oklahoma's Open Records Act.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Refused To Answer If His Campaign Received Max Donations From Koch Industries, Exxon, Ad Devon Energy**. When asked, “During the 2010 election cycle, did Devon Energy and Koch Industries max out to your campaign? During the 2014 election cycle, when you ran unopposed, did Devon, Koch Industries, and ExxonMobil max out to your campaign? How much total money has “Scott Pruitt for Attorney General” received from fossil fuel and agricultural interests? Please list your fossil fuel and agricultural donors, dates, and amounts.” Scott Pruitt wrote, “A full list of contributors to my campaigns for the state senate and attorney general may be found at the Oklahoma Ethics Commission's websites.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

Electoral History

State Senate

Mr. Pruitt’s told reporters in 1998 that he decided to run for State Senate after prayerful consideration and his faith has influenced many of his decisions while he served. “Since his election as 17th attorney general of the state of Oklahoma in 2010, Pruitt has gone on record opposing same-sex marriage and abortion. An LGBT advocate labeled him ‘head bully’ in opposition to 2016 guidelines by the federal government suggesting transgender and gender nonconforming students be permitted to use public restrooms corresponding to their gender identity rather than the sex assigned on their birth certificate.”

**1998-2006: Pruitt Served Eight Years In The Oklahoma State Senate Before Becoming Attorney General.** According to Scott Pruitt’s website, “Before being elected attorney general, he served eight years in the Oklahoma State Senate where he was a leading voice for fiscal responsibility, religious freedom and pro-life issues. Pruitt and his wife, Marlyn, have been married 25 years and have two children, McKenna and Cade.” [Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/28/16](https://www.ok.gov/oag/Media/About_the_AG/)]

* **Pruitt Served Broken Arrow, Coweta And Tulsa In The Oklahoma State Senate For Eight Years.** According to RAGA, “Before being elected Attorney General, Pruitt served Broken Arrow, Coweta and Tulsa in the Oklahoma State Senate where he served for eight years, four of those as Assistant Republican Floor Leader. Attorney General Pruitt used his experience in the Legislature to transform the AG’s Workers’ Compensation and Insurance Fraud Unit and the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit.” [RAGA, accessed [11/28/16](http://www.republicanags.com/scott_pruitt)]

**2001-2003: Pruitt Was Republican Whip**. [LinkedIn, accessed [3/15/17](https://www.linkedin.com/in/e-scott-pruitt-3b771653/)]

**2003-2006: Pruitt Was Republican Assistant Floor Leader**. [LinkedIn, accessed [3/15/17](https://www.linkedin.com/in/e-scott-pruitt-3b771653/)]

**1998**

**1998: Pruitt Elected With 64 Percent Of The Vote** **To State Senate 54th District.** According to Daily Oklahoman, “37 of 37 precincts - 100 percent x-Scott Pruitt, GOP 9,971 - 64 per cent Shannon T. Clark, Dem 5,728 - 36 percent” [Daily Oklahoman, 11/4/98]

**1998: Pruitt “Said He And His Wife Have Been ‘Pondering And Praying’ About [Running For State Senate] For The Past Two Years.”** According to Tulsa World, “The contest for state Senate District 54, representing parts of Tulsa and Wagoner counties, features two men who are in their first campaign, but who have planned this move for some time. Scott Pruitt, 30, said he and his wife have been ‘pondering and praying’ about the decision for the past two years. It has been a good one so far, as Pruitt moves to the Nov. 3 general election following a convincing defeat of 16-year Republican incumbent Ged Wright in the September runoff. ‘I have a passionate desire to serve the people of this community,’ said Pruitt, who has exhaustively campaigned door-to-door for months. ‘I can’t think of a more fulfilling thing to do.’” [Tulsa World, 10/10/98]

**1998: AP: “Long-Time Sen. Ged Wright, R-Tulsa, Was Defeated By Challenger Scott Pruitt In The Republican Runoff In Senate District 54. With All 32 Precincts Reporting, Pruitt Of Broken Arrow Had 2,326 Votes, Or 56 Percent, To Wright's 1,803 Votes, Or 44 Percent.”** According to The Associated Press State & Local Wire, “State Rep. Charles Key has lost his re-election bid to a fellow Republican who said the hard-fought campaign was a referendum on Key’s conspiracy theories about the Oklahoma City bombing. John Nance defeated Key, R-Oklahoma City, with 797 votes, or 55 percent, to Key’s 644 votes, or 45 percent, according to complete but unofficial returns in Tuesday’s election in 17 Oklahoma City precincts. ‘I feel good about it,’ Nance said Tuesday. ‘We tried to do what was right.’ In another race, long-time Sen. Ged Wright, R-Tulsa, was defeated by challenger Scott Pruitt in the Republican runoff in Senate District 54. With all 32 precincts reporting, Pruitt of Broken Arrow had 2,326 votes, or 56 percent, to Wright’s 1,803 votes, or 44 percent. Wright sought re-election to a fifth four-year term. Pruitt will face Democrat Shannon Clark of Broken Arrow in the Nov. 3 general election.” [The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 9/16/98]

**1998: Pruitt’s District “Cover[ed] Southeastern Tulsa County And Part Of Wagoner County.”** According to Tulsa World, “Sen. Gerald Wright and Rep. Charles Key are two veteran state lawmakers whose political fates will be decided on Tuesday. The Republican legislators received less than half the vote in their Aug. 25 party primaries and were propelled into runoff races that culminate on Tuesday. In all, there are two state Senate runoffs and four House runoffs. Wright, a 16-year incumbent who is seeking another four-year term, faces Broken Arrow attorney Scott Pruitt in the Senate District 54 GOP runoff. The district covers southeastern Tulsa County and part of Wagoner County.” [Tulsa World, 9/13/98]

**1998: In Low-Turnout Primary, Pruitt Beat Incumbent Gerald Wright By 140 Votes To Move To The Runoff Election.** According to The Associated Press State & Local Wire, “Only 21 percent of Oklahoma voters took part in Oklahoma’s gubernatorial primary, the lowest turnout in 50 years, officials said Wednesday … In District 54, incumbent Republican Gerald Wright was forced into a runoff with Scott Pruitt. Pruitt got 1,959 votes and Wright had 1,820.” [The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 8/26/98]

**1998: Pruitt Was The Youngest Senator At Age 30.** According to Tulsa World, “In the Senate, Scott Pruitt, a Broken Arrow Republican, is the youngest at 30.” [Tulsa World, 11/18/98]

**2000**

**2000: Pruitt Was Elected By Republican Caucus As Republican Whip.** According to MiLB, “Pruitt was elected to the State Senate in November of 1998, where he completed two four-year terms. After winning his bid to the Oklahoma State Senate over a 16-year incumbent, Pruitt became one of the most respected and influential voices in the Senate on crucial economic and social policies. He was elected by the Republican caucus to serve as Republican Whip in 2000 and as Assistant Republican Floor Leader in 2002, a position he held until 2006.” [MiLB, accessed [11/28/16](http://www.milb.com/content/page.jsp?sid=t238&ymd=20080408&content_id=382335&vkey=team4)]

**2002**

**Pruitt Ran Unopposed In Senate Reelection**. [Oklahoma Secretary of State, Unopposed Candidate List, 2002]

**2002: Pruitt Was Elected By Republican Caucus As Assistant Republican Floor Leader.** “Pruitt was elected to the State Senate in November of 1998, where he completed two four-year terms. After winning his bid to the Oklahoma State Senate over a 16-year incumbent, Pruitt became one of the most respected and influential voices in the Senate on crucial economic and social policies. He was elected by the Republican caucus to serve as Republican Whip in 2000 and as Assistant Republican Floor Leader in 2002, a position he held until 2006.” [MiLB, accessed [11/28/16](http://www.milb.com/content/page.jsp?sid=t238&ymd=20080408&content_id=382335&vkey=team4)]

United States Congress

**2001**

**2001: Pruitt Ran For The First Congressional District Seat, Faced Sitting Governor’s Wife.** According to Tulsa World, “Cathy Keating said Monday that running for the 1st Congressional District as the wife of the state’s governor has its disadvantages as well as advantages. It’s a disadvantage in that running for Congress the way most people know me is as first lady -- they don’t know me for my qualifications,’ Keating said. Keating, state Rep. John Sullivan of Tulsa and state Sen. Scott Pruitt of Broken Arrow, are seeking the Republican Party nomination for the 1st District House seat Steve Largent, R-Okla., will vacate Nov. 29 to make a race for governor.” [Tulsa World, 6/26/01]

**2001: Pruitt Lost GOP Primary, Failed To Make Runoff With Only 23 Percent Of The Vote.** According to Tulsa World, “State Rep. John Sullivan, in a stunning upset, fell just short Tuesday of winning the 1st District Republican primary outright over first lady Cathy Keating and state Sen. Scott Pruitt. ‘I’m shocked,’ Sullivan said. ‘I was just hoping to get into the runoff.’ Sullivan and Keating will now battle it out in a Jan. 8 runoff. Meanwhile, Tulsa attorney and former school board member Doug Dodd, who faced only token opposition, easily won the Democratic nomination. With all 259 precincts counted, unofficial returns showed Sullivan, R-Tulsa, captured 19,018 or 46 percent of the vote, compared to 12,736 (30 percent) for Keating and 9,513 (23 percent) for Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow.” [Tulsa World, 12/12/01]

**2001: After Defeat, Pruitt Endorsed Sullivan.** According to The Associated Press State & Local Wire, “‘I basically gave him the bill,’ Rice said. Sullivan now credits Pruitt, who has since endorsed him, with getting his abortion provision inserted into Rice’s bill, but during the legislative session he attempted to deny Pruitt credit. In the end, Sullivan said he deserved credit along with Pruitt because he negotiated the bill with the Senate, took the bill to the House floor and led the debate there.” [The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 12/30/01]

Lieutenant Governor

**2006: Pruitt Ran For Lt. Governor Against The Speaker Of The House.** According to Tulsa World, “In this fall’s race for lieutenant governor, Republican candidate Todd Hiett is expected to bring in more than $1 million in campaign contributions, thanks largely to the transfer of $670,000 from his House speaker war chest … Late last year, there was the possibility that Hiett might run for governor. However, after Lt. Gov. Mary Fallin announced she was giving up her post to run for Congress, Hiett said he would seek that post. Sen. Scott Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow, also has joined the race for the second-highest office in the state.” [Tulsa World, 4/9/06]

**Pruitt Received 33% Of Vote In Three Way Primary.** According to the Oklahoma Secretary of State, Scott Pruitt received 33.73% of the vote in a three-way primary for Lt. Governor. Fellow Republican Todd Hiett won with 42.82% while Nancy Riley received 23.46% of the vote. [Oklahoma Secretary of State, Primary Election Results, [7/25/06](https://www.ok.gov/elections/Election_Info/Election_Results/2006_Primary_Election.html)]

**Pruitt Lost The Runoff Election By 2,400 Votes, Then Endorsed Opponent Hiett.** According to The Associated Press State & Local Wire, “State Sen. Scott Pruitt, disappointed at losing the Republican runoff for lieutenant governor by a mere 2,400 votes, vowed Wednesday to support the GOP nominee and said he may seek another political office in the future. Oklahoma House Speaker Todd Hiett narrowly won Tuesday’s Republican runoff following a heated primary campaign in which Hiett and Pruitt traded accusations in negative television ads that helped make the race the most expensive for Oklahoma’s second-highest executive job in state history.” [The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 8/23/06]

**Pruitt: “Did Believe Hard. We Did Work Hard. We Just Fell A Little Short.”** According to The Associated Press State & Local Wire, “ ‘Yes, I am disappointed,’ said Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow, who gave up the Senate seat he held for eight years to run for lieutenant governor. ‘We did believe hard. We did work hard. We just fell a little short.’ Pruitt said he experienced ‘a range of emotions’ in the hours following the election but plans to support Hiett in the Nov. 7 general election. Hiett, R-Kellyville, will face state House Minority Leader Jari Askins of Duncan, winner of the Democratic runoff for lieutenant governor, and independent E.Z. Million.” [The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 8/23/06]

**Pruitt: “It’s Not About Politics. It’s About Doing Things That Are Right.”** According to The Associated Press State & Local Wire, “‘It’s the right thing to do for my colleagues,’ Pruitt said. ‘It’s not about politics. It’s about doing things that are right.’ Hiett, noting that Pruitt performed well in Tulsa County, said Pruitt’s support ‘is very valuable to me.’ ‘I appreciate greatly his willingness to endorse the campaign,’ Hiett said. Hiett described himself and Pruitt as ‘tough contenders’ and said it should be no surprise that their campaigns were spirited. The campaign turned negative after Pruitt ran TV ads that said state spending had increased more than 31 percent during the two years that Hiett had served as speaker. ‘When attacked, you have to respond,’ Hiett said. ‘There were references that were not correct. We set the record straight.’ ‘I sought to be factual all the way through the process,’ Pruitt said.” [The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 8/23/06]

**Pruitt Came In Second With 34 Percent In The Primary, Faced OK House Speaker In Runoff.** According to The Associated Press State & Local Wire, “The costliest campaign for lieutenant governor in state history will get even more expensive as candidates for the Republican and Democratic nominations face each other in runoff contests. Oklahoma House Speaker Todd Hiett and state Sen. Scott Pruitt will meet again in a runoff for the GOP nomination on Aug. 22. State Rep. Jari Askins and political newcomer Pete Regan will be in a runoff for the Democratic nomination. Republican Lt. Gov. Mary Fallin’s decision to run for Congress opened the seat up for the first time in 12 years, and candidates are spending record sums of money to be elected to an office that has few duties and in the past wielded little political power. Hiett has spent $1.2 million seeking the GOP nomination. Pruitt has spent about $860,000. The lieutenant governor’s role as president of the Senate and a tiebreaker in the 48-member body will make the position pivotal if the Senate is evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans after this fall’s round of legislative elections. Democrats hold a 25-23 majority in the Senate and Republicans have never controlled the body. In a 24-24 tie, the lieutenant governor would cast the deciding vote and determine which party is in control. The hotly contested primary elections produced no clear winner because no candidate received more than 50 percent of the vote. Hiett, the first Republican House speaker in more than 80 years, received 43 percent of the vote to 34 percent for Pruitt. A third candidate, state Sen. Nancy Riley of Tulsa, received 23 percent.” [The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 7/26/06]

**2006: The Oklahoman: “Pruitt, Managing General Partner Of The Oklahoma Redhawks Minor League Baseball Team In Oklahoma City, Said He Believes In Negotiating But Not Compromising.”** According to The Oklahoman, “Pruitt, managing general partner of the Oklahoma RedHawks minor league baseball team in Oklahoma City, said he believes in negotiating but not compromising. ‘I believe that you can go into a negotiation and accomplish your objectives without leaving behind what you really believe,’ he said. Riley, in the middle of her second four-year term in the Senate, said she is running to let Oklahomans know their state is the best in the nation. ‘People are ready to hear about all the good things about Oklahoma instead of all the negative about Oklahoma,’ she said.” [The Oklahoman, 7/21/06]

**2006: Tulsa World: “House Speaker Todd Hiett And State Sen. Scott Pruitt Are Seeking The Lieutenant Governor's Post To Bolster Their Political Careers, Not Because They Are That Interested In The Job, Said State Sen. Nancy Riley, Who Is Running A Low-Key, Underfinanced Race For The July 25 Primary Nomination.”** According to Tulsa World, “The two leading Republican candidates for lieutenant governor are vying to be considered the ‘most conservative,’ the third GOP candidate in the race says. House Speaker Todd Hiett and state Sen. Scott Pruitt are seeking the lieutenant governor’s post to bolster their political careers, not because they are that interested in the job, said state Sen. Nancy Riley, who is running a low-key, underfinanced race for the July 25 primary nomination. A dispute over who gets the credit for a tax cut recently approved by the Legislature is an example, Riley observed. When Pruitt sponsored a bill calling for a large cut in personal income taxes, Hiett latched onto the measure when it reached the House and called it his own. Hiett had proposed cutting the tax rate from 6.25 percent to 5.85 percent. Pruitt’s bill called for lowering the tax to 4.9 percent. Riley, R-Tulsa, voted against the tax cut bill.” [Tulsa World, 7/10/06]

**2006: Pruitt Ran For Lt. Governor Against The Speaker Of The House.** According to Tulsa World, “In this fall’s race for lieutenant governor, Republican candidate Todd Hiett is expected to bring in more than $1 million in campaign contributions, thanks largely to the transfer of $670,000 from his House speaker war chest … Late last year, there was the possibility that Hiett might run for governor. However, after Lt. Gov. Mary Fallin announced she was giving up her post to run for Congress, Hiett said he would seek that post. Sen. Scott Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow, also has joined the race for the second-highest office in the state. ‘I think that it is not right to raise money for one position and then transfer it to another office,’ Pruitt said. Pruitt said his disagreement is not with Hiett, but with the Ethics Commission. Pruitt said he objects to the Ethics Commission rule that required him to report contributions from his Senate campaign when he did not intend to use any of that money for his lieutenant governor’s race. Hiett’s last campaign report showed that he had raised about $840,000 for his lieutenant governor campaign. Matt Pinnell, Pruitt’s campaign manager, said subtracting the money transferred from Hiett’s House war chest means he had only raised about $140,000 for the lieutenant governor’s race. Meanwhile, Pruitt had raised about $328,000 in that period.” [Tulsa World, 4/9/06]

Attorney General

**2010**

**Pruitt Elected Attorney General; Defeated Democrat Jim Priest**. According to the Encyclopedia of American Politics, “The Oklahoma Attorney General election of 2010 was held on November 2, 2010. Incumbent Drew Edmondson had announced in 2009 that he would not pursue re-election. Former Republican State Sen. Scott Pruitt won the race to replace Edmondson, beating out Democrat Jim Priest.” [Encyclopedia of American Politics, accessed [3/15/17](https://ballotpedia.org/Oklahoma_Attorney_General_election%2C_2010)]

* **Pruitt Won 65% Of Vote.** According to the Encyclopedia of American Politics, Pruitt won 65.1% of vote compared to 34.9% for Democrat Jim Priest. [Encyclopedia of American Politics, accessed [3/15/17](https://ballotpedia.org/Oklahoma_Attorney_General_election%2C_2010)]

**Pruitt Was Second Republican Elected AG In Oklahoma.** According to the Oklahoma Attorney General’s office, “He is the second Republican in the history of the state to hold the office, which oversees 80 attorneys.” [Oklahoma Attorney General, about Scott Pruitt, accessed [3/15/17](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/profile.html)]

**2014**

**Pruitt Ran Unopposed For Attorney General For Reelection**. According to the Encyclopedia of American Politics, “Pruitt ran for re-election without opposition as Oklahoma Attorney General in 2014. He formally announced on July 29, 2013 that he would seek re-election, with energy executive Harold Hamm serving as his campaign chairman.” [Encyclopedia of American Politics, accessed [3/15/17](https://ballotpedia.org/Scott_Pruitt#cite_note-officeof-5)]

Republican Attorneys General Association

**2012-2014: Scott Pruitt Elected Twice As Chairman of the Republican Attorneys General Association.**  [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [2/25/13](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/3E67F1CEE13BC090862572B2005AD559/D7D0CEB8FCE468C886257B1D007738BE)]

**2014-2015: Scott Pruitt Was on the Executive Committee of RAGA.** [RAGA, accessed [12/20/16](http://www.republicanags.com/raga_announces_leadership)]

**RLDF and NAAG**

**Pruitt Was Rule Of Law Defense Fund Chairman From November 2015 Until November 2016**. According to the Executive Branch Personnel Public Financial Disclosure Report, Scott Pruitt was a member of the Board of Directors of the Rule of Law Defense Fund from November 2016 to December 2016 and Chairman from November 2015 until November 2016. Pruitt was also a board member from April 2014 until November 2015. [Executive Branch Personnel Public Financial Disclosure Report, OGE Form 278e, [12/16/16](https://extapps2.oge.gov/201/Presiden.nsf/PAS%2BIndex/AF6B16678D423328852580A1002C747F/%24FILE/Pruitt%2C%20Edward%20Scott%20%20%20final278.pdf)]

**2012: Pruitt Elected Chairman Of The Midwestern Region Of The National Association Of Attorneys General**. According to a press release, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt was elected chairman of the Midwestern Region of the National Association of Attorneys General (NAAG) by his colleagues during the association’s meeting this week in Anchorage, Alaska. He also will serve on the NAAG Executive Committee. ‘I am honored to play a leading role among the nation’s attorneys general to target some of the critical issues we face,’ Pruitt said. ‘As the new chairman, I very much look forward to working with my fellow attorneys general to tackle concerns important to Oklahomans and the nation.’” [Press Release, [6/22/12](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/3E67F1CEE13BC090862572B2005AD559/27E7C5E72C0110FE86257A250060D0BF)]

## Private Practice

After graduating law school in 1993, Pruitt founded Christian Legal Services to “defended the rights of individuals to practice their faith when government tries to tell them no.” In 1994, he defended an organization who’s representatives were teaching bible lessons in public schools, saying that they were “spreading the gospel of Jesus Christ.” In 1997, Pruittrepresented a former clerk-treasurer who was charged with embezzling more than $250,000 from a local community.

**1993-1998: Pruitt Was An Attorney With A Private Practice.** According to Scott Pruitt’s LinkedIn, Pruitt was an Attorney with a Private Practice from 1993 to 1998. According to his LinkedIn, “Worked in private practice, specializing in constitutional and employment law.” [Scott Pruitt LinkedIn, accessed [11/28/16](https://www.linkedin.com/in/e-scott-pruitt-3b771653)]

**“Pruitt Worked In Private Practice Five Years Specializing In Constitutional And Employment Law In A Firm Called Christian Legal Services.”** “After passing the Oklahoma bar exam Pruitt worked in private practice five years specializing in constitutional and employment law in a firm called Christian Legal Services. He served eight years in the state Senate before becoming co-owner and managing general partner of the Oklahoma City Redhawks Triple-A baseball team for seven years.” [Baptist News, [12/8/16](https://baptistnews.com/article/trump-picks-a-southern-baptist-to-run-the-epa/#.WE7vTOYrJhE)]

**2010: Pruitt Ad: “The Simple Fact Is We Need An Attorney General That Knows How To Fight The Reach Of The Federal Government. I’ve Been Doing That Since The First Day I Got Out Of Law School And Initially Opened Christian Legal Services Inc. I Have Successfully Defended The Rights Of Individuals To Practice Their Faith When Government Tries To Tell Them No.”** [The Oklahoman, 7/22/10]

**Pruitt Focused On Civil Litigation As A Private Attorney.** According to the Associated Press, “Pruitt said he’s practiced law for 17 years and his practice has involved ‘predominantly civil litigation,’ focusing on employment discrimination. He said ‘the civil responsibilities of the attorney general are as great or greater than the criminal responsibilities.’” [The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 7/16/10]

**Tulsa World:** **“In 1993, His First Year Out Of Law School, Pruitt Was Assigned A Case Involving A Tahlequah Woman Who Worked With The State Department Of Human Services. She Wanted To Hold Bible Study In Her Home But Was Prohibited Because Of A Federal Regulation Saying That She Couldn’t.”** According to Tulsa World, “In 1993, his first year out of law school, Pruitt was assigned a case involving a Tahlequah woman who worked with the state Department of Human Services. She wanted to hold Bible study in her home but was prohibited because of a federal regulation saying that she couldn’t because it was possible those attending the Bible study might be her clients seeking welfare from the state. ‘We won the federal lawsuit,’ Pruitt said.” [Tulsa World, 8/13/06]

**1994: Pruitt Defended An Organization That Engaged In “Spreading The Gospel Of Jesus Christ.”** According to Daily Oklahoman, “A Midwest City minister, dubbed the ‘Bible Man’ for his Bible lessons in public schools, must pay $ 253 in damages to a Seminole County family who had sued New Lima schools for allowing the lessons, a federal jury ruled Thursday. The jury found that George Warrington and Bible Fellowship Inc., a religious organization associated with Warrington, were liable for damages to Karen and Harold Hughes. The trial, which began Monday in Oklahoma City federal court, was to determine only the amount of any damages. It already had been decided that Warrington’s activities were unconstitutional. In 1992, the New Lima school district entered into an out-of-court settlement with the Hughes and banned the ‘Bible Man’ from making any religious presentations at the school. The Hughes’ attorney, Micheal Salem, said he was happy with the award. The trial was not about money, he said. Salem said his clients objected both to the content of Warrington’s presentations and that they were occurring in school. Warrington used the King James version of the Bible while the Hughes used the Revised American Standard Bible, he said. ‘The jury held Bible Fellowship was liable for an indifference to my clients’ constitutional rights,’ Salem said. ‘My clients wanted Bible Fellowship to accept responsibility for their actions. They had an opportunity to settle it for $ 1. We made that offer to them. ‘Warrington and Bible Fellowship had denied that they were liable for any damages. The Hughes, who are legal guardians of their two grandsons, accepted $ 25 in damages from the school district in that settlement. Bible Fellowship is an independent, non-profit corporation in Dallas engaged in ‘spreading the gospel of Jesus Christ,’ said Scott Pruitt, attorney for Warrington and the organization. The jury found that Bible Fellowship’s general director, Oliver Price, was not individually liable for damages.” [Daily Oklahoman, 1/28/94]

**1997: Pruitt Represented Former Clerk-Treasurer Who Was Charged With Embezzling More Than $250,000.**  According to Tulsa World, “Linda Surmount, the former clerk-treasurer for the town of Kiefer, was charged Monday with embezzling more than $ 250,000 from town accounts. Surmount, 49, was charged with four counts of embezzlement by trustee and one count of false accounts by a trustee. An affidavit by Creek County Sheriff Larry Fugate said Surmount admitted Aug. 14 that ‘she did take money’ from town accounts. Surmount, who resigned in April after 17 years in office, surrendered late Monday, accompanied by her attorneys, Scott Pruitt and Jack Gordon. She was released on $ 5,000 bail pending a district court arraignment Oct. 13, when she will enter a plea. ‘Linda is responding well and handling it as well as could be expected,’ said Pruitt.” [Tulsa World, 10/7/97]

**Pruitt Had Virtually No Experience Arguing Before A Jury As Lawyer**. According to an article in The Oklahoman, “Pruitt’s campaign provided a civil trial cover sheet…listing him as one of two attorneys who represented a defendant in a civil rights trial that was argued before a jury in 1994. However, state and federal court dockets don’t show Pruitt has argued before a jury. Asked this week how many cases he had argued before juries, Pruitt told The Oklahoman: ‘I have not done that calculation. The courtroom experience that I have had has been at all stages of litigation.’” [The Oklahoman, 10/18/10]

* **Pruitt Never Handled A Criminal Case As An Attorney**. According to an article in The Oklahoman, “Priest is a career attorney. Pruitt practiced law for a couple of years before serving as a state senator and becoming managing partner of the Oklahoma RedHawks baseball team Neither candidate has been a prosecutor nor handled a criminal case.” [The Oklahoman, 10/18/10]
* **Transcript Showed Pruitt Never Argued Before A Jury As A Lawyer**. According to an article in The Oklahoman, “Attorney general candidate Scott Pruitt never spoke to the jury at a 1994 civil trial his campaign cited last week as proof the candidate has jury trial experience. Pruitt, a Republican, was in the courtroom to assist another attorney in the case, which saw jurors rule against their client. A transcript of the trial shows Pruitt never presented arguments or evidence to the jury.” [The Oklahoman, 10/21/10]
* **Pruitt’s Campaign Downplayed Importance Of Jury Trials As A Lawyer**. According to an article in The Oklahoman, “‘Jury trials are rare and verbal arguments before a jury does not qualify one, in and above itself, to be at-torney general,’ Pruitt’s campaign manager, Tyler Laughlin, said in a statement. ‘Scott is not a trial lawyer. He is a businessman who has extensive legal, negotiating, political and government experience.’” [The Oklahoman, 10/21/10]
* **Pruitt Legal Experience Often As Co-Counsel**. According to an article in The Oklahoman, “Pruitt's legal experience has often been as co-counsel, Laughlin said.” [The Oklahoman, 10/21/10]

**Oklahoman: “Most Civil Cases Pruitt Has Handled Were Settled Out Of Court Or Dismissed For Other Reasons Before Going To Trial.”** According to an article in The Associated Press, “Records show most civil cases Pruitt has handled were settled out of court or dismissed for other reasons before going to trial. ‘I litigated those cases to the objective the client had,’ Pruitt said.” [Associated Press, 11/3/10]

## Giant Partners

Edmond, OK-based Giant Partners was an Edmond, Oklahoma-based consulting firm that “offered coaching services to leaders and companies to help them grow.” One of its founders, Jeremie Kubicek called it a “revenue-generating firm.” The firm has split into four entities: the overarching group GiANT Capital, GiANT Impact (now Leadercast), GiANT Partners (now Magellan Executive Partners), and GiANT Worldwide.

Scott Pruitt was an “Executive Partner” at Giant from 2007 until 2010. He has not received significant financial support from his former colleagues: only one donated to his 2010 Attorney General campaign, in the amount of $250.

**2007: Pruitt Was Named an Executive Partner of Giant Partners in June.** According to The Journal Record, “Oklahoma City-based Giant Partners recently added four names to its list of executives - Pattye Moore, Richard Christman, Taylor Keen and Scott Pruitt.” [The Journal Record, 6/1/07]

* **Pattye Moore, Richard Christman, Taylor Keen Hired At Same Time As Pruitt**. According to The Journal Record, “All four were hired as executive partners. Moore is the former president of Sonic Corp. and current owner of Pattye More and Associates, a business consulting company. Christman spent 30 years as chief executive officer of Case New Holland, and the last two years heading up The GSI Group, an agriculture equipment company. Keen was executive vice president of Cherokee Nation Enterprises Inc. Currently, he serves as a legislator for the Cherokee Nation. Pruitt is general managing partner of the Oklahoma RedHawks and a former state senator. Executive partners work with Giant Partners in Oklahoma City and their Atlanta-based company, Giant Impact, to offer strategic planning and leadership services designed to impact the heads and hearts of chief executive officers, their management teams and their companies. Giant Partners is a growth firm offering strategic planning and advisory services, as well as leadership conferences and resources to select companies dedicated to growth.” [The Journal Record, 6/1/07]

**Pruitt Had a Bio Page That Highlighted His Chairmanship of ALEC’s Civil Justice Task Force.** According to Giant Partners, “Scott Pruitt was elected to the Oklahoma State Senate in 1998 after a competitive, grassroots campaign. His victory over a 16-year incumbent was no surprise to people who knew Pruitt well. He had already earned a reputation for being a hardworking, serious competitor. As a kid in Kentucky, Pruitt could most often be found on a baseball field. And in college, he played 2nd base for the Kentucky Wildcats whose winning record brought them to within one game of the College World Series. After graduation, he hung up his cleats and moved to the great state of Oklahoma where he attended law school at the University of Tulsa. The tenacity, passion and capacity for leadership developed on the baseball diamond served him well in elected office as well as business. During his tenure in the Senate, Pruitt became one of the most respected and influential voices in the Senate on crucial economic and social policies. He was elected by his caucus to serve as Minority Whip in 2000 and as Assistant Minority Floor Leader in 2002. The Research Institute for Economic Development routinely named him among the top pro-business Senators.

**Pruitt Had a Bio Page That Highlighted His Chairmanship of ALEC’s Civil Justice Task Force.** According to Giant Partners, “In 2002, the American Legislative Exchange Council, a national bipartisan association of state legislators, chose him to serve as Chairman of their Civil Justice Task Force, a position which allowed him to develop model tort legislation with the best minds in the country on civil justice issues like lawsuit reform.” [Giant Partners, Archived [10/13/07](https://web.archive.org/web/20071013022447/http%3A/www.giantpartners.biz%3A80/OURTEAM/ScottPruitt/tabid/110/Default.aspx)]

**2007: Giant Partners: Pruitt was “Respected by Colleagues on Both Sides of the Aisle,” Worked on Workers Compensation Reform, Lawsuit Reform, and Tax Reform.** According to Giant Partners, “Respected by colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Pruitt became the leading spokesman for workers compensation reform. As a freshman senator, Pruitt envisioned a streamlined system that would provide greater benefits for injured workers at less cost to employers. His ideas propelled workers compensation to the top of the legislative agenda and radically altered the debate at the Capitol. Senator Pruitt has championed lawsuit reform, a common sense tax system, and greater accountability for government spending. He played a key roll in the successful effort to fund education first and worked to provide greater flexibility to local school districts to allocate state funds to the areas they need most. In 2004, Senator Pruitt returned to his baseball roots by becoming the General Managing Partner of the Oklahoma RedHawks, Oklahoma City’s lone Triple-A baseball club. Under his leadership, the RedHawks have seen a 42% increase in attendance and experienced in 2006 experienced the highest attendance in Oklahoma’s minor league baseball history. In the same time, season ticket sales soared 65%. In baseball, business, and at the legislature, Pruitt has achieved much in his young life, but he is most grateful for his wife Marlyn, and their two children, McKenna and Caden. He is devoted to his family and to his deep faith in God. The Pruitt’s are members of First Baptist, Broken Arrow, where Scott serves a Deacon.” [Giant Partners, Archived [10/13/07](https://web.archive.org/web/20071013022447/http%3A/www.giantpartners.biz%3A80/OURTEAM/ScottPruitt/tabid/110/Default.aspx)]

Pruitt Speaking Topics at Giant Partners Included:

Business of Sports

Let's Start A Country: Lessons On Leadership From Our Founding Fathers

[Giant Partners, Archived [10/13/07](https://web.archive.org/web/20071022024337/http%3A/www.giantpartners.biz/CONFERENCESRESOURCES/SpeakerRoster/tabid/115/Default.aspx)]

**2010: Pruitt Reported Commission As An Executive Partner At Giant Partners**. According to the Oklahoma Ethics Commission Pruitt reported income greater than $5,000 as an executive partner at Giant Partners. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2010]

* **Giant Partners Offered Coaching Services To Business Leaders**. According to Bloomberg, “Giant Partners LLC offers coaching services to leaders and companies to help them grow. The company conducts programs for CEOs, presidents, directors, senior executives, and division managers to learn how to reduce stress and develop executive communication skills. Giant Partners LLC was founded in 2002 and is based in Edmond, Oklahoma with an additional office in London.” [Bloomberg, accessed [12/9/16](http://www.bloomberg.com/research/stocks/private/snapshot.asp?privcapId=21823168)]

**Environmental Positions**

Clean Power Plan

**EPA To Revoke Clean Power Plan As Beyond Authority — OMB.**According to Politico, “EPA’s forthcoming review of the Clean Power Plan will propose revoking the landmark regulation ‘on grounds that it exceeds the statutory authority provided under section 111 of the Clean Air Act,’ according to an update to the White House’s Unified Agenda released today. The rule’s entry does not describe any time frame to propose repealing the rule, nor to finalize the repeal. EPA’s proposal has been under review at the Office of Management and Budget since June 8…WHAT’S NEXT: EPA in the coming months will release its proposed legal justification for repealing the Clean Power Plan, take public comment and finalize the decision. It is expected to face an immediate court challenge.” [Politico, [7/20/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/07/epa-to-revoke-clean-power-plan-as-beyond-authority-omb-says-090821)]

**Pruitt And Utility CEOs Discussed Clean Power Plan.**According to Politico, “At least 10 utility CEOs are expected to be there, according to a list of confirmed attendees viewed by POLITICO. They include Entergy’s Leo Denault, Duke’s Lynn Good, AEP’s Nick Akins, DTE’s Gerry Anderson, Ameren’s Warner Baxter, Exelon’s Chris Crane, PNM’s Pat Vincent-Collawn, Dominion’s Tom Farrell, Xcel’s Ben Fowke and Oklahoma Gas Electric’s Sean Trauschke. Municipals power companies and electric coops have also been invited, the sources said. Southern Co. CEO Tom Fanning was invited, a source said, but Fanning is scheduled to speak at the Mid-American Regulatory Conference in Chicago this afternoon. While the meeting is expected to focus on the Obama-era power plant emissions rule, one of the sources said other energy issues may come up. WHAT’S NEXT: EPA’s proposal for dealing with the Clean Power Plan is currently under review at the White House Office of Management and Budget. It is unclear whether EPA will propose a full repeal of the rule before potentially replacing it, or if the agency will instead seek to drastically scale it back through a new rulemaking.” [Politico, [6/19/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/06/pruitt-utility-ceos-to-discuss-clean-power-plan-today-089272)]

**Pruitt: “You Have Stays Of Enforcement Against That Clean Power Plan And There’s No Progress Being Made With Clean Air And We Are Also Spending Money On Litigation.”** According to Fox News Sunday, “Pruitt: Look -- look, Chris, I mean, I think what we have to keep in mind is that EPA only possesses authority that the Congress gets it. The EPA has tried twice to regulate CO2. One, with the tailoring rule, and the Supreme Court struck it down in the UR decision, and secondly, the Clean Power Plan that the president introduced in 2015, which is subject to a U.S. Supreme Court stay. As much as we want to see progress made in clean air and clean water, with an understanding that we can also grow jobs, we had to do so within the framework of what Congress has passed. The tools have to be in a tool box. The past administration just made it up. They re-imagined authority on a statute. There’s a commitment with the new administration to have a pro-growth, pro-environment approach to these issues, but also to respect rule of law. You talked about many times, the regulatory overreach, about executive fiat that the previous administration engaged in. We can’t continue that process because what happens, Chris, is clean air is not advanced because you have litigation such as the Clean Power Plan. You have stays of enforcement against that Clean Power Plan and there’s no progress being made with clean air and we are also spending money on litigation.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

**Pruitt Would Not Say What Policies He Would Implement In Place Of The Clean Power Plan**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “It would be inappropriate for me to prejudge an issue that may come before me for decision if I am confirmed as Administrator. If the issue comes before me, I will ensure that the issue is fully and fairly considered with input from staff, as part of a transparent process that seeks input from stakeholders, and that is consistent with EPA's statutory authorities.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Am Unable To Say Whether United States Utilities And Electric Cooperatives Would Or Would Not Return To Coal As A Predominant Portion Of Their Fuel Mix If The Clean Power Plan Were Revoked.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am unable to say whether United States utilities and electric cooperatives would or would not return to coal as a predominant portion of their fuel mix if the Clean Power Plan were revoked or other regulations were cut back. The federal Energy Information Administration projects that coal will be an important part of the American fuel mix for the foreseeable future.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: Clean Power Plan Is “One Of The Most Ambitious Ever Proposed, Will Shutter Coal-Fired Power Plants, Significantly Increase The Price Of Electricity For American Consumers, And Enact By Executive Fiat The Very Same Cap-And-Trade System Congress Has Rejected.”** According to an op-ed written by Scott Pruitt in Tulsa World, “Sadly, this isn’t the first time we’ve seen this tactic of advancing the climate change agenda by any means necessary. President Obama’s Clean Power Plan is a particularly noteworthy example. This EPA regulation, one of the most ambitious ever proposed, will shutter coal-fired power plants, significantly increase the price of electricity for American consumers, and enact by executive fiat the very same Cap-and-Trade system Congress has rejected.” [Tulsa World, [5/21/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/opinion/othervoices/scott-pruitt-and-luther-strange-an-un-american-prosecution-of/article_eff77ff4-8f6c-5646-84da-1f3204b89f54.html)]

**Pruitt Was Involved In Oral Arguments For CPP Case In DC Court**. According to Tulsa World, “Pruitt was among several state legal officers involved in oral arguments before the D.C. Court of Appeals for West Virginia v. EPA, a lawsuit challenging the Obama administration’s Clean Power Plan. West Virginia Solicitor General Elbert Lin is the lead litigator for the plaintiffs, but Pruitt and his office have been involved in preparing a considerable part of the case. ‘We’ve devoted substantial resources to the constitutional questions,’ Pruitt said. ‘That doesn’t mean we haven’t been involved in the rest of it, but we have focused on the that particular part.’” [Tulsa World, 9/28/16]

**Pruitt: “That Is Why We Are Part Of A Very Different Kind Of Coalition, A Coalition Of 29 States Seeking To Vindicate The Rule Of Law By Challenging The Legality Of The Clean Power Plan In Our Courts.”** According to an op-ed written by Scott Pruitt in Tulsa World, “That is why we are part of a very different kind of coalition, a coalition of 29 states seeking to vindicate the rule of law by challenging the legality of the Clean Power Plan in our courts. The 29 states and state Attorneys General who are part of this effort respect our proper role, which is neither to pick winners and losers in the energy sector nor to silence those with whom we disagree. Rather, our job is to hold the EPA accountable to the laws that created it and to fulfill our statutory duties to ensure that consumers in our states have access to reliable, affordable energy. We will continue to pursue those goals and to present our arguments in the courts and in the public square, treating our opponents with the respect they deserve.” [Tulsa World, [5/21/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/opinion/othervoices/scott-pruitt-and-luther-strange-an-un-american-prosecution-of/article_eff77ff4-8f6c-5646-84da-1f3204b89f54.html)]

**Pruitt: “No State Should Comply With The Clean Power Plan If It Means Surrendering Decision-Making Authority To The EPA. States Should Be Left To Make Decisions On Fuel Diversity That Best Meet Their Power Generation Needs.”** According to News Oklahoma, “Testifying before a Senate subcommittee, Pruitt said the Environmental Protection Agency is using an ‘obscure’ section of law to tell states what mix of sources they should use to generate electricity. ‘No state should comply with the Clean Power Plan if it means surrendering decision-making authority to the EPA,’ Pruitt said. States should be left to make decisions on fuel diversity that best meet their power generation needs.’” [News Oklahoma, [5/6/15](http://newsok.com/article/5416581)]

**Pruitt: “I Think At The End Of The Day, The Supreme Court Has Indicated That We're Going To Win On The Merits.”** According to a press release by Attorney General Scott Pruitt, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt said granting the stay gives states some clarity. His office joined in the stay appeal on behalf of Oklahoma and the Department of Environmental Quality. ‘They can sit back, take a breath and let the legal process work,’ Pruitt said Tuesday. ‘I think at the end of the day, the Supreme Court has indicated that we're going to win on the merits, as well. It's a huge step, and something that illustrates how seriously the Supreme Court is taking these types of issues.’” [Attorney General Scott Pruitt, [2/10/16](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=18424)]

**Pruitt: Clean Power Plan Would Force “Oklahoma Into Fundamentally Restructuring The Generation, Transmission And Regulation Of Electricity In Such A Manner That Would Threaten The Reliability And Affordability Of Power.”** According to an article in E&E News, “It was not the first time Attorney General Scott Pruitt (R) pursued litigation over the plan; he joined a group of other attorneys general in August in asking a federal court to delay the rule's timelines. Pruitt's office previously said a lawsuit was filed because the plan would force ‘Oklahoma into fundamentally restructuring the generation, transmission and regulation of electricity in such a manner that would threaten the reliability and affordability of power in the state.’” [E&E News, [1/7/16](http://www.eenews.net/interactive/clean_power_plan/states/oklahoma)]

**Pruitt Quickly Filed Challenge To Clean Power Plan.**According to an article in the Oklahoman, “Oklahoma's attorney general filed another legal challenge Friday to the Obama administration's Clean Power Plan to reduce greenhouse gases from power plants. The Environmental Protection Agency published the final rule in the Federal Register on Friday, and Attorney General Scott Pruitt said his office immediately filed a lawsuit in the federal appeals court for the District of Columbia. Pruitt called the plan unlawful and said it threatens the reliability and affordability of power generation across the nation.” [Oklahoman, [10/24/15](http://www.oklahoman.com/article/5455659?access=1827ceda39b2b458772560722b29995f)]

**Pruitt Joined The Lawsuit To Overturn The Clean Power Plan Due To Misuse Of The Clean Air Act.** According to a press release by Attorney General Patrick Morrisey, “Attorney General Patrick Morrisey, leading a coalition of 15 state Attorneys General, today filed a petition asking a court to issue an emergency stay to postpone deadlines imposed by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s Clean Power Plan while its legality is determined by the courts. ‘This rule is the most far-reaching energy regulation in the nation’s history, and the EPA simply does not have the legal authority to carry it out,’ Attorney General Morrisey said. ‘With this rule, the EPA is attempting to transform itself from an environmental regulator to a central planning agency for states’ energy economies. The Clean Air Act was never intended to be used to create this type of regulatory regime, and it flies in the face of the powers granted to states under the U.S. Constitution. The petition was filed Thursday afternoon with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit by Attorneys General from the states of West Virginia, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Wisconsin and Wyoming.’” [Attorney General Patrick Morrisey, [8/13/15](http://www.ago.wv.gov/pressroom/2015/Pages/Attorney-General-Patrick-Morrisey-Leads-15-State-Coalition-Asking-Court-to-Stay-EPA%27s-Clean-Power-Plan-Deadlines.aspx)]

**Pruitt: “The President Could Announce The Most ‘State Friendly’ Plan Possible, But It Would Not Change The Fact That The Administration Doesn’t Have The Legal Authority Under The Clean Air Act To Regulate Carbon Emissions.”** According to an article in Scripps Media, “Attorney General Scott Pruitt on Monday said the final version of the Clean Power Plan announced by the Administration is unlawful because the EPA does not have the legal authority under the Clean Air to regulate carbon emissions from the electricity generating plants covered by the final rule. ‘The president could announce the most ‘state friendly’ plan possible, but it would not change the fact that the administration doesn’t have the legal authority under the Clean Air Act to regulate carbon emissions from these sources because these sources are already being regulated and the Act prohibits this sort of double regulation. The most important detail left out today, however, is the fact the Clean Power Plan threatens the reliability and affordability of power for consumers and business across this country. Oklahoma is suing the EPA over the Clean Power Plan because we are asking the federal government to comply with the Clean Air Act, not because we need more time and flexibility to implement this unlawful plan. My office will continue to challenge the EPA as long as the administration continues to pursue this unlawful rule,’ Attorney General Pruitt said.” [Scripps Media, [8/3/15](http://www.scrippsmedia.com/kfaq/news/Attorney-General-Scott-Pruitt-Says-Final-Clean-Power-Plan-Still-Unlawful--320517142.html)]

**Pruitt, On The Clean Power Plan: “The EPA Does Not Possess The Authority Under The Clean Air Act To Do What It Is Seeking To Accomplish In The So-Called Clean Power Plan.”** According to Testimony Attorney General Scott Pruitt gave to the Environment and Public Works Committee, “This is an issue of major importance to states like Oklahoma. Quite simply, Madam Chairwoman, the EPA does not possess the authority under the Clean Air Act to do what it is seeking to accomplish in the so-called Clean Power Plan. The EPA, under this administration, treats states like a vessel of federal will. The EPA believes the states exist to implement the policies the Administration sees fit, regardless of whether laws like the Clean Air Act permit such action. In their wisdom, Congress gave states a primary role in emissions regulation, noting in the statement of policy of the Clean Air Act that “air pollution control at its source is the primary responsibility of states and local governments.” That statement respects the constitutional limits on federal regulation of air quality, and the reality that states are best suited to develop and implement such policies.” [Testimony to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, [5/5/15]](http://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.View&FileStore_id=60e46f76-2eb8-4761-bd88-b89b31f7d0ad)

**Pruitt: “My Office Will Continue Its Aggressive Challenge Of The EPA’s Unlawful And Overreaching Clean Power Plan To Protect The Interests Of Oklahoma.”** According to an article in the Bartlesville Examiner Enterprise, “In a statement, Attorney General Scott Pruitt said he was disappointed with Fallin’s veto. Pruitt’s office requested the bill. ‘Senate Bill 676 would not have been a great expense to the state,’ Pruitt said. ‘Rather, it ensured Oklahoma would not be forced to submit a compliance plan to the EPA that violated state or federal law. Nevertheless, my office will continue its aggressive challenge of the EPA’s unlawful and overreaching Clean Power Plan to protect the interests of Oklahoma.’” [Bartlesville Examiner Enterprise, [5/3/15](http://m.newsok.com/oklahoma-gov.-mary-fallin-vetoes-bill-expanding-attorney-generals-input-on-federal-carbon-rules/article/5415510/?page=2)]

**2015: Pruitt Wanted Full Hearing For Clean Power Plan**. According to Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt isn’t taking no for an answer when it comes to the state’s legal cases against the yet-to-be-finalized Clean Power Plan for electric generating plants. Judges at the appellate level and the district court level have tossed out Pruitt’s lawsuits against the Environmental Protection Agency’s proposed rules to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. But Pruitt joined more than a dozen states Friday in asking for a full rehearing before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in a lawsuit that was dismissed by a three-judge panel in June.” [Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, 7/26/15]

**Pruitt: “EPA’s Proposal Attempts To Use The Clean Air Act To Override States’ Energy Policies And Impose A National Energy And Resource-Planning Policy That Picks Winners And Losers Based Solely On EPA’s Policy Choices, Forcing States To Favor Renewable Energy Sources And Demand-Reduction Measures Over Fossil Fuel-Fired Electric Production.”** According to a comment submitted to the EPA on the Clean Power Plan and signed by Attorney General Pruitt, “On June 18, 2014, EPA proposed emission guidelines for carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired power plants, invoking its authority under Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (‘CAA’), 42 U.S.C. § 7411(d). Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units, 79 Fed. Reg. 34,830 (June 18, 2014) (hereinafter ‘Proposal’). EPA’s proposal attempts to use the Clean Air Act to override states’ energy policies and impose a national energy and resource-planning policy that picks winners and losers based solely on EPA’s policy choices, forcing states to favor renewable energy sources and demand-reduction measures over fossil fuel-fired electric production. But the Clean Air Act generally and Section 111(d) specifically do not give EPA that breathtakingly broad authority to reorganize states’ economies. ‘Congress . . . does not, one might say, hide elephants in mouseholes.’ Whitman v. Am. Trucking Ass’ns, Inc., 531 U.S. 457, 468 (2001). Congress did not hide the authority to impose a national energy policy in the ‘mousehole’ of this obscure, little-used provision of the Clean Air Act, which EPA has only invoked five times in 40 years. The proposed rule has numerous legal defects, each of which provides an independent basis to invalidate the rule in its entirety.” [Comment by Attorneys General Submitted to the EPA on the Clean Power Plan, [11/24/14](http://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/EPA%20Comment%20Letter%20111d%2011-24-2014.pdf)]

**Pruitt Argued The Clean Power Plan Should Be Withdrawn, Stating, “In The Existing Source Rule, EPA Omitted For The Docket 84 Percent Of The Modeling Runs On Which It Relied In Crafting The Proposed Rule, Without Which The States And The Public Cannot Comment Meaningfully On The Proposal.”** According to a letter written by Attorney General Pruitt concerning the Clean Power Plan, “In The Existing Source Rule and the Modified Sources Rule, EPA has repeated violated Section 307’s unambiguous requirements: In the Existing Source Rule, EPA omitted for the docket 84 percent of the modeling runs on which it relied in crafting the proposed Rule, without which the States and the public cannot comment meaningfully on the proposal. Specifically, the docket does not include 21 out of 25 of the Integrated Planning Model modeling runs cover projections for 2016, 2018, 2020, 2025, and 2030. This information is critical to assessing EPA’s claims that States and industry will be able to comply with the four “building blocks” in the Proposed Existing Source Rule. The states need the modeling run data for sufficient analysis of what that data shows on a unit by unit and state by state basis.” [Letter to Gina McCarthy, [8/25/14](http://energyfairness.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AGs-Letter.pdf)]

**Pruitt Sued EPA Over Federal Clean Power Plan**. According to a radio segment in NPR, “When StateImpact reported on President Barack Obama’s proposal to cut carbon emissions 30 percent nationally by 2030, mainly through less reliance on coal-fired power plants, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt’s reaction made it clear a lawsuit was coming. On Tuesday, it became official. Oklahoma joined West Virginia — which is leading the case — and 10 other states to sue the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.” [NPR Oklahoma, [8/6/14](http://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2014/08/06/oklahoma-attorney-general-scott-pruitt-sues-epa-over-federal-clean-power-plan/)]

**Pruitt Submitted A White Paper To The EPA About Problems With Clean Air Act Regulations**. According to a press release by the House Committee of Energy and Commerce, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt discussed states’ concerns over EPA’s expansive regulatory efforts being undertaken under the guise of the Clean Air Act. Pruitt, along with the attorneys general of 16 other states and one senior environmental regulator, recently submitted a white paper to EPA outlining concerns with EPA’s failure to properly defer to state authority under the Clean Air Act, and the implications of the agency’s planned power plant rules. Pruitt reiterated these concerns in his testimony today, stating, ‘The elimination of coal-based electric generation – which according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration is projected to provide 40 percent of U.S. electricity in 2014 – would result in higher electricity prices for ratepayers, and would be detrimental to the national and state economies, as well as job-creation in general. No doubt, increased electricity prices will hurt the competitiveness of American manufacturing.’” [House Committee of Energy and Commerce, [11/14/13](http://energycommerce.house.gov/press-release/subcommittee-reviews-epa%E2%80%99s-unworkable-power-plant-proposal-and-bipartisan-legislative)]

Executive Order Repealed Clean Power Plan

**Pruitt Said Executive Order To End CPP Was “Rejecting The Narrative That This Country Cannot Be Both Pro-Energy And Pro-Environment.”** At President Trump’s Executive Order signing EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt said, “Number one, the president, by his signature today is rejecting the narrative that this country cannot be both pro-energy and pro-environment. We have done that throughout our history. We can actually achieve good jobs, good growth and pro-energy policies at the same time as protecting our environment. The president is sending that message today, by his signature today on this executive order.” [EPA, Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-review-clean-power-plan-under-president-trumps-executive-order)]

**Pruitt On Climate EO: “We Are Not Going To Allow Regulations Here At The EPA To Pick Winners And Losers.”** At President Trump’s Executive Order signing EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt said, “But, number two, he’s also setting a pathway forward, a journey to say that we are no longer going to have regulatory assault on any given sector of our economy. That is going to end by the signing of this executive order. We are not going to allow regulations here at the EPA to pick winners and losers. And that is going to be very important as we chart the pathway forward.” [EPA, Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-review-clean-power-plan-under-president-trumps-executive-order)]

**Pruitt: “The EPA Should Pass Rules That Are Within The Framework That Congress Has Established.”** At President Trump’s Executive Order signing EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt said, “But, the third thing is that we are going to play within the rules. The EPA should pass rules that are within the framework that Congress has established. That sounds pretty novel, but that is exactly what should occur. We shouldn’t reimagine our authority to pick winners and losers.” [EPA, Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-review-clean-power-plan-under-president-trumps-executive-order)]

**Pruitt At EO Signing: “We Are Going To Provide Regulatory Certainty.”** At President Trump’s Executive Order signing EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt said, “We are going to provide regulatory certainty. So, the president is setting a new pathway forward that is going to literally make sure that we transform our economy, grow jobs and also protect our environment. And it’s an exciting day and I appreciate his leadership.” [EPA, Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-review-clean-power-plan-under-president-trumps-executive-order)]

Clean Air Act

**Pruitt Hinted Interest In Clean Air Act “Update.”** According to National Review Ideas Summit, “The Clean Air Act was last updated in 1990. So some of these issues that we’re talking about are meritorious to revisit and say ‘do we need an update to the Clean Air Act,’ what is the will of the American people with respect to these issues? How is it going to express through congress to deal with these issues? How should it be addressed in the framework?” [National Review Ideas Summit, 3/17/17]

**Pruitt: “The Clean Air Act, If Anything, Was Set Up To Deal With Regional And Local Air Pollutants. It Was Not Set Up To Deal With This Global Phenomena That We Talk About At Times.”** According to National Review Ideas Summit, “When you look at the carbon issue, we have a Supreme Court case in 2007, Massachusetts v. EPA. where six states sued the federal government to say ‘regulate CO2 for mobile sources.’ The US Supreme Court didn’t say that the EPA should regulate, by the way, it said go make a decision. You have to determine whether CO2 is something that should be regulated or not and you simply just can’t fail to make a decision. That was the Supreme Court Decision in 2007. In 2009, an endangerment finding by the EPA. And then you’ve had two responses since. You’ve had the tailoring rule that was struck down by the US Supreme Court and you have the Clean Power Plan that has been stayed by the US Supreme Court. So two bites of the apple that the EPA has engaged in to regulate carbon, both times the Supreme Court has said ‘you didn’t get it right, we question whether you have the authority to do what you did.’ So what does that tell you? Congress hasn’t dealt with this issue. Congress has not actually, through the Clean Air Act addressed this issue called carbon. As you look at the Clean Air Act it if anything was set up to deal with regional and local air pollutants. It was not set up to deal with this global phenomena that we talk about at times.” [National Review Ideas Summit, 3/17/17]

**Pruitt: “We Have Nothing To Be Apologetic About. We’re Going To Operate Within The Framework Of The Clean Air Act To Deal With These Issues And Make Sure That We Advance Clean Air, Clean Water, Not Just With This Respect To CO2, But With Those Key Air Pollutants Under The Ambient Air Quality Standard Program That We Have.”** According to Fox News Sunday, “I think that we’ve done it better than anybody in the world at burning coal clean, in a clean fashion. The innovative and technological advances that we’ve seen along with natural gas production and generating electricity, it all contributed to a CO2 footprint that’s pre-1994. Again, we have done better than anybody in the world, and growing our economy and also being a good steward of our environment. We have nothing to be apologetic about. We’re going to operate within the framework of the Clean Air Act to deal with these issues and make sure that we advance clean air, clean water, not just with this respect to CO2, but with those key air pollutants under the ambient air quality standard program that we have.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

**Pruitt Would Comply With Clean Air Act “In Accordance With Congressional Intent.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “If confirmed, I would faithfully comply the Clean Air Act in accordance with congressional intent. Judicial precedent is undoubtedly an important guide to congressional intent but Congress has also delegated interpretive authority to the Administrator of the Clean Air Act, consistent with judicial review. If I am confirmed as Administrator and form the judgment that a judicial decision is incorrect, I would consider seeking an appeal or petition for certiorari to the Supreme Court seeking reversal of that decision. Likewise, EPA recently promulgated regional consistency regulations that address the implication of adverse federal court decisions that result from challenges to locally or regionally applicable actions and I would exercise my discretion under those regional consistency regulations unless and until they are changed.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Fully Support The Clean Water Act And The Clean Air Act.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I fully support the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said The Clean Air Act Specifically Re-Serves For The States The Authority To Implement Plans That Would ‘Achieve Natural Visibility.’** According to Muskogee Daily Phoenix And Times-Democrat, “Pruitt said the Clean Air Act specifically re-serves for the states the authority to implement plans that would ‘achieve natural visibility’ in certain areas by 2064. The U.S. Environmental Agency rejected a plan put together by Oklahoma stakeholders and supple-mented it with a federal plan that Pruitt said usurps the state’s authority. In both legal challenges, Pruitt said, his lawsuits are ‘not meant to be a policy statement’ nor a ‘political statement.’ Those challenges and others with which Pruitt is involved are ‘meant to be a statement about ... the rule of law,’ he said.” [Muskogee Daily Phoenix And Times-Democrat, 9/8/13]

Non-Attainment

**Pruitt Went On To Discuss Necessity Of Reducing Portion Of  Population In Non-Attainment For Clean Air Standards.** According to Fox News Sunday, “Pruitt: Chris, I think what you are referring to is, we have about 40 percent of the country in non-attainment right now, those key air pollutants under our ambient air quality standards, which are outside of the CO2 discussion. And I agree wholeheartedly that we need to focus our attention at making sure we make progress there. In fact, that’s one of the key priorities of the administration, is to improve air quality to be on the 60 percent attainment that we see. That’s not been a focal point over the last several years as much as it should be.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

**Pruitt Expressed Need To Work Better In Areas Where Ozone Levels Are In Non-Attainment.** According to C-Span, “An area that I think we should celebrate progress but also recognize that there’s work to be done is an area of attainment. When you look at the max program, the national ambient air quality standards program, we’ve achieved I think tremendous success since 1980, we’ve had a 63 percent reduction in those criteria pollutants. Today, under … the ozone standard that currently exist were presently around 40 percent of our country, is in non-attainment, around 122 million people. We need to do better. The focus should be to work with you on assistance, how to improve attainment and not punish you.” [C-Span, [3/14/17](https://www.c-span.org/video/?425351-1/epa-administrator-scott-pruitt-delivers-remarks-national-league-cities-conference)]

**Pruitt: “All Too Often, Federal Agencies Generally Take The First Step Of Punishment As Opposed To Cooperation And Partnership In Trying To Provide Assistance To Provide Attainment.”** According to C-Span, “All too often, federal agencies generally take the first step of punishment as opposed to cooperation and partnership in trying to provide assistance to provide attainment. We want attainment, you want attainment. Citizens care about the air they breathe in water they drink, it’s important for us to partner with you to improve attainment beyond 40 percent. you have my commitment we will use the resources of my office to work with you in that regard to achieve better outcomes with attainment and see increased, hopefully, areas of attainment across the country so we can have permitting and jobs and communities celebrating that progress.” [C-Span, [3/14/17](https://www.c-span.org/video/?425351-1/epa-administrator-scott-pruitt-delivers-remarks-national-league-cities-conference)]

## Executive Order on Climate

**Pruitt Said Executive Order To End CPP Was “Rejecting The Narrative That This Country Cannot Be Both Pro-Energy And Pro-Environment.”** At President Trump’s Executive Order signing EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt said, “Number one, the president, by his signature today is rejecting the narrative that this country cannot be both pro-energy and pro-environment. We have done that throughout our history. We can actually achieve good jobs, good growth and pro-energy policies at the same time as protecting our environment. The president is sending that message today, by his signature today on this executive order.” [EPA, Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-review-clean-power-plan-under-president-trumps-executive-order)]

**Pruitt On Climate EO: “We Are Not Going To Allow Regulations Here At The EPA To Pick Winners And Losers.”** At President Trump’s Executive Order signing EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt said, “But, number two, he’s also setting a pathway forward, a journey to say that we are no longer going to have regulatory assault on any given sector of our economy. That is going to end by the signing of this executive order. We are not going to allow regulations here at the EPA to pick winners and losers. And that is going to be very important as we chart the pathway forward.” [EPA, Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-review-clean-power-plan-under-president-trumps-executive-order)]

**Pruitt At EO Signing: “We Are Going To Provide Regulatory Certainty.”** At President Trump’s Executive Order signing EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt said, “We are going to provide regulatory certainty. So, the president is setting a new pathway forward that is going to literally make sure that we transform our economy, grow jobs and also protect our environment. And it’s an exciting day and I appreciate his leadership.” [EPA, Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-review-clean-power-plan-under-president-trumps-executive-order)]

**Pruitt: “President Trump Has A Clear Vision To Create Jobs And His Vision Is Completely Compatible With A Clean And Healthy Environment.”** According to a press release, “‘The American people deserve an EPA that works to protect both the environment and enables a growing economy,’ said Administrator Pruitt. ‘Our EPA puts America first. President Trump has a clear vision to create jobs and his vision is completely compatible with a clean and healthy environment. By taking these actions today, the EPA is returning the Agency to its core mission of protecting public health while also being pro-energy independence.’” [EPA, Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-review-clean-power-plan-under-president-trumps-executive-order)]

**Pruitt: “Our EPA Puts America First. President Trump Has A Clear Vision To Create Jobs And His Vision Is Completely Compatible With A Clean And Healthy Environment.”** According to a press release, “‘The American people deserve an EPA that works to protect both the environment and enables a growing economy,’ said Administrator Pruitt. ‘Our EPA puts America first. President Trump has a clear vision to create jobs and his vision is completely compatible with a clean and healthy environment. By taking these actions today, the EPA is returning the Agency to its core mission of protecting public health while also being pro-energy independence.’” [EPA, Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-review-clean-power-plan-under-president-trumps-executive-order)]

**Pruitt: “I Think The Executive Orders That Are Being Issued Are To Fix The Executive Order That Overreached Before.”** According to National Review Ideas Summit, “I think the executive orders that are being issued are to fix the executive order that overreached before. So I don’t think qualitatively it’s the same. … [The Obama Administration] through a whole host of executive orders overreached and enlarged their authority. President Trump is fixing that. … Now what comes next I think is a legislative response or Congressional response to these key issues.” [National Review Ideas Summit, 3/17/17]

## EPA Authority

**Pruitt: “The EPA Should Pass Rules That Are Within The Framework That Congress Has Established.”** At President Trump’s Executive Order signing EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt said, “But, the third thing is that we are going to play within the rules. The EPA should pass rules that are within the framework that Congress has established. That sounds pretty novel, but that is exactly what should occur. We shouldn’t reimagine our authority to pick winners and losers.” [EPA, Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-review-clean-power-plan-under-president-trumps-executive-order)]

**Pruitt: “I Will Say To You Today That The Historical Purpose EPA Has Served Is Not What Is Occurring.”** According to Tulsa World, “‘There is a reason and a need to have an Environmental Protection Agency,’ Pruitt said. ‘The EPA has performed a very important role for us all. There are air-quality issues that cross state lines. There are water-quality issues, obviously, that cross state lines. ‘There is a reason to have an agency called the EPA, and it has served an historical purpose I believe is vital to this country. However, I will say to you today that the historical purpose EPA has served is not what is occurring.’” [Tulsa World, 9/20/14]

### Regulatory Authority

**Pruitt: “The Job Of A Regulator Is To Make Things Regular. And What That Means Is To Give Expectation.”** According to National Review Ideas Summit, “I’m gonna say something very profound to you this morning, the job of a regulator is to make things regular. And what that means is to give expectation — here’s where we are, here’s what we want to achieve — after comments, voice, from all the people that are impacted and then make a decision and then allow the markets, allow those in the industries, allow those in the country to then get about the business of meeting those standards.” [National Review Ideas Summit, 3/17/17]

**Pruitt Described Regulatory Uncertainty As A Hindrance To Regulated Industries.** According to National Review Ideas Summit, “Regulatory certainty — when you look at economic growth over the last several years its discouraging and we’ve accepted less than what it should be as far as our GDP and economic growth we’ve seen. … Particularly in the energy and environmental sector regulatory uncertainty I think has been the greatest impediment to economic growth. As I’ve talked to those in the industry, whether it’s utilities or otherwise, they say that the EPA has engaged in something called ‘regulatory pancaking’ where they will issue a rule one year that applies to a particular situation and then two or three years later pass another rule the undermines the previous one. And so the investments that were made by the company by the industry to meet the standard two or three years prior are undone in a short amount of time. That’s poor planning. … I believe those in the industry care about the environment and want to grow and what’s expected of them and they want to be able to allocate resources. ” [National Review Ideas Summit, 3/17/17]

**Pruitt: “One Of The Objectives We Have In The Short Run Is Working To Provide More Regulatory Certainty To Those In The Marketplace, To Know What’s Expected Of Them.”** According to National Review Ideas Summit, “Since 1980s, … under the NAAQS … we’ve had over 63% reduction in air pollutants since the 1980s. We should celebrate that at the same time of growing our economy. … One of the objectives we have in the short run is working to provide more regulatory certainty to those in the marketplace, to know what’s expected of them.” [National Review Ideas Summit, 3/17/17]

**Pruitt Said Auto And Energy Industries Have Been Split In To Winners And Losers.** According to National Review Ideas Summit, “I do think that this process of environment and energy, we’ve put on jerseys, we’ve allowed ourselves as a country to buy into a belief that if you’re pro energy, you’re anti-environment and if you’re pro-environment you’re anti-energy. And that is something we have to reject as a country. … It’s not just … the auto-industry that that impacts, it’s the utility sector as well.” [National Review Ideas Summit, 3/17/17]

**Pruitt: “Government Shouldn’t Be In The Business Of Forcing Outcomes On The Utility Sector.”** According to National Review Ideas Summit, “As we delivery energy in this country, government shouldn’t be in the business of forcing outcomes on the utility sector. The utility sector ought to be making decision on what is the most stable form of delivering electricity and what is the most cost effective and making decisions across a cafeteria of options from fossil fuels, to renewables, to nuclear etc. and they ought to be making business decisions. What’s happening in the last several years is the government has been the one trying to force upon that industry those decisions, picking winners and losers. That’s not the role of a regulator.” [National Review Ideas Summit, 3/17/17]

**Pruitt: “We Need To Embrace A Pro-Growth, Pro-Environment, Pro-Natural Resources Approach.”** According to C-Span, “I would say lastly, this attitude we’ve seen the last several years that we cannot be pro-growth and pro-environment is something that we need to embrace a pro-growth, pro-environment, pro-natural resources approach. Done that for our entire life now, we make great progress since 1970. We need to work diligently to grow jobs at the local level, be stewards of our air and water at the same time. I know you focused on that for your citizens and I want you to know you got a partner that will work with you in that regard.” [C-Span, [3/14/17](https://www.c-span.org/video/?425351-1/epa-administrator-scott-pruitt-delivers-remarks-national-league-cities-conference)]

**Pruitt: “We Don’t Live In A System That Allows An Administrative Agency To Take A Statute And Change It To Their Own Authority ... Administrative Agencies Exist To Administer The Laws As Passed By Congress.”** According to The Grove Sun, “According to Pruitt federal agencies, such as the EPA, IRS and others, have disregarded laws and make laws up -- or repeal laws after the fact. ‘That’s not how our system works,’ he said. ‘We don’t live in a system that allows an administrative agency to take a statute and change it to their own authority ... Administrative agencies exist to administer the laws as passed by Congress ... When we see the President use executive order and these agencies disregard the law, we all have to care about that because that’s why these cases are so important.’” [The Grove Sun, 11/9/14]

**Pruitt Said EPA Was Using Regulatory Overreach To Pick Winners And Losers**. According to The Grove Sun, “According to Pruitt the Environmental Protection Agency is using their regulatory reach and power ‘to pick winners and losers.’ He cited an example of a past clean air plan for the Wichita Mountains which the state beat the statute deadline to accomplish the goal by two decades but was then challenged and rejected by the EPA. The EPA went on to force a federal plan on the state costing over $2 billion and increase electricity rates by 20 percent. ‘So we sued the EPA,’ Pruitt said. ‘We were able to keep that federal plan from coming to fruition ... That was the State of Oklahoma using its authority to challenge the EPA and keep fossil fuels in the mix. These cases affect you in a very personal way.’” [The Grove Sun, 11/9/14]

Does Not Believe EPA has Authority to Regulate CO2

**Pruitt: EPA Must Work Within The Framework Of Congress**. According to Fox News, ““As much as we want to see progress made with clean air and clean water with an understanding we can also grow jobs, we have to do so within the framework of what Congress has passed,” Pruitt said.” [Fox News, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2017/04/02/epas-pruitt-trump-will-end-overreach-obama-made-up-regulatory-power.html)]

**Pruitt: “President Trump Is Dealing With That Regulatory Overreach.”** According to Fox News Pruitt Said, ‘The past administration just made it up, they reimagined authority under the statute. … That’s why President Trump is dealing with that regulatory overreach in charting a new path forward to deal with these issues within the framework of the Clean Air Act.’” [Fox News, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2017/04/02/epas-pruitt-trump-will-end-overreach-obama-made-up-regulatory-power.html)]

**Pruitt: Trump Is Setting “Pathway Forward, A Journey To Say That We Are No Longer Going To Have Regulatory Assault On Any Given Sector Of Our Economy.”** According to a press release Scott Pruitt said, “But, number two, he’s also setting a pathway forward, a journey to say that we are no longer going to have regulatory assault on any given sector of our economy. That is going to end by the signing of this executive order. We are not going to allow regulations here at the EPA to pick winners and losers. And that is going to be very important as we chart the pathway forward.” [Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-review-clean-power-plan-under-president-trumps-executive-order)]

**Pruitt: “We Shouldn’t Reimagine Our Authority To Pick Winners And Losers.”** According to a press release Scott Pruitt said, “But, the third thing is that we are going to play within the rules. The EPA should pass rules that are within the framework that Congress has established. That sounds pretty novel, but that is exactly what should occur. We shouldn’t reimagine our authority to pick winners and losers. We are going to provide regulatory certainty. So, the president is setting a new pathway forward that is going to literally make sure that we transform our economy, grow jobs and also protect our environment. And it’s an exciting day and I appreciate his leadership.” [Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-review-clean-power-plan-under-president-trumps-executive-order)]

**Pruitt: “I Think What’s Important This Past Week Is To Recognize That The President Is Keeping His Promise To The American People To Rollback Regulatory Overreaches That Have Been Occurring The Last Couple Of Years.”** According to Fox News Sunday, “Pruitt: Well, Chris, I think what’s important this past week is to recognize that the president is keeping his promise to the American people to rollback regulatory overreaches that have been occurring the last couple of years. And as you know, the Clean Power Plan is subject to a U.S. Supreme Court state. The steps have been taken by the EPA historically, they’ve equally been challenged several times with respective CO2 regulation. And each of those times the Supreme Court and courts have said that the power that has been used has been an overreach. And so, the president is keeping his promise to deal with that overreach, Chris. It doesn’t mean that clean air and clean water is not going to be the focus in the future. We’re just going to do it right within the consistency of the framework that Congress has passed. Now, I think that’s very important to recognize.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

**Pruitt: “If Greenhouse Gases Are Anything, They Are International In Scope And To Think That Somehow The Clean Air Act Is Something In The Toolbox To Regulate … CO2 Initiatives, I Think It’s Quite Ambitious.”** According to Federalist Society, “We have Massachusetts vs. EPA in 2007 that said what, not that EPA could regulate, but that the EPA could make a decision on whether to regulate [carbon emissions]. And the endangerment finding ion 2009, and then the Clean Power Plan as an extension of that process in 2007 and 2009. But as you look at the framework … The Clean Air Act was really set up to address local and regional air pollutants. If greenhouse gases are anything, they are international in scope and to think that somehow the Clean Air Act is something in the toolbox to regulate … CO2 initiatives, I think it’s quite ambitious, and how do we know that? The Supreme Court said so when they issued a stay against the Clean Power Plan. Unprecedented in judicial history.” [Federalist Society, 3/31/17]

**Pruitt: “It’s Not Our Job To Reimagine Authority In Order To Reach A Result Of Something We Need To Reach. And That Is Something We’re Going To Implement With Sincerity And Commitment At The EPA Going Forward.”** According to Federalist Society, And so this effort that we’re engaged in adhering to rule of law is not just academic is not just legal, it’s a commitment to say the only power we have at the EPA is the framework that Congress has established. If Congress has not spoken, if Congress has not given the tool to the agency to address certain matters, than Congress must speak. It’s not our job to fill in the space. It’s not our job to pitch in. It’s not our job to reimagine authority in order to reach a result of something we need to reach. And that is something we’re going to implement with sincerity and commitment at the EPA going forward. Rule of Law matters. We’ll make sure rule of law is carried out. No more and no less. And that is something that is going to change.” [Federalist Society, 3/31/17]

**Pruitt: The EPA Was “Intended To Truly Inform Regulators In Washington D.C. How To Make Decisions.”** According to Federalist Society, “When Congress established the EPA it wasn’t a suggestion … it’s intended to truly inform regulators in Washington D.C. how to make decisions. We will offer a proposed rule, we take comment, we respond to that comment, you learn, and then we finalize that rule. Why do we do that? Because we want to know how it impacts people across the country – the citizens, the industries, the states - all various stakeholders as you engage with in rule making. When an agency abuses that process or avoids that process, you have bad outcomes. And this agency historically has been one of the greatest ever in abusing that process. How so? You know about consent decrees, you know about “sue and settle,” you know about third parties that bring about lawsuits against the EPA and through that process some have urged — sometimes the same type of lawsuit that was initiated — and new timelines such that a change that was made in that consent decree and you have a third party dictating the priorities of the U.S. government. That’s wrong and that’s an abuse of the regulatory process. Regulation through litigation is something we shall not do.”  [Federalist Society, 3/31/17]

**Pruitt Dodged Question And Discussed EPA Overreach And Lack Of Congressional Action On Clean Air Issues.** According to Fox News Sunday, “Pruitt: Well, Chris, I think what’s important this past week is to recognize that the president is keeping his promise to the American people to rollback regulatory overreaches that have been occurring the last couple of years. And as you know, the Clean Power Plan is subject to a U.S. Supreme Court state. The steps have been taken by the EPA historically, they’ve equally been challenged several times with respective CO2 regulation. And each of those times the Supreme Court and courts have said that the power that has been used has been an overreach. And so, the president is keeping his promise to deal with that overreach, Chris. It doesn’t mean that clean air and clean water is not going to be the focus in the future. We’re just going to do it right within the consistency of the framework that Congress has passed. Now, I think that’s very important to recognize.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

**Pruitt Argued EPA Did Not Have Authority To Write Carbon Regulations**. According to Tulsa World, “Pruitt and others maintain the administration has exceeded its authority on environmental matters, including its attempt to regulate carbon dioxide emissions under the Clean Air Act. Carbon dioxide is not specifically covered by the law, but courts have ruled it can be regulated as a danger to health. The Clean Air Act does not include standards applicable to carbon dioxide, however, and Pruitt and others have argued the EPA does not have the authority to write suitable ones.” [Tulsa World, 9/20/14]

### Endangerment Finding

**Pruitt Pushed Against Including Endangerment Finding In Trump Executive Order**. According to an article in The Hill, “Sources close to EPA leadership said that early drafts of the order would have instructed the department review the finding. But Pruitt successfully pushed against that.” [The Hill, [3/31/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/326635-conservatives-fear-epa-chief-going-soft-on-climate-science)]

* **Pruitt Concerned About Political Future; Did Not Want To Be Labeled “Anti-Science.”** According to an article in The Hill, “Those sources claimed that Pruitt, the former attorney general of Oklahoma and a frequent litigant against the Obama administration, was concerned about his political future and didn’t want to be labeled anti-science. ‘They’re looking for reasons to not do it because they don’t want a fight,’ a person familiar with the deliberations said, referring to Pruitt and his allies.” [The Hill, [3/31/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/326635-conservatives-fear-epa-chief-going-soft-on-climate-science)]

**Some Conservative Groups Wanted Pruitt To Launch Review Of Endangerment**. According to an article in The Hill, “Breitbart News columnist James Delingpole wrote this week that Pruitt should consider resigning if he won’t repeal the endangerment finding, saying that he ‘is more interested in building his political career than he is taking on the Green Blob.’ In addition, the conservative Competitive Enterprise Institute filed a petition last month formally asking the EPA to launch a review, saying, ‘since that finding was issued, evidence has continued to mount that directly contradicts it.’” [The Hill, [3/31/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/326635-conservatives-fear-epa-chief-going-soft-on-climate-science)]

### Massachusetts V EPA

**Pruitt Said 2007 Massachusetts V EPA Case Applied To Vehicle Emissions**. According to Enid News And Eagle, “When it comes to carbon emissions, a Supreme Court decision in 2007 allowed for the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate emissions from vehicles. Pruitt said the EPA has taken that case and is trying to regulate power plants all over the country for emissions. The EPA’s authority is currently being challenged, he said.” [Enid News And Eagle, 10/20/14]

Paris Deal

**Pruitt Said Paris Agreement Was A “Bad Deal” For The U.S.** According to Fox News Sunday, “Pruitt: Engagement internationally is very important. To demonstrate the leadership that we have shown on this issue with China and India and other nations is very important. Those discussions should ensue. But what Paris represents is bad deal for this country. We frontloaded our costs. China and India backloaded theirs. That caused a contraction in our economy. Look, we’ve shown leadership on this issue in the key way, Chris, and we’re going to continue that.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

**Pruitt Pointed To “Steps We’ve Taken Already” As A Reason Why The U.S. Should Not Be Committed To Paris Agreement.** According to Fox News Sunday, “We’ve demonstrated through the steps we’ve taken already, the pre-1994 levels, because of that technology. We can burn coal in clean fashion. We shouldn’t have this commitment by the U.S. government to say that fossil fuels are bad. Renewables are good. The U.S. EPA and the U.S. government should not pick winners and losers, Chris. And that’s what happened in the last several years.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

**Pruitt Would Not Say That US Should Honor Paris Climate Deal**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “I believe I stated that a decision as to whether the U.S. stayed in the Paris Agreement would be a decision for the State Department.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would Not Commit To Supporting The Paris Climate Deal**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “The role of the United States in the Paris Agreement is a State Department matter. If confirmed, I will work to advance the mission of the EPA, which is to protect human health and the environment, consistent with the State Department's strategy for international engagement on climate change.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: The Role Of The United States In The Paris Agreement Is A State Department Matter.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “The role of the United States in the Paris Agreement is a State Department matter. If confirmed, I will work to advance the mission of the EPA, which is to protect human health and the environment, consistent with the State Department's strategy for international engagement on climate change.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

Climate Change

Denied CO2 was Primary Contributor to Climate Change

**Pruitt: “I Would Not Agree That [CO2 Is] The Primary Contributor To The Global Warming That We’re Seeing.”** According to Fox News Sunday, “Joe Kerner, CNBC Anchor: Do you believe that it’s been proven that CO2 is the primary control knob for climate? Do you believe that? Pruitt: No, I would not agree that it’s the primary contributor to the global warming that we’re seeing.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

* **Wallace: “Mr. Pruitt, There Are All Kinds Of Studies That Contradict You.”** According to Fox News Sunday, “Wallace: Mr. Pruitt, there are all kinds of studies that contradict you. The U.N.’s panel on climate change says it is at least 95 percent likely that more than half the temperature increase since the mid-20th century is due to human activities. NOAA, that’s our own, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, says there’s more carbon dioxide now than in the last 400,000 years, and NOAA says 2015 and 2016 are the two hottest years on record.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

**Pruitt: “There’s A Warming Trend, The Climate Is Changing. And Human Activity Contributes To The Change In Some Measure. The Real Issue Is How Much We Contribute To It And Measuring That With Precision.”** According to Fox News Sunday, “No, look, Chris, I said to the process -- in my confirmation process, individual senators as well, that there’s a warming trend, the climate is changing. And human activity contributes to the change in some measure. The real issue is how much we contribute to it and measuring that with precision. But then also, what is the process as far as response, what can we do about it, the tools in the toolbox to address the CO2 issue? And you can’t just simply, from the EPA perspective, make that up. You can’t do with the president did previously with the Clean Power Plan, President Obama, and his administration, to simply re-imagine authority. That’s why we have a U.S. Supreme Court stay against the Clean Power Plan. That’s why President Trump is dealing with that regulatory overreach and charting a new path forward to deal with these issues within the framework of Clean Air Act.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

**Pruitt Dodged Question About What If He Was Wrong In Assumption CO2 Doesn’t Play Role In Global Warming.** According to Fox News Sunday, “Wallace: Simple question, what if you’re wrong? Pruitt: Look, let me say to you, CO2 contributes to greenhouse gas, it has a greenhouse gas effect and global warming, as methane does and other types of gases. The issue is, how much we contribute to it from the human activity perspective and what can be done about it from a process perspective, Chris.” [Fox News Sunday, [4/2/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/04/02/scott-pruitt-on-balancing-environmental-economic-priorities-mitch-mcconnell-on-gorsuch-nomination-health-care-reform.html)]

\*\*\*\*

**Pruitt: “Sadly, This Isn’t The First Time We’ve Seen This Tactic Of Advancing The Climate Change Agenda By Any Means Necessary.”** According to an op-ed written by Scott Pruitt in Tulsa World, “Sadly, this isn’t the first time we’ve seen this tactic of advancing the climate change agenda by any means necessary. President Obama’s Clean Power Plan is a particularly noteworthy example. This EPA regulation, one of the most ambitious ever proposed, will shutter coal-fired power plants, significantly increase the price of electricity for American consumers, and enact by executive fiat the very same Cap-and-Trade system Congress has rejected.” [Tulsa World, [5/21/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/opinion/othervoices/scott-pruitt-and-luther-strange-an-un-american-prosecution-of/article_eff77ff4-8f6c-5646-84da-1f3204b89f54.html)]

**Pruitt: “We Do Not Doubt The Sincerity Of The Beliefs Of Our Fellow Attorneys General About Climate Change And The Role Human Activity Plays In It. But We Call Upon Them To Press Those Beliefs Through Debate, Not Through Governmental Intimidation Of Those Who Disagree With Them.”** According to an op-ed written by Scott Pruitt in Tulsa World, “We do not doubt the sincerity of the beliefs of our fellow Attorneys General about climate change and the role human activity plays in it. But we call upon them to press those beliefs through debate, not through governmental intimidation of those who disagree with them. Few things could be more un-American.” [Tulsa World, [5/21/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/opinion/othervoices/scott-pruitt-and-luther-strange-an-un-american-prosecution-of/article_eff77ff4-8f6c-5646-84da-1f3204b89f54.html)]

**Pruitt: “Determining The Specific Risks To Specific Companies Of A Global Phenomenon Like Climate Change Amounts To No More Than Speculative Guess Work.”** According to E&E News, “Fourteen Republican attorneys general are fighting the Securities and Exchange Commission's plan to beef up climate change disclosure. The top prosecutors -- all from states suing to block U.S. EPA's Clean Power Plan -- argued in a letter to the SEC that they believe current disclosure rules are sufficient and that the regulators are forwarding a political agenda by considering the topic. ‘Determining the specific risks to specific companies of a global phenomenon like climate change amounts to no more than speculative guess work,’ the officials said in a July 21 letter organized by Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt (R).” [E&E News, [7/28/16](http://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2016/07/28/stories/1060040903)]

* **Pruitt: “The Commission Should Not Attempt To Unnecessarily Inject Itself Into Partisan Battles, Including The One Of Climate Change.”** According to E&E News, “‘It is clear that such mandatory disclosure suggestions have not been the result of massive public uproar about investors being unaware that the activities of fossil-fuel producing companies might impact the environment,’ the attorneys general wrote. ‘Nor have large swathes of investors been hoodwinked by coastal real-estate corporations whose assets have now all disappeared under the sea.’ They added, ‘The Commission should not attempt to unnecessarily inject itself into partisan battles, including the one of climate change.’ The law enforcement officials also appeared to issue a warning of potential lawsuits.” [E&E News, [7/28/16](http://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2016/07/28/stories/1060040903)]

**Pruitt: “Reasonable Minds Can Disagree About The Science Behind Global Warming, And Disagree They Do.”** According to Bloomberg, “‘Reasonable minds can disagree about the science behind global warming, and disagree they do,’ Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt and Alabama Attorney General Luther Strange said in a statement Wednesday.” [Bloomberg, [3/30/16](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-03-30/oklahoma-alabama-support-exxon-mobil-in-ny-led-climate-probe)]

**Pruitt: Climate Change Debate “Should Not Be Silenced With Threats Of Criminal Prosecution By Those Who Believe That Their Position Is The Only Correct One And That All Dissenting Voices Must Therefore Be Intimidated And Coerced Into Silence.”** According to Bloomberg, “The debate ‘should not be silenced with threats of criminal prosecution by those who believe that their position is the only correct one and that all dissenting voices must therefore be intimidated and coerced into silence.’” [Bloomberg, [3/30/16](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-03-30/oklahoma-alabama-support-exxon-mobil-in-ny-led-climate-probe)]

**Pruitt: “I Think The Question About Climate Action ... Is Something That’s A Policy Consideration Of This Congress.”** According to News Oklahoma, “‘I think the question about climate action ... is something that’s a policy consideration of this Congress,’ Pruitt said. ‘If you want EPA to address that in a direct way, you can amend the Clean Air Act to provide that authority and the statutory power to do so ... so that the states can know how to conduct themselves in a way that is consistent with statutory construction.’” [News Oklahoma, [5/6/15](http://newsok.com/article/5416581)]

 **Pruitt Said Climate Change Debate Was “Far From Settled.”**According to a column co-authored by Scott Pruitt, “We won’t be joining this coalition, and we hope that those attorneys general who have joined will disavow it. Healthy debate is the lifeblood of American democracy, and global warming has inspired one of the major policy debates of our time. That debate is far from settled.” [National Review, [5/17/16](http://www.nationalreview.com/article/435470/climate-change-attorneys-general)]

**Pruitt: “Scientists Continue To Disagree About The Degree And Extent Of Global Warming And Its Connection To The Actions Of Mankind… Dissent Is Not A Crime.”**According to a column co-authored by Scott Pruitt, “Scientists continue to disagree about the degree and extent of global warming and its connection to the actions of mankind. That debate should be encouraged — in classrooms, public forums, and the halls of Congress. It should not be silenced with threats of prosecution. Dissent is not a crime.” [National Review, [5/17/16](http://www.nationalreview.com/article/435470/climate-change-attorneys-general)]

**Pruitt Would Not Say Climate Change Impacted Harmful Algae Blooms**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “EPA identifies the following as causes of harmful algal blooms: sunlight, slow-moving water, and excess nutrients. For climate change to have a role, it would first have to have an impact on one of these three causes.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Deferred To State Department On Climate Change**. Senator Cardin asked, “Do you believe it is the U.S.’s national interest to cede leadership to the Chinese on global action to address climate change?” According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “It is the mission of the State Department to advance our national interests within the realm of foreign policy. If confirmed, I will work to advance the mission of the EPA, which is to protect human health and the environment, consistent with the State Department's strategy for international engagement on climate change.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Skepticism**

**Pruitt Would Not Say Climate Change Was Real And A Threat To The Planet**. Senator Cardin asked, “Do you believe climate change is a real and serious threat to the planet?” According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “The climate is changing and human activity impacts our changing climate in some manner. The ability to measure with precision the degree and extent of that impact, and what to do about it, are subject to continuing debate and dialogue.’ [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Claimed There Was “Continuing Debate And Dialogue” On Human Impact To Climate Change**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “The climate is changing and human activity impacts our changing climate in some manner. The ability to measure with precision the degree and extent of that impact, and what to do about it, are subject to continuing debate and dialogue.’ [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said He Has Not “Independently Verified” That 97 Percent Of Climate Scientists Believe Climate Change Is Due To Human Activity**. When asked, “Do you agree with this statement from NASA: “97 percent or more of actively publishing climate scientists agree: Climate-warming trends over the past century are extremely likely due to human activities.” If not, please explain why you do not agree.” Scott Pruitt wrote, “I have no reason to disagree with NASA’s statement, although I have not made any attempt to independently verify its accuracy.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Did Not Believer Harold Hamm Was A Climate Denier**. When asked, “If Harold Hamm told you he was no longer a climate change denier, would you believe him?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “I do not believe he is a climate change ‘denier.’” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “There Is A Diverse Range Of Views Regarding The Key Drivers Of Our Changing Climate Among Scientists, Policy-Makers And President Trump's Nominees.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “There is a diverse range of views regarding the key drivers of our changing climate among scientists, policy-makers and President Trump's nominees. I believe that these differences should be the subject of robust and open debate free from intimidation. If confirmed, I will continue to encourage an honest debate on our changing climate, the role of human activity, our ability to measure the degree and extent of human activity, and what to do about it.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Unaware Of Impact Of Climate Change On Invasive Species.** When asked, “Does climate change have an impact on the spread of invasive species, such as the emerald ash borer, in New York State?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am not familiar with the state of invasive species in New York.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt “Aware” Of “Broad Range Of Views Within The Scientific Community Regarding The Relationship Between Human Activity On Changes In The Climate And Any Resulting Impact On Extreme Weather.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am aware of the broad range of views within the scientific community regarding the relationship between human activity on changes in the climate and any resulting impact on extreme weather events. If confirmed as Administrator, I will work to ensure EPA regulatory actions are based on the most up to date and objective scientific data.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Had “No First-Hand Knowledge” Of Position That Warming Trends Was Dude To Human Activity**. When asked, “The EPA is required to follow the best available science in its rule-making process. Given that every major scientific institution in the United States agrees with the position that the warming trend over the past century is due to human activity, do you have any reason to disagree with the position of every major scientific institution in the United States? Please explain.” Scott Pruitt wrote, “I agree EPA's rulemaking process must be based on the best available science. However, I have no first-hand knowledge of the specific institutions or findings referenced in the question. If confirmed, I commit EPA's rulemaking process will be based on the best available science and will follow applicable laws and federal guidance on scientific integrity, information, and transparency.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said Degree And Extent Of Human Caused Climate Change “Are Subject To Continuing Debate And Dialogue.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “The ability to measure with precision the degree and extent of human activity on our changing climate, and what to do about it, are subject to continuing debate and dialogue. If confirmed, I will make sure the agency's regulatory actions are based on the most up to date and objective scientific data.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “There Is A Diverse Range Of Views Regarding The Key Drivers Of Our Changing Climate Among Scientists.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “There is a diverse range of views regarding the key drivers of our changing climate among scientists. I believe that these differences should be the subject of robust and open debate free from intimidation. If confirmed, I will continue to encourage an honest debate on our changing climate, the role of human activity, our ability to measure the degree and extent of human activity, and what to do about it. If confirmed, I will work to ensure that any regulatory actions are based on the most up to date and objective scientific data. I will also adhere to the applicable statutory authorities to fulfill EPA’s mission to protect human health and the environment consistent with the process and rule of law established by congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Wanted “Robust And Open Debate Free From Intimidation” On Human Role In Climate Change**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “There is a diverse range of views regarding the key drivers of our changing climate among scientists. I believe that these differences should be the subject of robust and open debate free from intimidation. If confirmed, I will continue to encourage an honest debate on our changing climate, the role of human activity, our ability to measure the degree and extent of human activity, and what to do about it. If confirmed, I will work to ensure that any regulatory actions are based on the most up to date and objective scientific data. I will also adhere to the applicable statutory authorities to fulfill EPA’s mission to protect human health and the environment consistent with the process and rule of law established by congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Am Aware Of A Diverse Range Of Conclusions Regarding Global Temperatures, Including That Over The Past Two Decades Satellite Data Indicates There Has Been A Leveling Off Of Warming.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am aware of a diverse range of conclusions regarding global temperatures, including that over the past two decades satellite data indicates there has been a leveling off of warming, which some scientists refer to as the ‘hiatus.’ I am also aware that the discrepancy between land-based temperature stations and satellite temperature stations can be attributed to expansive urbanization within in our country where artificial substances such as asphalt can interfere with the accuracy of land-based temperature stations and that the agencies charged with keeping the data do not accurately account for this type of interference.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said “Warmest Year” Claims From NASA And NOAA Were “Within The Margin Of Error.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am also aware that ‘warmest year ever’ claims from NASA and NOAA are based on minimal temperature differences that fall within the margin of error. Finally, I am aware that temperatures have been changing for millions of years that predate the relatively short modern record keeping efforts that began in 1880.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Science Philosophy**

**Pruitt Said His Experience In Environmental Science Were Limited To College Perquisite Courses**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “My degrees are in communications, political science, and law. As with prior EPA Administrators who held bachelor of arts degrees, I completed science courses as a prerequisite to requiring my degree. Also, I understand that six of the 12 people who have been confirmed as EPA Administrator (including the first four individuals) had law degrees.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “EPA Should Rely On Well-Reasoned, And Sound, Scientific Findings.”** According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “The mission of EPA is to protect human health and the environment. Where Congress directs the EPA to act based upon scientific findings, the EPA should rely on well-reasoned, and sound, scientific findings.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said “Sound Science… Complies With Applicable Laws And Federal Guidance.”** When asked, “What is your definition of sound science?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “Sound science is that which complies with applicable laws and federal guidance regarding scientific integrity, peer review, information quality, and transparency.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said He Would Follow “Federal Guidance On Scientific Integrity, Information Quality, And Transparency.”** When asked, “If confirmed, how will you ensure that EPA maintains independent science, transparent decision-making, and scientific free speech?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “If confirmed, it will be my privilege to work with EPA scientists and the thousands of other dedicated public servants at EPA who have chosen to devote their careers to improving public health and our environment. I also commit, if confirmed, to follow applicable laws and federal guidance on scientific integrity, information quality, and transparency.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “EPA Regulatory Actions Must Be Based On The Best Available Science In Accordance With The Law.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I agree that EPA regulatory actions must be based on the best available science in accordance with the law. If confirmed, I commit to faithfully execute the law as enacted by Congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Had No Science Advisor In AG Office**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “The Office of Attorney General does not have a science advisor.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Will Work To Ensure That Any Regulatory Actions Are Based On The Most Up To Date And Objective Scientific Data, Including The Ever-Evolving Understanding Of The Impact Increasing Greenhouse Gases Have On Our Changing Climate.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “If confirmed, I will work to ensure that any regulatory actions are based on the most up to date and objective scientific data, including the ever-evolving understanding of the impact increasing greenhouse gases have on our changing climate. I will also adhere to the applicable statutory authorities to fulfill EPA’s mission to protect human health and the environment consistent with the process and rule of law established by congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Believed Science Should Be The “Backbone” Of EPA Decisions**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “fully believe, as former EPA administrators have stated, that science must serve as ‘the backbone’ of EPA actions.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Agreed With DOD Assessment Of Impact Of Climate Change On National Security But Has Not “Made Any Attempt To Independently Verify Their Accuracy.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I have no reason to disagree with the statements from the listed security experts, although I have not made any attempt to independently verify their accuracy.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would Lean On “Agency Experts And Advisory Personnel” For Scientific Information**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “If confirmed as EPA Administrator, I will adhere to the applicable statutory authorities to fulfill EPA’s mission to protect human health and the environment and will base my decisions on sound science, including advice provided by agency experts and advisory personnel.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Will Make Decisions Based On Sound Science Reflective Of Diverse, Objective And Unbiased Views Conducted In A Transparent Manner.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “If confirmed, I will make decisions based on sound science reflective of diverse, objective and unbiased views conducted in a transparent manner reliant on public engagement and consistent with the framework established by Congress.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “Global Warming Has Inspired One Of The Major Policy Debates Of Our Time. That Debate Is Far From Settled. Scientists Continue To Disagree About The Degree And Extent Of Global Warming And Its Connection To The Actions Of Mankind.”** According to an op-ed written by Scott Pruitt in Tulsa World, “Healthy debate is the lifeblood of American democracy, and global warming has inspired one of the major policy debates of our time. That debate is far from settled. Scientists continue to disagree about the degree and extent of global warming and its connection to the actions of mankind.” [Tulsa World, [5/21/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/opinion/othervoices/scott-pruitt-and-luther-strange-an-un-american-prosecution-of/article_eff77ff4-8f6c-5646-84da-1f3204b89f54.html)]

Mercury

**Pruitt Ordered Pennsylvania To Justify Utility MATS Compliance Extension Air Permit.**According to Inside EPA, “EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt at the urging of environmentalists is objecting to a Clean Air Act permit issued by Pennsylvania for a coal-fired power plant that gives it three more years to comply with the Obama-era power plant air toxics rule, forcing the state to better justify the novel extension or revise the air permit to remove it. Pruitt’s May 12 order appears to mark the first time EPA has objected to a state-issued air permit during his tenure. Although the order does not fault the extension on the merits and instead seeks more information on the permit, it still represents a victory for environmentalists at a time when the Trump administration’s deregulatory actions are drawing criticism for what environmental groups say are adverse effects on public health and welfare. Further, Pruitt has stated his intent to restore decision-making authority to the states, ending what he sees as federal overreach in environmental regulation. In his former role as attorney general of Oklahoma, Pruitt sued the agency on numerous occasions because of what he saw as onerous rules imposed by the federal government. But the order requires Pennsylvania to better justify the permit that it issued under delegated air law authority.” [Inside EPA, [5/17/17](https://insideepa.com/daily-news/pruitt-orders-state-justify-utility-mact-compliance-extension-air-permit)]

**Pruitt Would Not Say Who Served As Scientific Advisor In Mercury And Air Toxics Rule Lawsuit Brought By State Of Oklahoma**. When asked, “In your cases against the EPA’s Mercury and Air Toxics Rule, who served as your scientific advisor for the case?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “Oklahoma’s petition to review the Mercury and Air Toxics Rule was a legal challenge brought on the administrative record and argued that EPA acted contrary to law and arbitrarily and capriciously by not considering the costs of regulation in determining whether it was necessary and appropriate to regulate mercury from fossil fuel power plants within the meaning of Section 112(n). The Supreme Court ultimately agreed with Oklahoma’s argument that EPA failed to act in accordance with the rule of law when it ignored costs in its determination and remanded the matter to the D.C. Circuit.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Will Enforce The Mercury Air Toxics Rule So Long As That Rule Remains In Force.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “The Mercury and Air Toxics Standard has not been vacated by the Supreme Court or the D.C. Circuit and currently regulates both mercury and other air toxics. If confirmed, I will enforce the Mercury Air Toxics Rule so long as that Rule remains in force.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said Concentration Of Mercury In Air Began Before EPA Regulation**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “I agree that there has been a consistent downward trend in mercury concentrations, but note that this trend began well before EPA promulgated the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards. As I stated in my testimony before the Committee, mercury is appropriately regulated as a hazardous air pollutant under Section 112 of the Clean Air Act. If I am confirmed as Administrator, I will regulate under Section 112 in a manner that is consistent with Congress's intent in enacting that provision. I will also faithfully administer other federal statutes that regulate mercury to the extent that they are under my jurisdiction, including the Mercury Export Ban Act of 2008, the Mercury-Containing and Rechargeable Battery Management Act of 1996, the Clean Water Act, the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act, the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, and the Safe Drinking Water Act.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

Natural Gas

**2012: Pruitt Praised The American Natural Gas Association And Extolled The Virtue Of Using Natural Gas As An Energy Source.** Pruitt said: “Scott Pruitt Attorney-General in Oklahoma and what what, I wanna spend a few minutes talking about the importance of natural gas to the state of Oklahoma. When you have companies like Contential Resources, Devon Energy Chesapeake, Sanders Energy and and what we see going on nationally with respect the imports of natural natural gas to our energy independence Oklahoma is a major contributing factor to that with our leadership of those companies and not only have our company's I think led the way as it relates to contributing to a dialogue nationally about the importance of natural gas to our country's future but the state of Oklahoma for decades has been the primary regulator of that. To displace the states from their, I think very traditional and legal role in regulating natural gas and having promising the battle that attorneys general facing and and actually engaging in to protect the state's interest is very important it's in partnership with those companies in Oklahoma in partnership with those companies across the country that this dialogue is taking place and it’s a great thing to be in partnership with ANGA. ANGA is a great leader in this space and it's important to have organizations like ANGA communicating a message on the importance of energy independence, the development of natural gas, the opportunities that we have as a country. But then also partnering with states and attorneys general to make sure that the enforcement and action is taken to preserve that roll into the future.” [American Natural Gas Association Youtube Page, [8/30/12](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0iIQfv93nDM)]

## Ozone

**EPA Said Ozone Delay Suit Was “Moot” And Sought Dismissal.**According to E&E News, “A day after retreating from a previously announced delay in implementation of its 2015 ground-level ozone standard, U.S. EPA is seeking dismissal of a lawsuit challenging that delay. Because the agency has now decided against extending the key Clean Air Act deadline, ‘there is no longer anything for the court to review, and therefore the case is moot,’ an agency attorney wrote in a motion filed today with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The suit, brought last month by a dozen public health and environmental groups, sought to block the agency from postponing state attainment designations from this October to October 2018. EPA chief Scott Pruitt announced the delay with no advance public notice in early June, then, just as abruptly, withdrew it late yesterday, saying the designations for compliance with the 70-parts-per-billion standard will now go forward this October, as originally scheduled.” [E&E News, [8/3/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/08/03/stories/1060058367)]

**Pruitt Reversed Course On Smog Rule Delay After 16 States Sued.**According to Think Progress, “One day after getting sued by 15 states, the Environmental Protection Agency on Wednesday reversed course on its plans to delay implementation of Obama-era rules intended to reduce emissions of smog-causing air pollutants. The 15 states and the District of Columbia sued the EPA, saying that EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt’s proposed one-year delay in compliance deadlines for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards violate the requirements of the Clean Air Act. The Obama-era regulation lowered the allowable concentration of ozone to 70 parts per billion, from the previous 75. … The EPA’s reversal on the ozone role is the latest setback for the Trump administration’s regulatory rollback agenda. On Monday, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit struck down the EPA’s attempt to suspend methane restrictions for the sector, formally vacating the agency’s 90-day stay of key provisions of New Source Performance Standards. … In a statement issued Wednesday evening, Pruitt suggested his agency’s change of course on ozone standards was unrelated to the states’ lawsuit, but instead reinforced the Trump EPA’s commitment to working with states through the process of meeting the new ozone standards on time.” [Think Progress, [8/3/17](https://thinkprogress.org/scott-pruitt-ditches-plan-to-delay-obama-smog-rule/)]

**Pruitt Dropped Delay Of Ozone Rule Implementation.**According to Politico, “EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt has dropped his one-year delay of an upcoming implementation step for the 2015 ozone standard, EPA announced today. The withdrawal comes after lawsuits from environmental groups and Democratic states sued over the delay in deciding which areas meet the standard and which do not. EPA had been due to file its first defense of Pruitt’s delay in court on Thursday. Pruitt originally said he did not believe EPA had the necessary data to decide on the designations by the Oct. 1 deadline. But a pre-publication Federal Register notice signed by Pruitt on Wednesday says that ‘the information gaps that formed the basis of the extension may not be as expansive as we previously believed.’ … ‘The Administrator may still determine that an extension of time to complete designations is necessary, but is not making such a determination at this time,’ says the notice in withdrawing the nationwide delay. ‘We believe in dialogue with, and being responsive to, our state partners. Today’s action reinforces our commitment to working with the states through the complex designation process,’ Pruitt said in a statement. … WHAT’S NEXT: EPA has until Oct. 1 to determine which areas of the U.S. meet the standard and which will have to submit plans to lower pollution, a years-long process.” [Politico, [8/2/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/08/pruitt-drops-delay-of-ozone-rule-implementation-091443)]

CAFE Standards

**Washington Post: Trump Officials Begin Review Of Obama Emissions Standards For Cars.** According to the Washington Post, “The Trump administration gave notice it intends to relax the rules governing greenhouse gas emissions on new model cars Thursday, in its latest move to undo President Barack Obama’s climate policies. In a notice on the federal register, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Transportation Department announced they were considering rewriting emissions standards for cars and light trucks made between 2021 and 2025.” [Washington Post, [8/10/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/08/10/trump-officials-begin-review-of-obama-emissions-standards-for-cars/?utm_term=.0d0fe54cc0b5)]

**Pruitt On CAFE Standards: “We’re Not Going To Accelerate It For Political Ends.”** According to National Review Ideas Summit, “[President Trump] announced the decision with respect to the CAFE Standards … we told the industry across that keep working toward these standards, that we’re going to review them in due course — process matters, we’re gonna keep our word that we’re not going to accelerate it for political ends.” [National Review Ideas Summit, 3/17/17]

**Pruitt Wanted To “Take Cars That People Want To Buy And Make Them More Efficient Meet CAFE Standards.** to National Review Ideas Summit, “[The direction of the CAFE Standards] are yet to be determined, that’s why you have a mid-term review. … The goal, in my view, with respect to those mission control standards, with respect to mobile sources is to actually take cars that people want to buy and make them more efficient. That sounds rather novel, perhaps, but what happened over the last several years is the government will go to industry and say go build a bunch of cars that nobody wants to buy and the balance that against the rest of your portfolio that people are wanting to buy and then throw it in the mix and say we’re making these emission control outcomes. What should be the goal is to work with those in the R&D sector in each of these car manufacturers and take trucks, take SUVs, and do all we can to meet those outcomes to make the cars that people want to buy while providing safety.” [National Review Ideas Summit, 3/17/17]

**Pruitt Took “No Position” On CAFE Standards**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “While the EPA regulates emissions under the Clean Air Act, it is true that Congress vested authority to regulate fuel economy through the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards" framework set forth originally in the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. Congress vested responsibility for the CAFE program in the Department of Transportation, not the EPA; accordingly, I take no position on Congress's policy decision on this subject, or on the Department of Transportation's administration of the CAFE program. If confirmed as EPA Administration, I would administer the Clean Air Act in accordance with the terms of the Act, including Congress's statutory policy objectives, and would do so on the basis of the factual record in any given proceeding.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

### California Waiver

**Lawmakers Pressed EPA To Allow California Emissions Standards.**Lawmakers press EPA to allow Calif. emissions standards. According to E&E News, “Dozens of lawmakers, including a handful of Republicans, joined a letter to U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt urging him to maintain California’s ability to set its own stringent vehicle emissions standards. Seventy-six members — including dozens of California Democrats and Republican Reps. Carlos Curbelo of Florida and Mike Coffman of Colorado — called on Pruitt to not pre-empt California and 12 states that have signed onto its vehicle requirements. Curbelo and Coffman are members of the bipartisan Climate Solutions Caucus. Pruitt told House appropriators yesterday that ‘currently the waiver is not under review,’ but did not say whether he would never revoke California’s allowance or whether he would grant new waivers. … ‘If the administration is unwilling to support strong federal fuel efficiency and emission standards, it is more important than ever that states be allowed to continue driving innovation, consumer choice, and environmental and public health improvements through strong state standards,’ the letter says. ‘States should decide for themselves if they want to follow California’s lead or not.’” [E&E News, [6/16/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/06/16/stories/1060056177)]

**Trump Administration Backs Away From Fight Over California's Power To Set Rules For Cars And Trucks.** According to Los Angeles Times, “The Trump administration is backing off its threat to revoke California’s unique authority to set its own tough pollution standards for cars and trucks — rules that have become a crucial tool for states to combat climate change without help from Washington. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt assured lawmakers on Thursday that his agency is not currently looking to take away the power that California has used for decades to reduce emissions that cause smog and heat up the planet. Earlier this year, Pruitt had suggested that the Trump administration might try to weaken or revoke California’s authority, which would have put Washington on a collision course with the state over a crucial environmental issue.” [Los Angeles Times, [6/15/17](http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-pol-sac-california-waiver-trump-20170615-story.html)]

**Pruitt: EPA Not Reviewing California Car Emissions Waiver.**According to Politico, “EPA is not reviewing a key waiver that allows California to set stricter emissions limits for cars than the federal government, EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt said today. ‘Currently the waiver is not under review … by EPA,’ Pruitt said at an appropriations hearing. ‘It’s important we recognize the role of states in achieving good air quality standards,’ Pruitt added, noting California’s early role in environmental regulation. EPA’s decision to re-open a review of auto standards for model year 2022-2025 cars also raised concerns that EPA would consider revoking the California waiver. The Clean Air Act allows EPA to give waivers to California on air quality issues because of the state’s historic and chronic pollution problems. The state and environmentalists argued that the law does not allow EPA to revoke such waivers once granted, and California officials said they would fight the Trump administration if it attempted to revoke it. The waiver in question was granted by the Obama administration in 2009. EPA and the Transportation Department later set the first greenhouse gas emissions standards for cars, but California said that any cars complying with the federal standard would also be deemed to have met the state’s standards so as to avoid a patchwork of regulations. WHAT’S NEXT: EPA is continuing its review of the nationwide emissions rules for model year 2022-2025 vehicles.” [Politico, [6/15/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/06/pruitt-epa-not-reviewing-california-car-emissions-waiver-089168)]

**California's Air Quality Waiver Appeared Secure As Trump's EPA Chief Told Congress It's Not Under Review.**According to Los Angeles Times, “California’s unique authority to set tougher air quality standards than the federal government isn’t being targeted right now, according to Environmental Protection Agency head Scott Pruitt. ‘Currently the waiver is not under review,’ Pruitt said Thursday. The comment, made during a Capitol Hill hearing, could deescalate what appeared to be a brewing battle between California and President Trump’s administration. During Pruitt’s confirmation hearing earlier this year, he raised the possibility of reviewing California’s waivers under the Clean Air Act, a decades-old mechanism that has helped the state become a leader in fighting smog and climate change. But Pruitt said Thursday that his office hadn’t taken that step when asked by Rep. Ken Calvert (R-Corona), who emphasized bipartisan support for the waivers over the years.” [Los Angeles Times,[6/15/17](http://www.latimes.com/politics/essential/la-pol-ca-essential-politics-updates-california-s-waiver-appears-secure-for-1497547579-htmlstory.html)]

**After Industry Push EPA Sought To “Work With” Brown On Vehicle GHG Review.**According to Inside EPA, “EPA is asking California Gov. Jerry Brown (D) to participate in the Trump administration’s restarted mid-term review of greenhouse gas and fuel economy rules for model year 2022-2025 vehicles, even though the state has pledged to use its special Clean Air Act (CAA) authority to aggressively fight any move to weaken the federal standards. ‘With your participation, this reconsideration will be based on the best available data and part of a robust, timely and inclusive process,’ agency Administrator Scott Pruitt says in a May 2 letter to Brown. ‘We hope you will work with us to be part of this process.’ The letter, first reported by E&E News, appears to be a formal restatement of the administration’s prior position. ‘We welcome California to the table,’ a senior White House official told reporters on a press call previewing the administration’s move to reconsider the standards. It also comes just days after automakers pressed Pruitt and Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao to ‘get moving’ on the re-started mid-term review, according to a knowledgeable source who added that there are indications that the industry is getting nervous about the slow pace of action.” [Inside EPA, [5/5/17](https://insideepa.com/daily-news/after-industry-push-epa-seeks-work-brown-vehicle-ghg-review)]

**Automakers Prepared To Bargain With EPA And CARB On Emissions.**According to Washington Post, “Bainwol appears to be a little disingenuous when he says things like ‘The talk the of rollback is fallacious. What we are talking here is the nature of the slope.’ If he’s asking CARB and the EPA to push back the timeline for achieving current 2025 emissions and fuel economy goals, then he is, in essence, asking for a rollback. While the current head of the EPA, Scott Pruitt, might buy Bainwol’s line of reasoning, we’re not so sure CARB will feel the same. He might be better served by sticking with the hard facts of economics, which seem more persuasive.” [Washington Post, [4/12/17](http://www.washingtonpost.com/cars/sensing-trouble-automakers-prepare-to-bargain-with-epa-carb-on-emissions/2017/04/13/38da20a6-2004-11e7-bb59-a74ccaf1d02f_story.html?utm_term=.474c7d0f075e)]

**California Refused To Back Down On 2025 Vehicle Emissions Standards, Invited Automakers To Sit Down.**According to Politico, “Setting up a potential showdown with the Trump administration, the California Air Resources Board voted unanimously Friday to maintain strict vehicle emissions standards through 2025. The Golden State’s decision comes on the heels of Trump’s EPA granting an automakers’ request to reconsider federal emissions standards locked in under the Obama administration in January. California invited automakers ‘to come sit down with us if they have specific concerns about implementation of the existing regulations that can be addressed without weakening the impact overall,’ CARB Chair Mary Nichols said in a statement. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt said Sunday he was ‘going to be evaluating’ whether to continue a waiver allowing California to go beyond federal standards for vehicle emissions. Twelve other states follow the vehicle regulations set by California.” [Politico, 3/27/17]

**California Retained Vehicle GHG Rules But Invited Industry To “Sit Down.”**According to Inside EPA, “The California Air Resources Board (CARB) is retaining the state’s vehicle greenhouse gas standards for model year 2022-2025 that currently align with national rules, but is inviting the auto industry to discuss its implementation concerns, though its top official is promising to maintain the rules ‘overall impact.’ The move suggests that the board may be open to tweaking its rules to maintain one set of national requirements amid the Trump administration’s recent move to revisit federal standards, though it indicates a relatively narrow set of options may be available to the administration and the industry as they work to review the parallel federal standards. ‘We invite you to come and sit down with us, if you have specific concerns about the implementation of the existing regulations that can be addressed without weakening the overall impact, which is what I’ve heard the leaders of your associations say is what you wanted to do,’ CARB Chairwoman Mary Nichols said during a March 24 meeting, addressing industry representatives.” [Inside EPA, [3/24/17](https://insideepa.com/daily-news/california-retains-vehicle-ghg-rules-invites-industry-sit-down)]

**10 States Urged Pruitt To Keep California Vehicle GHG Waiver, Federal Rules.**According to Inside EPA, “The states’ March 22 letter to EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt is notable in that it signals a potentially broad state backlash to any agency effort to target California’s existing air act waiver to issue stronger vehicle GHG rules than federal limits or possibly any future limits. ‘You have often spoken of the importance of states’ rights, and the right of California to establish and enforce standards that are needed to meet its environmental challenges is fundamental to the Clean Air Act, as is the right of other states to opt into the California standards,’ the letter says, characterizing the push to target California’s waiver as ‘industry lobbying.’ It was signed by the top environmental officials in Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Washington and Vermont. All of those states have adopted at least part of California’s vehicle standards under section 177 of the air act.” [Inside EPA, [3/23/17](https://insideepa.com/daily-news/10-states-urge-pruitt-keep-california-vehicle-ghg-waiver-federal-rules)]

**States Defended California's Vehicle Rules.**According to E&E News, “California will consider tomorrow whether to plow ahead with its own strict rules through 2025. The 12 other states and Washington that have signed on to follow the Golden State’s standards are rallying against a potential weakening of the rules. Together, they make up around 40 percent of the country’s automotive market. ‘We can’t meet our goals in Connecticut, in the Mid-Atlantic states, without the cars being delivered here,’ said Rob Klee, the commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. ‘We’re going to fight really hard on this one. ... We’re all in.’ Top environmental officials from Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Washington state and D.C. sent a letter to EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt yesterday asking that he maintain the Obama-era rules through 2025.” [E&E News, [3/23/17](http://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/03/23/stories/1060051970)]

**States Urged Saving Vehicle Rules.**According to Politico, “Ten states and D.C. sent a letter to EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt asking the agency to maintain vehicle greenhouse gas emissions standards locked in by the Obama EPA in January and to respect California’s Clean Air Act waiver that allows it to pursue more aggressive regulatory standards. ‘You have often spoken of the importance of states’ rights, and the right of California to establish and enforce standards that are needed to meet its environmental challenges is fundamental to the Clean Air Act, as is the right of other states to opt into the California standards,’ they wrote. ME readers probably remember Trump’s visit to Michigan where he ordered the reopening of the midterm review of auto emissions standards for 2022-25 model year vehicles.” [Politico, 3/24/17]

**California Politicians Slammed Auto Rule Roll Back.**According to Politico, “California politicians slammed the Trump administration’s decision Wednesday to reopen the EPA’s midterm review of auto emissions standards for 2022-2025 model year vehicles. Gov. Jerry Brown called it ‘an unconscionable gift to polluters’ that ‘put the interest of big oil ahead of clean air and politics ahead of science’ in a letter to Pruitt. ‘If Washington continues down this road, California will take the necessary actions to preserve current standards,’ he wrote. And Sen. Kamala Harris asked Pruitt to reverse the decision, saying it contradicted an answer he gave her under oath during his confirmation hearing. In addition, a coalition of Democratic attorneys general vowed in a statement to ‘vigorously oppose attempts by the Trump Administration to weaken our vehicle emission policies,’ while the state of California asked late Wednesday to intervene in a lawsuit filed by the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers in the D.C. Circuit challenging the Obama administration’s January determination.” [Politico, 3/16/17]

**California And New York Ready To Fight Trump Mileage Move.**According to E&E News, “California, New York and seven other states yesterday challenged President Trump’s bid to roll back fuel economy standards that were approved by the Obama administration and largely based on a Golden State model. ‘President Trump’s decision today to weaken emission standards in cars is an unconscionable gift to polluters,’ California Gov. Jerry Brown (D) said in a letter U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt. ‘Once again, you’ve put the interests of big oil ahead of clean air and politics ahead of science.’ Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao and Pruitt yesterday said they would revisit the decision that finalized standards increasing gas mileage to 50.8 mpg for cars and light-duty trucks by model year 2025. Trump tied the move to autoworker jobs. He condemned the Obama administration’s ‘eleventh-hour decision’ to lock in the rules more than a year ahead of schedule.” [E&E News, [3/16/17](http://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/03/16/stories/1060051554)]

**Trump Fuel Economy Move Set Up Fight With California And New York.**According to Associated Press, “California Gov. Jerry Brown denounced the Trump administration’s move, telling Environmental Protection Agency chief Scott Pruitt in a letter Wednesday it was a ‘gift to polluters.’ Brown warned auto makers in another letter Wednesday that his state would take the ‘necessary steps’ to preserve its current emissions standards. Buttressing Brown’s threats, California filed a motion late Tuesday to intervene in a new lawsuit brought by auto manufacturers against the EPA, a move immediately joined by New York State. The actions will allow the two states to defend the tougher emissions standards in court. ‘President Trump’s action represents a dramatic wrong turn in our nation’s efforts to fight air pollution from passenger cars and trucks and protect the health of our children, seniors and all communities,’ said New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman.” [Associated Press,[3/15/17](https://www.wsj.com/articles/AP2ea20deaca6e4d88ab70497ab5f1be9e)]

**Enviros Braced For Battle If Pruitt Takes Aim At Car Standards.**According to E&E News, “State officials maintain that they don’t expect Pruitt to target the existing waivers, despite his refusal in his confirmation hearing to commit to extending or maintaining waivers received by the state. The particular waiver at issue, giving California permission to set greenhouse gas standards for model years 2017-25, was granted in 2013. … But state Senate President Pro Tem Kevin de León (D)is reportedly consulting with former U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder, whom he hired to advise him on defending against Trump’s policies, as well as with Gov. Jerry Brown (D) and state Attorney General Xavier Becerra (D). Pruitt’s motivation for targeting California remains unclear. Automakers did not want to take a position on the waiver yesterday. The Alliance for Automobile Manufacturers and Global Automakers both pointed to their previous letters to EPA. They urge harmonization among California, EPA and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s standards, yet do not call for a revocation of the waiver. … ‘They’re going to lose in court,’ said Simon Mui, director of California vehicles and fuels at the Natural Resources Defense Council. ‘The automakers have opened Pandora’s box, and what they’ve created for themselves will be years of litigation and uncertainty for their product plans.’” [E&E News, [3/8/17](http://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/03/08/stories/1060051121)]

**The Coming Clean-Air War Between Trump And California.**According to Atlantic, “The probable withdrawal has so far avoided attracting significant activist attention, perhaps because the idea of the waiver is difficult to explain or because at first glance it appears to be a local issue affecting only Californians. But if Scott Pruitt and the Trump administration succeed in revoking the waiver, it could spell catastrophe for California’s climate policy, which is one of the most aggressive and technologically important in the developed world. It could also worsen the health of the roughly 130 million Americans who depend directly on the Golden State’s more stringent environmental standards. … This power is reserved alone for California, and it only covers pollution from cars. No other state can ask for a waiver. … If Pruitt tries to withdraw a waiver from California, he may quickly run into legal trouble: The Clean Air Act provides no mechanism for the EPA to ever revoke a waiver. He would more or less be identifying a new power in an old law specifically to attack a state’s sovereignty, experts said.” [Atlantic, [3/7/17](https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/03/trump-california-clean-air-act-waiver-climate-change/518649/)]

**EPA To Reconsider Vehicle Fuel Standards, May Move Against California Targets.**According to Los Angeles Times, “The Environmental Protection Agency plans to announce its intent to withdraw final determination on strict fuel-efficiency standards for future cars and light trucks, the latest signal by the Trump administration that it is charting a new course on climate change. According to individuals briefed on the matter, the new administration also is considering issuing an executive order that would revoke California’s ability to set its own, tighter targets for those model years. California is the only state allowed to do so under the Clean Air Act, but other states can adopt its regulations as their own. Two associations representing the world’s biggest automakers last week asked EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt to reconsider the standards for model years 2022 to 2025, which would require the nation’s car and light-truck fleet to average 54.5 miles per gallon by the end of that period.” [Los Angeles Times, [3/3/17](http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-epa-fuel-mileage-autos-20170303-story.html)]

**California Is Environmentalists' Trump Card.**According to Atlantic, “Pruitt’s problem is California’s second waiver from Obama: the California Air Resources Board says it provides the state authority through 2025 to implement its own fuel economy rules, which match the existing federal standards. That means if Pruitt and the auto manufacturers truly want to roll back Obama’s auto efficiency standards, they will need to also rescind California’s waiver for its own rules––especially since about a dozen states, cumulatively representing about one-third of all new car sales, have adopted the state’s regulations. ‘At some point, they have to try to take California’s authority away,’ says Roland Hwang, director of the Natural Resources Defense Council’s energy and transportation program. No previous administration has tried to revoke a California waiver. ‘There is no precedent for revoking a waiver, and there doesn’t appear to be a pathway in the Clean Air Act for doing that,’ says Dan Becker, founder of the Safe Climate Campaign. But Pruitt raised eyebrows at his confirmation hearing when, under sharp questioning from Sen. Kamala Harris (D-CA), he expressed clear skepticism about the waiver process.” [Atlantic, [3/2/17](https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2017/03/why-california-is-environmentalists-trump-card/518301/)]

**As Pruitt Loomed, California Prepared To Cut Truck Emissions.**According to E&E News, “California Air Resources Board officials said they want to lock in a state version of the fuel economy rules for trucks, to preserve their authority to enforce them and to prevent a complete nationwide rollback. ‘There is, given the recent administration change and current political climate in Washington, there is a small chance the federal program could be revoked, and if that should happen, we do still plan on having a program here in California,’ said Kim Heroy-Rogalski, the manager of the mobile source control division at ARB. ‘We are hopeful it will not happen.’ … State officials said yesterday they would propose to align the state’s emissions standards for delivery trucks, school and transit buses, pickups, vans, and trailers with the tighter federal rules. A few modest tweaks unique to California would seek more emissions cuts and electrification. Were the state to seek major changes to the rules, it would have to ask EPA for permission.” [E&E News, [2/7/17](http://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/02/07/stories/1060049627)]

**Pruitt Pledge To “Review” California GHG Waiver Suggested Emerging Battle.**According to Inside EPA, “EPA administrator nominee Scott Pruitt during his Senate confirmation hearing opened the door to rescinding California’s existing waiver to pursue light-duty vehicle greenhouse gas controls -- pledging to review the waiver, which allows the state to implement its vehicle program, though he vowed not to ‘prejudge’ the issue. Pruitt’s testimony at the Jan. 18 Senate environment committee hearing leaves some wiggle room on EPA’s future course, and it is being interpreted in part as consistent with typical efforts by Cabinet nominees to avoid ironclad policy commitments during confirmation hearings. … ‘It is statutory . . . it has to be respected,’ Pruitt said, responding to Sen. Ed Markey’s (D-MA) query on whether Pruitt supports the Clean Air Act provision giving California the right to request waivers to pursue vehicle emissions programs that are more stringent than federal limits. But Pruitt’s subsequent remarks appeared to signal that the Trump EPA might not agree to such requests.” [Inside EPA, [1/23/17](https://insideepaclimate.com/daily-news/pruitt-pledge-review-california-ghg-waiver-suggests-emerging-battle)]

## WOTUS

**Pruitt Instructed EPA Employees To Write New Analysis Of WOTUS Without Economic Benefits**. According to the New York Times, “E.P.A. employees say that in mid-June, as Mr. Pruitt prepared a proposal to reverse the rule, they were told by his deputies to produce a new analysis of the rule — one that stripped away the half-billion-dollar economic benefits associated with protecting wetlands. ‘On June 13, my economists were verbally told to produce a new study that changed the wetlands benefit,’ said Elizabeth Southerland, who retired last month from a 30-year career at the E.P.A., most recently as a senior official in the agency’s water office. ‘On June 16, they did what they were told,’ Ms. Southerland said. ‘They produced a new cost-benefit analysis that showed no quantifiable benefit to preserving wetlands.’” [New York Times, [8/11/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/11/us/politics/scott-pruitt-epa.html?_r=0)]

**Pruitt Starred In Industry Video That Promoted WOTUS Repeal.**According to E&E News, “In the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association video, Pruitt uses industry talking points to inaccurately describe the rule, also known as the Waters of the U.S. (WOTUS). The 2015 regulation was aimed at clarifying which wetlands and small waterways are protected by the Clean Water Act. The video directs viewers to BeefUSA.org for filing comments on the proposed repeal. The trade group’s webpage says, ‘Take Action Now — Tell EPA to Kill WOTUS.’ It offers a link to the Federal Register and provides ‘sample comments’ that readers can ‘copy and paste (or modify).’ … ‘This kind of behavior by an agency makes the rulemaking process seem like it is not really open-minded and that public participation doesn’t really matter that much because certain commenters would be treated as more favorably than other commenters,’ said Jeffrey Lubbers, a specialist in administrative law at American University’s Washington College of Law. In response to questions about the video, EPA issued a statement describing the logistics that went into its production. ‘As Administrator Pruitt says in the video, receiving public comments from across the country helps EPA make informed decisions on proposed rules,’ an EPA spokeswoman said. ‘Just like the Administrator’s countless other interviews, there was no script and no cost to EPA to accommodate the National Cattlemen’s Beef Association’s request for a brief interview regarding EPA’s State Action Tour and WOTUS.’” [E&E News, [8/21/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/08/21/stories/1060058985)]

**EPA Extended Public Comment Period For WOTUS Repeal.**According to Politico, “EPA is giving the public another month to comment on its move to repeal the Obama administration’s Waters of the U.S. rule. The agency announced today that it will extend the public comment period by 30 days, giving environmental groups, industry advocates and the public until Sept. 27 to weigh on its proposed rule to repeal the Obama-era regulation. Supporters of the Obama rule, which increases the number of streams and wetlands that receive automatic federal protection, had criticized the length of time the Trump administration gave for public comment. The repeal rule was originally opened for 30 days of comment, although it was public for about a month before the comment period formally opened. The original Obama rule, also called the Clean Water Rule, was open for more than 200 days. Issues raised through the public comment process help lay the groundwork for future legal challenges. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt has pushed to swiftly repeal the contentious regulation and draft his own rewrite defining which marshes, bogs and creeks are subject to regulation under the Clean Water Act. WHAT’S NEXT: Comments on the Trump administration’s rule to repeal the WOTUS regulation are due by Sept. 27.” [Politico, [8/16/17](https://www.politicopro.com/agriculture/whiteboard/2017/08/epa-extends-public-comment-period-for-wotus-repeal-091881)]

**Pruitt: There Is A Very Clear Role For The Feds In WOTUS Rule Repeal Process.** According to KCCI (CBS), “[Host]: ‘This should be up to the states?’ [Pruitt]: No, there is a very clear role for the feds. We are repealing the 2015 rule. That is in fact the case. We are withdrawing that 2015 rule but not just doing that. We will provide a definition of a new Water Of The United States to ensure Iowans know where federal jurisdiction begins and ends. States and the federal government for years have worked to improve water quality, worked to improve air quality. Farmers and ranchers are first environmentalists. The other first conservationist. Their land is the greatest asset. To think they are not committed to improving air quality and engaging in conservation practices to ensure good water quality and to achieve what they need to form their land and provide for their livestock is something that is foreign to the way I think. We need to have a partnership in place and provide clarity [and] regulatory certainty on our federal jurisdiction begins and ends.” [KCCI (CBS), [8/13/17](http://www.kcci.com/article/kcci-close-up-the-environmental-protection-agency/12005746)]

**Politico: EPA Formally Proposed WOTUS Withdrawal.**According to Politico, “EPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers will formally propose withdrawal of the Obama administration's controversial water rule today, marking the end of a yearslong effort by farm and other groups to scrap what they say is burdensome federal overreach. The proposed rule to withdraw the Waters of the U.S. rule, also called the Clean Water Rule, was unveiled in late June, but had yet to be noticed in the Federal Register, the formal step that triggers the beginning of the public comment period. The Trump administration has given the public 30 days to weigh in on the proposed rule, though critics of the repeal effort have called for more time.” [Politico, [7/27/17](http://www.politico.com/tipsheets/morning-agriculture/2017/07/27/crop-insurance-and-the-natural-disaster-problem-221560)]

**EPA Planned WOTUS Rewrite Rule For December.**According to Politico, “EPA is planning a December unveiling of its rewrite of the controversial rule defining which streams and wetlands get federal protection. A listing in the Unified Agenda posted by the White House today indicates the agency plans to put the proposed rewrite of the Waters of the U.S. rule out for public comment in December. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt is taking a two-step approach to undoing the Obama administration’s rule on the topic. The agency took the first step last month, with a proposed rule to formally take the Obama era rule off the books. The rewrite rule, which EPA has solicited input from states and local government officials, would be the second step. Both rules are certain to face fierce legal challenges. Environmental groups and states supportive of the Obama rule have indicated they are prepared to sue over efforts to repeal it. Meanwhile, President Donald Trump has directed EPA to take an unproven approach to the new rule, relying on a plurality opinion in a 2006 Supreme Court case that lower courts have ruled is not controlling. WHAT’S NEXT: EPA will draft its rewrite of the Waters of the U.S. rule based on Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia’s much narrower interpretation of which streams and wetlands warrant federal protection.” [Politico, [7/20/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/07/epa-plans-wotus-rewrite-rule-for-december-090820)]

**Pruitt: “If The WOTUS Rule Is Vacated, We Will Return The Status Quo.”** According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “The goal of the lawsuit I brought to advance the State of Oklahoma’s interest in protecting its regulatory authority is to have the courts vacate the WOTUS rule. If the WOTUS rule is vacated, we will return the status quo, and the State of Oklahoma’s sovereign authority to regulate waters within its border will not be diminished.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**2016: Pruitt On WOTUS: “We Got A Stay Of Enforcement. The Sixth Circuit Has Taken Jurisdiction And Every State In The Country Is Now Able To Live Without Any Kind Of Fear Against The WOTUS Rule Being Enforced Against Private Property Owners.”** [OK AG Policy Youtube, [3/14/16](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P7-PnsHeHJw)]

**Pruitt: WOTUS Rule a Threat to Private Property Rights.** “If we fail, we will all live in a regulatory state where farmers must go before the EPA to seek permission to build a farm pond to keep their livestock alive, where homebuilders must seek EPA approval before beginning construction on a housing development that contains a dry creek bed, and where energy producers are left waiting for months or even years to get permits from the EPA, costing the producers tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of dollars that inevitably will be passed on to consumers. That is why failure is not an option. The EPA’s rule is unlawful and must be withdrawn. We urge the EPA to meet with state-level officials who can help the agency understand the careful measures that states already have in place to protect and develop the lands and waters within their borders. We urge the EPA to listen to Congress regarding the intent of the law to limit the regulation of non-navigable waters. But most of all, we urge the EPA to take note of the harm that its rule will do to the property rights of the average American.” [The Hill, [3/4/15](http://thehill.com/opinion/op-ed/234685-epa-water-rule-is-blow-to-americans-private-property-rights)]

**Pruitt On WOTUS: “This Is Not An Overstatement, They Are Changing The Definition To Include Water That Would Be In A Drainage Ditch.”** According to The Grove Sun, “One of the attendees asked about the EPA’s consideration of changing the rule to redefine what is considered a navigable waterway. ‘This is not an overstatement, they are changing the definition to include water that would be in a drainage ditch,’ Pruitt said. This rule change means any land use change or development by landowners, including farms and ranches, would have to go through the EPA for prior approval and permitting. ‘Think about how that affects farming and ranching in this state, oil and gas development, municipalities,’ he said. ‘I’m filing comments on behalf of the State of Oklahoma in that rule making process to say it’s unlawful. ‘If they do not change course I guarantee we will file a lawsuit, and there will be many states that join.’” [The Grove Sun, 11/9/14]

**Pruitt Called WOTUS “A Naked Power Grab By The EPA.”** According to Tulsa World, " The EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers say the proposal only clarifies existing definitions of federally regulated waters and, on balance, will reduce the potential extent of federal authority. Opponents, including Pruitt and Environment and Public Works Committee Chairman Jim Inhofe, sharply disagree. Pruitt, in his prepared remarks, said the rule would include ‘virtually every body of water down to the smallest of streams, farm ponds and ditches. This is a naked power grab by the EPA.’" [Tulsa World, 2/5/15]

**Pruitt: “That WOTUS Rule Is Quite Breathtaking.”** According to Tulsa World, “In particular, he singled out two EPA gambits - the administration’s Clean Power Plan, and a revision of the Waters of the U.S. rule, or WOTUS, which defines waters regulated by the Clean Water Act. ‘That WOTUS rule is quite breathtaking,’ Pruitt said. ‘There are issues the EPA should be dealing with. When I talk about the EPA and its role with the states, it’s not an abolitionist view, that we don’t need that agency. It’s that the agency should act within the outlines established by Congress.’” [Tulsa World, 8/6/15]

**Pruitt On WOTUS: “If You Have Water That Crosses State Line, Navigability Is The Key.”** According to Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, “‘It is a hugely impactful rule the EPA has come down with in the not-so-distant past,’ Pruitt said. The Clean Water Act authorized by Congress gives the EPA jurisdiction over navigable waters, Pruitt said. The Interstate Commerce clause justifies the Clean Water Act, Pruitt said. ‘If you have water that crosses state line, navigability is the key,’ Pruitt said. ‘The EPA has jurisdiction with that.’” [Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, 8/26/15]

* **“This Is About Property Rights. It’s About The Providence Of The States.”** According to Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, “According to the EPA, ‘The rule ensures that waters protected under the Clean Water Act are more precisely defined, more predictably determined, and easier for businesses and industry to understand. ‘This is about property rights. It’s about the providence of the states, because local towns and municipalities across this state and property owners, are the ones who have made decisions about the use of land and the allocation of water,’ Pruitt said.” [Bartlesville Examiner-Enterprise, 8/26/15]

Fracking

**Pruitt Claimed Fracking Innovation Allowed U.S. To Reduce CO2 Footprint To Pre -1994 Levels.** According to National Review Ideas Summit, “We’re at pre-1994 levels with respect to our CO2 footprint. Why? Because of hydraulic fracturing combined with horizontal drilling. We’ve had a lot of people think that hydraulic fracturing is something that we discovered in the last ten years, Oklahoma’s been regulating that process since 1948. … The difference is you now have horizontal drilling combined with the fracking process that allows an extraction of oil and gas that we couldn’t reach before. So innovation has helped us … with respect to our CO2 footprint.” [National Review Ideas Summit, 3/17/17]

**Pruitt Implied That There Was No Evidence To Support Fracking And Water Contamination**. According to FactCheck.org, “He implied in April 2014 that’s there’s no evidence to support a link between fracking and water contamination. There is some evidence to support a link in certain instances, but not enough to definitively conclude that contamination is widespread, as we wrote in early December.” [FactCheck.org, [12/14/16](http://www.factcheck.org/2016/12/facts-trumps-epa-nominee/)]

**2016: EPA Says Fracking Can Contaminate Drinking Water**. According to an article in the New York Times, “The Environmental Protection Agency has concluded that hydraulic fracturing, the oil and gas extraction technique also known as fracking, has contaminated drinking water in some circumstances, according to the final version of a comprehensive study first issued in 2015. The new version is far more worrying than the first, which found ‘no evidence that fracking systemically contaminates water’ supplies. In a significant change, that conclusion was deleted from the final study.” [New York Times, [12/13/16](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/13/us/reversing-course-epa-says-fracking-can-contaminate-drinking-water.html?_r=0)]

**Pruitt: States Have ‘Been In The Driver’s Seat’ And Have Been Regulating Hydraulic Fracturing For More Than Six Decades**. According to Enid News and Eagle, “Pruitt addressed concerns among some attendees Friday the EPA could begin regulating hydraulic fracturing in the oil and gas industry. He said the states have ‘been in the driver’s seat’ and have been regulating hydraulic fracturing for more than six decades. ‘Now, you have the EPA in Washington, D.C., studying whether they should insert themselves into the process of hydraulic fracturing,’ Pruitt said. ‘We have resources like the Corporation Commission that have been responsible for regulating that activity for years. We’ve been doing it and doing it well, and we have primacy.” [Enid News and Eagle, 3/15/13]

**2012: Pruitt Challenged BLM Fracking Rule As Oklahoma AG**. According to The Journal Record, “Calling a federal proposal arbitrary, capricious and without justification, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt and Louisiana Gov. Bobby Jindal on Monday challenged a pro-posed rule by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management to federally regulate hydraulic fracturing. Pruitt, writing for the Republican Attorneys General Association, and Jindal, writing as the current chairman of the Repub-lican Governors Association, said in a letter to President Barack Obama on Monday that historically, states have had the responsibility of regulating drilling on Indian land. The letter, the second from Pruitt and the RGA, asks Obama, the Office of Management and Budget and the U.S. Department of the Interior to drop the proposed BLM rule. Pruitt and Jindal called the rule destructive, saying it would negatively affect in-vestment, revenue and employment.” [The Journal Record, 12/17/12]

* **Pruitt: “State Regulators, Not The Federal Government, Are In The Best Position To Understand The Scientific And Economic Requirements Of The Industry.”** According to The Journal Record, “In the latest letter, Pruitt and Jindal outlined a number of objections to the proposal. ‘State regulators, not the federal government, are in the best position to understand the scientific and economic requirements of the industry without adding burdensome delays and more than $1 billion in unnecessary costs,’ Pruitt and Jindal said in the letter.” [The Journal Record, 12/17/12]

### Methane

**Pruitt: “EPA Has Appropriately Declined To Regulate Methane Emissions From New And Existing Oil And Gas Facilities Under The Clean Air Act.”** According to Tulsa World, “A letter by Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt and signed by his counter-parts in 12 other energy-producing states tells the EPA it should not allow threats of litigation by six North-east states to provide a back-door entry for federal oversight of fracking. The U.S. Environmental Protec-tion Agency has been studying the effects of hydraulic fracturing but so far has stayed out of an enforce-ment role. The Pruitt letter, however, noted that New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Vermont, Delaware and Rhode Island have threatened to sue the agency and perhaps force it into a regional regulatory role that eventually could set a precedent. ‘EPA has appropriately declined to regulate methane emissions from new and existing oil and gas facilities under the Clean Air Act,’ Pruitt wrote.” [Tulsa World, 5/7/13]

**2011: Pruitt Wrote Letter To Other AGs Alleging EPA Used “Inaccurate Methods: To Form Methane Regulations**. According to Journal Record Legislative Report, “Attorney General Scott Pruitt has received little response from attorneys general in other states and no response from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency regarding letters sent to them. Pruitt sent a letter on Wednesday to attorneys general, said Diane Clay, director of communications for the AG. In the letter, Pruitt shared his concerns over the federal agency’s creation of regulations based on what he called inaccurate data, asking them to review the issue in their own states. The letter alerted the AGs to what Pruitt called inaccurate methods being used by the EPA to formulate regulations on natural gas exploration.” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 10/27/11]

* **Pruitt: “Misstep Or Deception By The EPA Has Resulted In New Figures That Are Faulty, Unreasonable And Based On A Distorted Understanding Of How Gas Drilling Operates.”** According to The Oklahoman, “‘This misstep or deception by the EPA has resulted in new figures that are faulty, unreasonable and based on a distorted understanding of how gas drilling operates,’ Pruitt said in the letter to the AGs. ‘The agency’s actions have a very real effect on families, businesses, communities and state economies. The EPA’s actions in this case are working toward eroding the states’ ability to self-regulate and stifle exploration of domestic energy sources, putting our national energy security at risk without justification.’” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 10/27/11]

Renewable Energy

**2014: Pruitt At ALEC: “If Fossil Fuels Go Away, If We Don't Go After Two Thirds Of Our Fossil Fuel That Is In The Ground I Ask You A Question What's Going To Happen To The Cost Of Electricity? What's Going To Happen To Manufacturing Our Businesses? … Costs Are Going To Skyrocket.”** “I was on a panel with the EPA General Counsel in park city Utah las week. I don’t watch MSNBC too much, but when I do, I Chris Hayes apparently and so on this show he had the president giving an interview I think it was to Mr. Krugman about energy policy in this country and I was shocked by what was reported the administration in this show show talked about that the goal of our energy policy should be to keep two-thirds of the fossil fuels in the ground. That’s the goal and and so when you have that stated as, as, as clearly as that. You start asking the question this body called the EPA this agency called the EPA what is their role? What is their objective? Is it to pick winners and losers in the energy context? Is it is it to say that renewables are good and fossil fuels are bad and so we're going to use our regulatory power to penalize fossil fuels to elevate other types of energy you know this, but if you look across this country and look at how fossil fuels power electricity if you combine oil natural gas and coaltogether it approaches seventy percent of what we used to generate electricity. If fossil fuels go away, if we don't go after two thirds of our fossil fuel that is in the ground I ask you a question what's going to happen to the cost of electricity? What's going to happen to manufacturing our businesses? … costs are going to skyrocket.” [American Legislative Exchange Council Youtube Page, [8/5/14](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K12PCuBjFgI)]

**2004: Pruitt Missed A Vote On SB 1212, A Bill That Created The “The Oklahoma Wind Power Assessment Committee Made Up Of 12 Members Who Shall Have The Duty Of Analyzing Data From The Newly Constructed Wind Farms Located In This State And Provide Recommendations For Legislation To Support Further Development Of Zero-Based Emission Renewable Energy In Oklahoma.”** Scott Pruitt did not vote on a 2004 bill, SB 1212. The measure passed 43 to 0. It “Creates the Oklahoma Wind Power Assessment Committee made up of 12 members who shall have the duty of analyzing data from the newly constructed wind farms located in this state and provide recommendations for legislation to support further development of zero-based emission renewable energy in Oklahoma. The Committee shall operate until 2009 and may make reports or recommendations as the committee deems necessary.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [3/3/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2004: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SJR 41, A Measure That “Encourages Local, State And Federal Agencies To Purchase Oklahoma Green Power And Encourages Citizens To Use Renewable Energy.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [3/3/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2004: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 2351, A Measure That “Creates A Fuel Cell Initiative Task Force To Study And Make Recommendations Relating To The Fuel Cell Industry, Encourage Fuel Cell Technology Manufacturers To Locate In This State And Study Tax And Other Economic Incentives Relating To Fuel Cell Technology.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 2351. The measure “Creates a Fuel Cell Initiative Task Force to study and make recommendations relating to the fuel cell industry, encourage fuel cell technology manufacturers to locate in this state and study tax and other economic incentives relating to fuel cell technology. This task force shall only be created if federal funds are obtained by the Oklahoma Department of Commerce by May 31, 2004.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [4/6/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2003: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 1705, A Measure That “Amends Current Statutes Governing Alternative-Fueled School And Government Vehicles By Limiting The Requirement To Use Alternative Fuel Only When A Fill Station Or Charge Station Is In Operation Within A Five-Mile Radius Of The Entity And The Price Of Alternative Fuel Is Comparable To The Price Of Fuel Being Displaced.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor ofHB 1705. The Measure “Amends current statutes governing alternative-fueled school and government vehicles by limiting the requirement to use alternative fuel only when a fill station or charge station is in operation within a five-mile radius of the entity and the price of alternative fuel is comparable to the price of fuel being displaced.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2003 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/21/03](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/senate_journals/sj2003/sj2003_index.html)]

**2001: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of A Measure That “Amends The Alternative Fuels Technician Certification Act. Modifies The Definition Of ‘Electric Vehicle Technician’ By Clarifying That The Technicians Must Work With Onboard Motors In Vehicles That Are Powered By Electricity Greater Than Eighty Volts.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2001 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/2/11](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf)]

**2001: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 440; The Bill Created “An Income Tax Credit For Any Entity Producing Electric Power From A ‘Zero-Emission Facility’ Which Uses Renewable Resources Such As Wind, Moving Water, Sun Or Geothermal Energy.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of SB440. The bill passed the Senate 44 to 1. The measure “Creates the Electric Restructuring Advisory Committee to continue studying the effects of electric restructuring in this state. This bill delays the implementation of any electric restructuring activities until the Advisory Committee submits their final report and legislation is enacted to authorize necessary changes. SB 440 continues the moratorium which prohibits municipalities from condemning the facilities of electric public utilities or electric cooperatives and continues the prohibition on consumer switching of electric power suppliers until such time as legislation is enacted to implement restructuring. The bill authorizes the Oklahoma Municipal Power Authority to own a joint interest in any electric generation plant, except a nuclear facility. SB 440 creates an income tax credit for any entity producing electric power from a ‘zero-emission facility’ which uses renewable resources such as wind, moving water, sun or geothermal energy. The bill also provides funding for the activities of the Advisory Committee, creates exemptions for the Grand River Dam Authority from the provisions of the Open Meetings and Open Records Acts relating to certain fuel and transportation contracts and directs the Department of Public Safety to distribute certain boating safety funds to all eligible waters of the state.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2001 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/14/01](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf)]

**2000: Pruitt Voted Against A “Bill Would Have Restructured The Electric Industry By Requiring Separation Of Generation, Transmission And Distribution Assets Of Retail Electric Providers So That Electric Generation Would Have Become An Unregulated Competitive Service, Thereby Giving Consumers Their Choice Of Electric Generation Providers After July 1, 2002.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted against SB 220. The bill failed in the House and passed the Senate. The measure would “have restructured the electric industry by requiring separation of generation, transmission and distribution assets of retail electric providers so that electric generation would have become an unregulated competitive service, thereby giving consumers their choice of electric generation providers after July 1, 2002.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/12/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

* **SB 220 “Contained A Requirement For Electric Distributors To Purchase Nine Percent Of The Electric Power Consumed In This State From Renewable Energy Technologies By January 1, 2008, If The Renewable Power Was Available. The State Of Oklahoma Was Mandated To Purchase Ten Percent Of Its Electric Needs From Renewable Sources If It Was Available.”**  “The bill contained a requirement for electric distributors to purchase nine percent of the electric power consumed in this state from renewable energy technologies by January 1, 2008, if the renewable power was available. The State of Oklahoma was mandated to purchase ten percent of its electric needs from renewable sources if it was available. There was a two and one-half cent per kWh tax credit included for new facilities generating zero emission power. Some of the sections of the bill would have been effective immediately to allow entities to begin the asset separation process and the oversight and supervision authorities to begin their rulemaking process. Other sections would have been effective upon the implementation date of electric restructuring, July 1, 2002.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/30/99](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

Electric Utilities

**2005: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 1910, A Measure That “Authorizes The Corporation Commission To Promulgate Rules Which Would Allow Electric Public Utilities To Recover Their Costs Incurred When Such Utilities Are Required By Federal Order To Upgrade Their Transmission Systems.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 1910. The bill “Authorizes the Corporation Commission to promulgate rules which would allow electric public utilities to recover their costs incurred when such utilities are required by federal order to upgrade their transmission systems. Such costs shall be presumed to be recoverable unless evidence proves such costs exceed the scope of the project which may be authorized by the Southwest Power Pool, Oklahoma’s regional transmission organization, or the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). The electric public utilities may periodically adjust their rates to recover such costs. HB 1910 further allows electric public utilities to apply for Corporation Commission authorization to recover capital expenditures for equipment necessary to comply with the Federal Clean Air Act. Such expenditures would be presumed to be used and useful and fully recoverable by the public utility. The bill additionally authorizes public utilities for pre-approval by the Commission prior to constructing or purchasing new electric generation facilities. If the Commission approves such purchase or construction then such a facility would be considered to be used and useful and subject to cost recovery rules promulgated by the Commission. This measure allows the Corporation Commission staff and the Attorney General to assess the need for such requests and the public utility is responsible for the costs associated with their assessments. The Commission is required to promulgate rules governing this pre-approval process before April 1, 2006 and the bill requires the Commission to consider several issues relating to cost recovery in the rulemaking process.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2005 Senate Journal, [4/26/05](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2004: Pruitt Missed A Vote On SB 848. The Bill Authorized “Electric Cooperatives With Less Than 17,000 Members To Allow Members To Exempt Themselves From Rate Regulation By The Corporation Commission.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [2/11/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2004: Pruitt Missed A Vote On HB 2278, A Measure That “Defines Foreign Public Utilities, Holding Companies And Nonutility Companies And Provides A Method For The Corporation Commission To Review Domestic Utility Companies And Mergers And Acquisitions Of Domestic Utility Companies.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt did not vote on HB2278. The measure “Defines foreign public utilities, holding companies and nonutility companies and provides a method for the Corporation Commission to review domestic utility companies and mergers and acquisitions of domestic utility companies.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [4/6/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2002: Pruitt Missed A Vote On HB 1300, A Bill That “Clarifies The Current Statutes Governing The Corporation Commission’s Regulation Of Electric Cooperatives By Authorizing All Cooperatives With Less Than 17,000 Members To Opt Out Of Commission Regulation Upon An Election By Their Members.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt missed a vote on HB 1300. The bill “Clarifies the current statutes governing the Corporation Commission’s regulation of electric cooperatives by authorizing all cooperatives with less than 17,000 members to opt out of Commission regulation upon an election by their members. Those cooperatives would be selfregulated and not subject to any regulation by the Commission.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [5/16/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2002: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 1312, A Bill That “Modifies The Powers Granted To Electric Cooperatives By Allowing Cooperatives To Jointly Own Or Operate Electric Generation, Transmission Or Distribution Facilities With Other Privately Owned Electric Utilities Or Other Private Business Entities.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of SB 1312. The bill “Modifies the powers granted to electric cooperatives by allowing cooperatives to jointly own or operate electric generation, transmission or distribution facilities with other privately owned electric utilities or other private business entities.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/20/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

Public Lands

**Pruitt: “The Obama Administrations Unlawful Attempt To List The Lesser Prairie Chicken As An Endangered Species Was Not Based On Sound Science But A Hastily Put Together Effort By Federal Agencies, Colluding With Environmental Groups, To Engage In Sue-And-Settle Tactics Designed To Stifle Oil And Gas Exploration In Oklahoma And Other States.”** According to a press release by Scott Pruitt, “Attorney General Scott Pruitt on Friday released the following statement in response to the Obama administrations recent decision to abandon its efforts to list the lesser prairie chicken as an endangered species. The Obama administrations unlawful attempt to list the lesser prairie chicken as an endangered species was not based on sound science but a hastily put together effort by federal agencies, colluding with environmental groups, to engage in sue-and-settle tactics designed to stifle oil and gas exploration in Oklahoma and other states, Attorney General Pruitt said.” [Scott Pruitt, 5/20/16]

* **Pruitt: “That Is Why I Brought Suit Challenging The Listing, And Arguing That Science And Facts-On-The-Ground Unequivocally Prove The Chicken Is Not Endangered, And That The State’s Conservation Efforts Are Working.”** According to a press release by Scott Pruitt, “That is why I brought suit challenging the listing, and arguing that science and facts-on-the-ground unequivocally prove the chicken is not endangered, and that the State’s conservation efforts are working. I’m pleased to report that the federal government has finally realized the error of its ways and has ended its efforts to list the bird as endangered. [Scott Pruitt, 5/20/16]

**Pruitt Joined Harold Hamm In Suing The DOI Over Adding Lesser Prairie Chicken To Endangered Species List, A Move That Would Knock Out “Some Of The Most Promising Land For Oil And Gas Leases In The Country.”** According to the New York Times, “This year, Mr. Pruitt joined with a group aligned with Mr. Hamm to sue the Interior Department over its plan to consider adding animals such as the lesser prairie chicken to the endangered species list, a move that Mr. Hamm has said could knock out ‘some of the most promising land for oil and gas leases in the country.’ The suit was filed after Mr. Hamm announced that he would serve as the chairman of Mr. Pruitt’s re-election campaign.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/07/us/politics/energy-firms-in-secretive-alliance-with-attorneys-general.html)]

**Pruitt: Even Threatened Or Endangered Species Designations Are Dictated By Attempts To Discourage Oil And Gas Production.** According to Tulsa World, “Even threatened or endangered species designations are dictated by attempts to discourage oil and gas production, Pruitt said, and cited the case of the lesser prairie chicken. In May, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service designated the bird as a threatened species, prompting lawsuits from environmental groups that wanted it listed as endangered, and agriculture and energy interests averse to the regulations that go with protected status. Several Pruitt challenges to federal environmental rules and decisions are pending. As in the past, Pruitt said they are not prompted by ideology or policy but by ‘rule of law.’” [Tulsa World, [9/20/14](http://www.tulsaworld.com/business/energy/pruitt-says-regulators-targeting-fossil-fuel-industry/article_f8e95ebe-7a28-5089-b5f3-752d518c7bd7.html)]

**2014: Pruitt Filed A Lawsuit Against The Interior Department And The U.S. Fish And Wildlife Service Over “Sue And Settle” Tactics… That Sought To Restrict Land Use For Agriculture, Oil And Gas Drilling, Wind Farms.** According to the USA Today, “In March, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt filed a lawsuit against the Interior Department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service over such ‘sue and settle’ tactics following an ESA lawsuit by a group called Wild Earth Guardians that sought to restrict land use for agriculture, oil and gas drilling, wind farms, and other activities in a five-state area-Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Kansas-inhabited by the lesser prairie chicken.” [USA Today, 7/1/14]

**Pruitt: “The Sue-And-Settle Timelines Force The FWS To Make Determinations Without A Thorough Review Of The Science. This Violates The Original Statute Requiring Sound Science Before Listing Species As Endangered.”** According to Investor’s Business Daily, “In an interview, Pruitt told IBD that ‘the sue-and-settle timelines force the FWS to make determinations without a thorough review of the science. This violates the original statute requiring sound science before listing species’ as endangered. Pruitt also claims the Fish and Wildlife has broken federal law by ‘ignoring state and local conservation measures’ in the affected states with millions of private and tax dollars invested.”[Investor’s Business Daily, 3/18/14]

**Pruitt: “Oklahoma Has Indicated Its Willingness To Protect The Lesser Prairie Chicken, But It Seems Increasingly Clear This Issue Isn’t About Sound Science Or Saving Endangered Species.”** According to the USA Today, “‘These settlements,’ Pruitt said in a statement, ‘impose tougher regulations and shorter timelines than those imposed by Congress,’ and thus violate the rule of law. ‘Oklahoma has indicated its willingness to protect the lesser prairie chicken,’ he added, ‘but it seems increasingly clear this issue isn’t about sound science or saving endangered species.’” [USA Today, 7/1/14]

**2013: Pruitt Fought Against An EPA Haze Rule That Would Have Cut Haze In National Parks And Wilderness Areas.** According to Clean Air Report, “The decision leaves in place a first-time ruling backing EPA's authority to reject state implementation plans (SIPs) that fail to properly use the agency's guidelines for estimating the costs of controlling pollutants that contribute to regional haze air pollution. EPA's haze program requires cuts in haze at national parks and wilderness areas. Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt said the state is considering ‘next steps,’ which could include appealing the case to the Supreme Court, but a spokeswoman says a decision on that has not yet been made.” [Clean Air Report, 11/7/13]

**2002: Tulsa World: “Pruitt Plans To File A Bill In The Legislature That Would Permit The School Land Commission To Sell The Land Surface Rights That It Holds, Put A Portion Of The Money Directly Into Schools And Colleges And Invest The Remainder.”** According to Tulsa World, “Pruitt plans to file a bill in the Legislature that would permit the school land commission to sell the land surface rights that it holds, put a portion of the money directly into schools and colleges and invest the remainder. Even if proceeds for a land sale were put into certificates of deposit, a meritoriously low-return investment, Pruitt notes, the beneficiaries of the trust would be better off. It’s not a radical idea. In fact, similar proposals have been discussed over the years. At statehood, two sections, or two square miles, of each township in Oklahoma Territory (western Oklahoma) were set aside to be held in trust for public schools. Another section was reserved for higher education and one section for charitable and penal institutions. Congress appropriated $5 million for those purposes in Indian Territory (eastern Oklahoma) to make up for land that was already occupied. Originally 3 million acres were held in trust; the 780,736 acres now held are what remains. Some of the land, especially in the state’s earlier days, was lost to sloppy bookkeeping or fraud.” [Tulsa World, 1/6/02]

### Federalism

**Scott Pruitt Created Federalism Unit; Oklahoma Allowed Gold and Silver Coins to Be Used as Legal Tender to the Glee of Militia Groups While He Was Attorney General.** “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt is such a nullification enthusiast that he created a separate ‘Federalism Unit’ devoted to fighting federal government ‘abuses of power.’ Oklahoma joined Utah and Arizona last summer in giving a glimmer of hope to fans of another goal of the militia world—returning America to the gold standard. In 2014, Oklahoma made it law that ‘gold and silver coins issued by the United States government are legal tender in the State of Oklahoma.’ Similar proposals are being pushed in at least a dozen states.” [Newsweek, [6/1/15](http://www.newsweek.com/2015/06/12/extremist-ideas-take-hold-republican-party-337913.html)]

**Scott Pruitt: Article V Conventions Could Only Propose Amendments; Constitutional Conventions That Called for “Broad and Unrestrained Purpose” Were Unconstitutional.** “Answering these concerns requires first distinguishing an Article V convention from a ‘constitutional convention.’ Oklahoma Attorney General, Scott Pruitt, addressed this in ‘A Brief Reflection on Article V of the U.S. Constitution.’ Granting that concerns over a runaway convention are ‘understandable,’ nonetheless, ‘safeguards exist to protect our Constitution against abuses.’ Conventions called under Article V may ‘only propose amendments. A plenipotentiary convention—a constitutional convention called for a broad and unrestrained purpose—is not authorized under the U.S. Constitution.’” [Forbes, [5/25/16](http://www.forbes.com/sites/tomlindsay/2016/05/25/was-americas-1787-constitutional-convention-illegal/#6c8451c2382d)]

**Scott Pruitt Wrote and Submitted Op-ed About Affordable Care Act to Breitbart Texas.** “After hearing oral arguments in King v Burwell, the Supreme Court is now considering its ruling in a case that presents what is likely the costliest example of executive lawmaking in the history of this Nation. Here’s what you need to know about the case: the Affordable Care Act (ACA) authorizes tax credits to be used to supplement the purchase of ACA-compliant health insurance through the ACA’s health insurance exchanges. But the ACA specifies that that the credits are only available through state-established exchanges, and not through the federal exchange (www.healthcare.gov). Importantly, the ACA also says that tax penalties on large employers for not providing ACA-compliant health insurance are triggered by an employee’s purchase of subsidized insurance on one of the state-established exchanges. In other words, the tax credits can’t be handed out, and the large-employer penalties cannot be assessed, in states that have declined to establish ACA exchanges.” [Breitbart, [3/15/16](http://www.breitbart.com/texas/2015/03/15/op-ed-king-v-burwell-and-the-presidents-extraordinary-rewriting-of-the-affordable-care-act/)]

### Lands Issues

**Pruitt Supported Pro-Ranching and Agriculture State Question 777.** “State Question 777 would afford Constitutional guarantees to farmers and ranchers to engage in agricultural operations. It would also prohibit the Legislature from passing laws obstructing the right to farm without a compelling state interest. The hyperbole has reached epic levels by those who oppose State Question 777. This question is not an effort to empower corporate farms to operate without regulation in Oklahoma. Of the 80,100 farms in Oklahoma, more than 73,000 are family farming operations. State Question 777 doesn’t end all regulation of farming and ranching in Oklahoma, nor does it give farmers and ranchers a license to pollute. Farmers and ranchers are stewards of the land; they have every incentive to ensure the land and water will be able to sustain future generations of farmers and ranchers. State Question 777 simply protects the ability of family farmers and ranchers in Oklahoma to continue to do what they’ve done for generations: feed the world. When voters go to the polls in November, they should support State Question 777 and protect the legacy of Oklahoma agriculture.” [Tulsa World, [4/30/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/opinion/readersforum/scott-pruitt-the-case-for-state-question---/article_a5e30c42-ebe3-5d31-80db-d2a011469f59.html)]

* **State Question 777 Would Give Farming and Ranching Constitutional Rights.** “A bill proposed by Rep. Scott Biggs, R-Chickasha, would, if passed by voters, change Oklahoma’s constitution to say something very similar to Missouri’s. It adds: ‘The legislature shall pass no law that abridges the right of farmers and ranchers to employ agricultural technology and livestock production and ranching practices without a compelling state interest.’ John Collison with the Oklahoma Farm Bureau questions why the Humane Society is so concerned about agriculture. He says farmers are can be trusted to protect animals and the environment. ‘We’re the ones that raise millions and millions of animals every single day, and take care of them,’ he says. ‘They’re our livelihood. We’re not going to treat our business badly.’ But Cynthia Armstrong with the Oklahoma chapter of the Humane Society says many farmers resist animal-related regulations because they’re doing ‘the bidding of corporate agriculture.’ ‘They want to do business the way they want to do it, without regard to environmental concerns, animal welfare,’ she says. ‘They don’t want any of that getting in their way.’” [State Impact, [2/26/15](https://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2015/02/26/oklahoma-right-to-farm-push-about-more-than-agricultural-practices/)]

**“Right to Farm’ Bill Defeated By Wide Margin.** ‘State Question 777, a constitutional amendment dubbed Right to Farm by its advocates and Right to Harm by its opponents, has been defeated amid concerns that it would undermine water quality standards and set a dangerous precedent. The measure would have restricted future regulation of agriculture, which supporters said is necessary to ward off interference from environmental and animal-rights groups. Click Here SQ 777 would have changed the state constitution to exempt agriculture from future state and local regulation except as deemed necessary by ‘compelling state interests.’ The state question was offered in reaction to environmental and animal-protection legislation in other states, particularly California. Unconvinced that farming and ranching need special regulatory protection, Oklahoma voters sent SQ 777 to a lopsided defeat on Tuesday. Opponents said the proposed constitutional amendment could endanger water quality, restrict the Legislature and lead to unnecessary litigation.” [Tulsa World, [11/8/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/elections/state-question-right-to-farm-measure-defeated-by-wide-margin/article_1ee69400-1236-5b0f-ba23-e5ceddbbdeed.html)]

* **Former Oklahoma Attorney General Drew Edmondson: “Oklahomans Recognized This Proposed Constitutional Amendment Was Rife With Problems And Nothing More Than A Corporate Giveaway Designed To Benefit Industrial Agriculture And Not Family Farmers.”** [Tulsa World, [11/8/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/elections/state-question-right-to-farm-measure-defeated-by-wide-margin/article_1ee69400-1236-5b0f-ba23-e5ceddbbdeed.html)]

**2004: Journal Record Legislative Report: “Senate Bill 898, By State Sen. Scott Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow, Included Provisions To Force Rural Water Districts To Negotiate With The Oklahoma Municipal League To Resolve Water Disputes. The Committee Defeated The Bill On A 2-7 Vote.”** According to Journal Record Legislative Report, “A bill to force compromise between cities and rural water districts in long-running jurisdictional disputes was rejected Thursday by the state Senate Energy, Environment and Communications Committee. Senate Bill 898, by state Sen. Scott Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow, included provisions to force rural water districts to negotiate with the Oklahoma Municipal League to resolve water disputes. The committee defeated the bill on a 2-7 vote. ‘It’s my understanding that there is ongoing litigation across the state on this particular issue, that there are great monies being spent on both sides,’ Pruitt said. ‘If that continues, it is very possible that one of the sides will be completely dissatisfied with the outcome, because it may be an all-or-nothing proposition when the courts determine these types of issues.’ Pruitt said rural water districts have obtained loans from the federal government that contain provisions saying the district cannot allow any encroachment upon its territory. Those provisions have had serious economic consequences. ‘What has happened historically is that when cities are growing, particularly in industrial areas or industrial areas that overlap with the rural water districts, there are certain needs that need to be expanded to that industrial park or those businesses that the rural water districts are unable to provide. And so the cities are seeking to serve that need better, and as they do that they have met with opposition with the rural water districts historically. It stifles growth. It’s an economic development issue.’” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 2/20/04]

### Religious Issues

**Pruitt Spoke About Religious Liberty at Briefing Organized by Ministry Arm of the Family Research Council.** “Against a backdrop of American flags, speakers at a Tuesday pastors’ briefing expressed deep concern about eroding religious freedoms and the political and cultural direction of America…The briefing was organized by the Oklahoma chapter of Watchmen on the Wall, which is the ministry arm of the Family Research Council in Washington, D.C., and by The Church United, a Tulsa-based ministry that seeks to unite churches across the state…Attorney General Pruitt said the Johnson Amendment was meant to prohibit candidate endorsement, never to restrict the content of sermons. He said that under Communism, the government monitored speech that was coming from the pulpits of churches, something no one ever thought would happen in the United States. But now, he said, ‘It’s happening right before our eyes,’ citing several cases around the nation. ‘Religious liberty is at stake today.’” [Tulsa World, [11/5/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/religion/church-leaders-told-that-hard-earned-religious-freedoms-are-slipping/article_7b3374ff-d279-50e8-b32c-27c1380e0276.html)]

* **Pruitt: “We Have Every Right To Exercise Our Faith In The Public Square. If You Do That, I Will Defend Your Right All The Way To The Supreme Court.”** [Tulsa World, [11/5/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/religion/church-leaders-told-that-hard-earned-religious-freedoms-are-slipping/article_7b3374ff-d279-50e8-b32c-27c1380e0276.html)]

**Family Research Council Was Considered Hate Group by the Southern Poverty Law Center.** “The FRC often makes false claims about the LGBT community based on discredited research and junk science. The intention is to denigrate LGBT people in its battles against same-sex marriage, hate crimes laws, anti-bullying programs and the repeal of the military’s ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’ policy. To make the case that the LGBT community is a threat to American society, the FRC employs a number of ‘policy experts’ whose ‘research’ has allowed the FRC to be extremely active politically in shaping public debate. Its research fellows and leaders often testify before Congress and appear in the mainstream media. It also works at the grassroots level, conducting outreach to pastors in an effort to ‘transform the culture.’” [Southern Poverty Law Center, accessed [12/14/16](https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/group/family-research-council)]

**Pruitt Disappointed Supreme Court Refused to Review Gay Marriage Decision.** “Attorney General Scott Pruitt issued a statement on the Supreme Court’s decision to not review marriage lawsuits. ‘I am disappointed the Supreme Court chose not to grant a hearing of these cases. The states have long held primacy in determining what constitutes the definition of marriage. That is why the state, though not named in the lawsuit, filed ‘friend of the court’ briefs encouraging the Supreme Court to take up for review the case from Oklahoma. As recently as 2013, the Supreme Court in the Windsor case recognized that marriage is a state institution and that states in fact do have primacy in determining what constitutes the definition of marriage. That makes the decision today by the Supreme Court not to take up these cases for review even more troubling.’’ [Fox25, [10/6/14](http://okcfox.com/archive/attorney-general-scott-pruitts-statement-on-same-sex-marriage-ruling)]

**Transgender Advocates Called Pruitt “Head Bully” for Suing Over Bathroom Restrictions.** “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt has become the ‘head bully’ for lawmakers opposed to transgender integration of restrooms and other public school facilities, a leading LGBT advocate said Thursday. Pruitt, on the state’s behalf, joined 10 other states on Wednesday in filing a lawsuit to block implementation of Obama administration guidance on school policy regarding transgender students’ use of restrooms, locker rooms and other facilities typically separated by gender. The lawsuit was filed the day after legislation addressing the issue failed in a House of Representatives committee. On Thursday, the House passed by unanimous consent a resolution supporting Pruitt’s lawsuit against what it calls a ‘blatant example of federal government and executive power overreach.’ ‘If a school district refuses to protect transgender students, they become (subject to) bullying,’ Toby Jenkins, executive director of Tulsa-based Oklahomans for Equality, said in an email. ‘It sounds like our legislators have now made our attorney general the head bully.’” [Tulsa World, [10/17/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/capitol_report/state-ag-scott-pruitt-is-head-bully-on-transgender-bathroom/article_43785b0d-9caa-5530-b650-96d433ca8b77.html)]

**Pruitt Defended Distribution of Bibles in Public Schools.** “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt has sent a letter to public school superintendents across the state vowing to defend religious freedom amid ‘veiled legal threats’ over the distribution of Bibles on campus. ‘Few things are as sacred and as fundamental to Oklahomans as the constitutional rights of free speech and the free exercise of religion,’ Pruitt wrote Tuesday. ‘It is a challenging time in our country for those who believe in religious liberty. Our religious freedoms are under constant attack from a variety of groups who seek to undermine our constitutional rights and threaten our founding principles.’ Aaron Cooper, a spokesman, said Pruitt’s office is trying to determine the extent of contact between the Freedom From Religion Foundation and similar groups and Oklahoma school districts. From that information, legal training on the topic of religious freedom will be developed for public school officials, he said.” [Tulsa World, [4/15/15](http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/education/oklahoma-attorney-general-scott-pruitt-defends-bible-distribution-in-schools/article_592d20aa-2c46-51f6-a3fb-f11480542217.html)]

* **Scott Pruitt: “The Group Has Contacted More Than One Oklahoma School With Misrepresentations Regarding The Law, Including The False Categorical Assertion That The Law Prohibits Distribution Of Religious Literature In Public Schools.”** [Tulsa World, [4/15/15](http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/education/oklahoma-attorney-general-scott-pruitt-defends-bible-distribution-in-schools/article_592d20aa-2c46-51f6-a3fb-f11480542217.html)]

**Scott Pruitt Fought Removal of Ten Commandments from State Capitol Grounds Despite Oklahoma Supreme Court Ruling.** “Attorney General Scott Pruitt is fighting an Oklahoma Supreme Court decision that a Ten Commandments monument on state Capitol grounds violates the state constitution and must be removed. The court reversed a district court ruling and ordered the removal. Thursday, Pruitt filed a legal brief in district court asking it to consider whether the state Supreme Court’s interpretation of the Oklahoma Constitution ‘creates hostility toward religion that violates the U.S. Constitution.’ ‘In defending the Ten Commandments display, my office argued the monument was lawfully permitted on Capitol grounds because of the historical significance of the text on the development of Western legal code.” [Oklahoman, [9/4/16](http://newsok.com/article/5444389)]

* **Scott Pruitt: ‘‘In Its Decision To Remove The Monument, The Oklahoma Supreme Court Held That No Matter How Historically Significant Or Beneficial To The State, State Law Prohibits Any Item On State Property Or To Be Funded By The State If It Is At All ‘Religious In Nature.’ That Declaration Prohibits Manifestations Of Faith From The Public Square In Such A Way As To Create Hostility Toward Religion In Violation Of The U.S. Constitution. Therefore, We Are Asking The District Court To Allow The State To Amend Its Original Answer So We May Fully Address This New Concern.”** [Oklahoman, [9/4/16](http://newsok.com/article/5444389)]
* **ACLU Legal Affairs Director Brady Henderson: “I've Never Seen Anything Like It And Would Say Most Lawyers Haven't, As Well. Unprecedented Would Be The Most Charitable Description. It's A Motion Asking For A Complete Do-Over Of The Case. It's Sufficiently Provocative And Abusive Of The Court Process That We Have To Consider Those Things.”** [Oklahoman, [9/4/16](http://newsok.com/article/5444389)]

Fossil Fuels and Fracking

**Scott Pruitt Joined Lawsuit Challenging Federal Regulations For Methane Emissions From New Equipment At Oil And Natural Gas Sites.** According to Tulsa World, “Oklahoma has joined a dozen other states in a lawsuit challenging federal regulations for methane emissions from new equipment at oil and natural gas sites. Attorney General Scott Pruitt joined the effort Tuesday led by West Virginia Attorney General Patrick Morrisey. The rules are part of the Obama administration’s goal to cut methane emissions from the oil and gas industry more than 40 percent from 2012 levels by 2025.” [Tulsa World, [8/4/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/business/energy/ag-scott-pruitt-joins-other-states-in-suit-against-epa/article_f218afbf-3a39-531b-9acc-84f34dd43516.html)]

**Pruitt Believed EPA Acted Outside Its Statutory Framework In Designating Methane Rules.** According to News Oklahoma, “Pruitt spokesman Will Gattenby said Pruitt and his fellow attorneys general believe the EPA is acting outside its statutory framework. The rules apply to new and modified oil-field equipment. ‘The industry has been steadily lowering methane emissions levels for years, and had the Obama administration conducted a proper cost-benefit analysis, which they are required to do, we are confident they would have found that the cost of this new rule outweighs the benefit,’ Gattenby said in an email.” [News Oklahoma, [8/4/16](http://newsok.com/article/5512380)]

**Pruitt Attacked EPA Methodology on Methane.** “The EPA, led by an entrepreneurial administrator, created a new method for calculating the amount of methane gas based on questionable assumptions about how the energy industry works. The agency decided to use Natural Gas STAR data to calculate emissions released into the atmosphere at conventional natural gas wells. It also applied this new method for the first time to unconventional wells used in hydraulic fracturing. The EPA’s problem is STAR data doesn’t measure methane escaping from wells into the atmosphere. Rather, the data measures methane returned to the surface through drilling or flowback… This misstep or deception by the EPA has resulted in new figures that are faulty, unreasonable and based on a distorted understanding of how gas drilling operates… Fortunately, the authors were honest about the quality of their data, calling it “really low,” “pretty lousy,” and “questionable.” Unfortunately, the EPA used it anyway… The agency’s actions are at best incompetent, and at worst reprehensible.” [Public Utilities Fortnightly, July 2012]

**Pruitt: “The U.S. Department Of Energy Has Investigated Hydraulic Fracturing's Potential Harm To Water Supplies And Found No Evidence Linking The Drilling Technique To Groundwater Contamination.”** According to Tulsa World, “Pruitt on Wednesday sent a letter to the office of the inspector general at the EPA in response to a Feb. 5 memorandum detailing plans to evaluate how the agency and states have done in regulating the process's impact on water resources. ‘I am concerned that this project is politically motivated and ignores the EPA's three previous failed attempts to link hydraulic fracturing to water contamination,’ Pruitt wrote. ‘The U.S. Department of Energy has investigated hydraulic fracturing's potential harm to water supplies and found no evidence linking the drilling technique to groundwater contamination.’” [Tulsa World, [4/4/14](http://www.tulsaworld.com/business/energy/epa-critique-of-state-regulation-of-fracking-draws-oklahoma-attorney/article_449d0d72-6ae4-507b-9423-cab64e5e7f05.html)]

**Pruitt: Decisions By The EPA Are Largely Driven By An Anti-Fossil Agenda.** According to Tulsa World, “Decisions by the Environmental Protection Agency and other Obama administration regulators are largely driven by an anti-fossil fuel agenda, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt told a meeting of oil and gas executives at the Mayo Hotel on Friday morning. ‘Whether it’s EPA through (carbon standards), EPA through regional haze (regulations) or Fish and Wildlife through endangered species, what we see is a regulatory approach that says ‘Fossil fuels are bad, and we’re going to do all we can to elevate renewables.’” [Tulsa World, [9/20/14](http://www.tulsaworld.com/business/energy/pruitt-says-regulators-targeting-fossil-fuel-industry/article_f8e95ebe-7a28-5089-b5f3-752d518c7bd7.html)]

## Superfunds

**EPA Won't Reconsider New Mexico And Navajo Mine Spill Claims.**According to E&E News, “U.S. EPA today said it will not reconsider the claims that New Mexico and the Navajo Nation filed for damages tied to the Gold King mine spill, since the two governments sued after the claims were first rejected. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt had promised his agency would revisit tort claims filed by governments, businesses and landowners during a visit last week to the site of the 2015 abandoned Colorado mine blowout. In January, the Obama administration rejected $420 million in claims, arguing that under the Federal Tort Claims Act, federal agencies are not liable for discretionary actions, like the excavation done by federal contractors that caused the toxic 3-million-gallon spill. The two largest claimants, the Navajo and New Mexico, promptly sued EPA over their respective claims of $162 million and $130 million. The lawsuits took the matter out of EPA’s hands, the agency said today. Under federal law, a denied tort claim can be reconsidered within six months of denial unless a lawsuit has been filed.” [E&E News, [8/9/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/08/09/stories/1060058589)]

**Pruitt Went To Georgia With Sonny Perdue For Event On Using Agency Resources To Promote Stewardship.**According to Politico, “EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt is in Georgia today with Agriculture Secretary Sonny Perdue for an event on using agency resources to promote stewardship. That comes after he toured several facilities in Alabama with Sen. Luther Strange, his former attorney general buddy-turned-senator. They toured the Plant Gaston in Wilsonville, Ala., where Pruitt discussed the Clean Power Plan with employees and saw the DOE-affiliated National Carbon Capture Center research facility, which experiments with carbon-capture technologies. After that, the federal officials stopped by Brentwood Farm in Mooresville, where they spoke with Alabama Farm Federation members about the Waters of the U.S. regulation, which EPA has begun the process of rescinding. … ‘It’s not the EPA’s job to say to people across the country, ‘Don’t touch that. Don’t use that,’’ he told an Alabama radio show. ‘It’s our job to say as you develop and produce and generate electricity, this is the latest and greatest technology that should be used to achieve good emissions outcomes.’ Pruitt added his efforts to restore ‘a sense of focus’ was already ‘making a difference’ around the country.” [Politico, 7/7/17]

**Scott Pruitt Vowed To Speed The Nation’s Superfund Cleanups And Communities Wonder How.**According to Washington Post, “With more than 1,300 Superfund sites nationwide — some of which have lingered for decades on the EPA’s ever-growing ‘priorities list’ — it’s unclear how Pruitt will back up his professed commitment in an age of scorched-earth budgets. Critics worry that a single-minded focus on speeding up the process could lead to inadequate cleanups. Pruitt has largely dismissed such issues. He argues that the program is beset more by bloated administrative costs and a shortage of initiative than by budget woes, and he notes that, at most sites, ‘private funding’ is available from firms deemed responsible for cleanups. ‘This agency has not responded to Superfund with the type of urgency and commitment that the people of this country deserve,’ Pruitt reiterated Wednesday — days before a contingent from Bridgeton would arrive in Washington in hopes of meeting with him. He said he understands communities’ distrust, not just about West Lake but many sites. ‘I’m very sensitive and sympathetic to what their concerns are,’ he said. ‘This agency has failed them. . . . They have a right to be skeptical.’” [Washington Post, [6/18/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/scott-pruitt-vows-to-speed-the-nations-superfund-cleanups-communities-wonder-how/2017/06/18/353c6566-4b07-11e7-9669-250d0b15f83b_story.html?utm_term=.f9dda7610e2d)]

**Trump Environmental Chief To Prioritize Toxic Sites’ Cleanup.**According to Associated Press, “As the head of the Environmental Protection Agency rolls back regulations aimed at preventing future pollution, he also is pledging to focus on cleaning up decades-old contamination. Scott Pruitt has directed his regional chiefs to elevate Superfund cleanup efforts to what he describes as their rightful place as the agency’s core mission. ‘I am making it a priority to ensure contaminated sites get cleaned up. We will be more hands-on to ensure proper oversight and attention to the Superfund program at the highest levels of the agency, and to create consistency across states,’ Pruitt said, according to an agency release. Pruitt’s directive appears to contradict the Trump administration’s proposed 2018 budget, which would cut Superfund’s $1.1 billion annual allocation by 30 percent.” [Associated Press, [5/11/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/federal_government/trump-environmental-chief-to-prioritize-toxic-sites-cleanup/2017/05/11/45c4c238-3668-11e7-ab03-aa29f656f13e_story.html?utm_term=.584e3e61790a)]

**With Climate Downgraded, Superfund Now Agency's Top Issue.**According to E&E News, “U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt says he is now officially putting Superfund site cleanup at the top of his to-do list. While climate change was a key focus of the agency under President Obama, Pruitt made clear in a memo to staff yesterday that he would be turning his attention to the remediation of areas contaminated with hazardous waste, and he and staff in the administrator’s office would be taking more direct involvement in the decisionmaking process. ‘We will be more hands-on to ensure proper oversight and attention to the Superfund program at the highest levels of the Agency, and to create consistency across states,’ Pruitt said in an agency press release yesterday evening. Pruitt will now make decisions about cleanup approaches that cost $50 million or more. Previously, the administrator delegated those decisions to the assistant administrator for the Office of Land and Emergency Management and regional administrators. Pruitt argued that this process had caused confusion and slowed cleanup efforts.” [E&E News, [5/11/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/05/11/stories/1060054401)]

**Pruitt Only Briefly Visited Chicago Superfund Site.**According to Politico, “It was tightly-controlled and fairly brief visit to a lead-tainted Superfund site in East Chicago, Ind., for EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt. He toured the area by car Wednesday morning, met with local groups and elected officials (very brief clip here) and delivered barely two minutes’ worth of general remarks at a press conference. ‘The reason I’m here is because it’s important that we restore confidence to people in this community that we’re going to get it right going forward,’ Pruitt said. ‘It’s the EPA’s objective, my objective as the administrator of the EPA, to come in and make sure people’s health is protected here in East Chicago.’ He left without responding to shouted questions about whether he was considering shutting down the regional office of the EPA.” [Politico, 4/20/17]

**Pruitt Spoke Of Concern For Super Fund Clean-Up.**According to C-Span, “The first is a superfund area. I know that most Americans are not — we have over 1300 superfund sites across the country and some of those sites have been on the national priority list for 30 to 40 years. That is unacceptable. We need a commitment from the EPA working with local officials to achieve remediation so you can actually benefit your citizens there in those communities with jobs, opportunities to repopulate that area from the remediation and superfund status that currently has. So we have already started the process. Worked with the land and emergency management office and our office to target and make sure we are working closely with you at the local level to do something about those 1300 sites and see those sites drop as opposed to increase and stay on the national priority list for 30 to 40 years.” [C-Span, [3/14/17](https://www.c-span.org/video/?425351-1/epa-administrator-scott-pruitt-delivers-remarks-national-league-cities-conference)]

**Pruitt Vowed To Protect Water Grants And Brownfields Programs White House Wanted To Slash.**According to Politico, “EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt said Thursday that he wants to protect state water grants as well as the brownfield program, despite the White House’s proposal to slash state grants and zero out the clean-up program. Pruitt did not directly discuss the White House’s proposed cuts included in the ‘pass-back’ budget sent to EPA this week, but asked a gathering of mayors to help him convince the administration not to seek major cuts to those key programs. He specifically discussed the twin state revolving funds for drinking water and clean water that make up around $2 billion of EPA’s annual budget, as well as the nascent, and relatively small, Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act program. ‘States across the country, cities and town across the country, have relied upon those grants for a long, long time to improve water infrastructure,’ he told a gathering of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. ‘We have a water infrastructure issue right now across this country.’” [Politico, [3/2/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/story/2017/03/pruitt-hints-at-pushback-on-white-house-proposals-to-slash-water-grants-brownfields-150236)]

**Pruitt Wanted More Money For Water Projects, Superfund Cleanups.**According to E&E News, “In an interview at the Capitol following Trump’s joint address to Congress, the recently confirmed administrator said EPA’s water infrastructure revolving loan and grant programs, and the backlog of Superfund cleanups, are prime candidates for inclusion in the infrastructure bill. ‘One of the things I’m emphasizing with the White House is that we shouldn’t just talk about infrastructure from a roads and bridges perspective, we need to be thinking about water infrastructure,’ Pruitt said. ‘We need to be thinking about these Superfund sites across the country, 1,300 or so that we see,’ he said. ‘We need to do more to remediate those because some of those have been on the list for three or four decades.’ Pruitt said he will be making that point at tomorrow’s White House meeting, which he said will focus on ‘roads, bridges and water infrastructure — outside the budget.’” [E&E News, [3/1/17](http://www.eenews.net/eedaily/2017/03/01/stories/1060050723)]

**Pruitt Spoke Of Concern For Super Fund Clean-Up.** According to C-Span, “The first is a superfund area. I know that most Americans are not — we have over 1300 superfund sites across the country and some of those sites have been on the national priority list for 30 to 40 years. That is unacceptable. We need a commitment from the EPA working with local officials to achieve remediation so you can actually benefit your citizens there in those communities with jobs, opportunities to repopulate that area from the remediation and superfund status that currently has. So we have already started the process. Worked with the land and emergency management office and our office to target and make sure we are working closely with you at the local level to do something about those 1300 sites and see those sites drop as opposed to increase and stay on the national priority list for 30 to 40 years.” [C-Span, [3/14/17](https://www.c-span.org/video/?425351-1/epa-administrator-scott-pruitt-delivers-remarks-national-league-cities-conference)]

### Trump Budget Would Put “Massive Dent” In Superfund Program

**Trump Budget Would Cut Superfunds By 28.1%**. According to the Environmental Protection Network, “The administration has stated that EPA should focus on its traditional core programs. However, under this Budget those programs would be cut as follows: Hazardous site cleanup (Superfund) – 28.1%. [Environmental Protection Network, June [2017](https://www.politicopro.com/f/?id=0000015c-9ded-d9ca-adfc-9dedff300001)]

**Trump Budget Would Put “Massive Dent” In Superfund Program**. According to the Washington Post, “The Trump administration’s proposed budget would put a massive dent in that funding for fiscal 2018. It would cut the Superfund program by $330 million a year, nearly a third. The EPA’s budget would be slashed 31 percent.” [Washington Post, [5/11/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/05/11/epa-head-says-he-wants-to-prioritize-superfund-cleanups/?utm_term=.4507f972e136)]

**Pruitt: “Superfund Is An Area That Is Absolutely Essential.”** According to the Washington Post, “Pruitt has defended the program even as he and the White House have aggressively sought to role back a slew of other environmental measures put in place by President Barack Obama, particularly those focused on combating climate change and limiting oil and gas drilling on public lands. ‘Superfund is an area that is absolutely essential,’ Pruitt told a gathering of the U.S. Conference of Mayors in March.” [Washington Post, [5/11/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/05/11/epa-head-says-he-wants-to-prioritize-superfund-cleanups/?utm_term=.4507f972e136)]

**Washington Post: “Superfund Program Has Been Considered Successful Overall And Has Been Popular Around The Country Among Lawmakers And Their Constituents.”** According to the Washington Post, “Like the agency’s brownfields program, which offers grants to communities to help clean up and redevelop abandoned industrial sites, the Superfund program has been considered successful overall and has been popular around the country among lawmakers and their constituents.” [Washington Post, [5/11/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/05/11/epa-head-says-he-wants-to-prioritize-superfund-cleanups/?utm_term=.4507f972e136)]

**Executive Order Could Undercut EPA Efforts To Make Superfund Cleanups More ‘Resilient’ To The Adverse Effects Of Climate Change**. According to Inside EPA, “President Donald Trump's sweeping executive order repealing former President Barack Obama's climate policies could undercut EPA efforts to make Superfund cleanups more "resilient" to the adverse effects of climate change, a former official and other sources say… [Mathy Stanislaus, who headed EPA's waste office under Obama]believes waste office staff would be hesitant to push climate adaptation given the direction the Trump administration is taking. Staff will not want to be scrutinized for this, he said, noting that adaption work has cut across various waste programs in addition to Superfund, to include programs under the Resource Conservation & Recovery Act (RCRA) and emergency response. [Inside EPA, 6/23/17]

## Other Environmental Issues



**Pruitt Promoted Goal Of Working Locally To Solve Brownfield Problems.** According to C-Span, “The second thing I would share with you as far as objectives and working locally is in the brownfield area. It’s been a tremendous success as you know with respect to brownfields across this country. It is important that the EPA and us government continue to fund brownfield and some superfund sites that I mentioned to ensure that we have success on the back end. Many of you may not know this, many of you may not know this but I owned a baseball team in Oklahoma City. The mayor is not here today, I saw him last week but that baseball stadium that we leased and managed from Oklahoma City was off work brownfield project and the area in Oklahoma City was a cornerstone to leading to an NBA franchise in making its location a permanent home in Oklahoma City so I believe the brownfield program, the superfund program is extremely important that we focus our attention with funding and outcomes to help citizens at the local level.” [C-Span, [3/14/17](https://www.c-span.org/video/?425351-1/epa-administrator-scott-pruitt-delivers-remarks-national-league-cities-conference)]

**Pruitt Expressed Need For Water Infrastructure.** According to C-Span, “Thirdly, I think this is equally important, and you know this is very key, water infrastructure. When we talk about infrastructure as you are on Capitol Hill, I’ll see you tomorrow. Infrastructure is not roads and bridges. Infrastructure is water infrastructure and making sure we are delivering safe water to our citizens and we have grant programs at the EPA, $4 billion about $8 billion budget is focused on grants. I am committed to working with congress and on behalf of the white house to ensure that water infrastructure, grants are effectively used to help you with the local level ensure safe water for your citizens.” [C-Span, [3/14/17](https://www.c-span.org/video/?425351-1/epa-administrator-scott-pruitt-delivers-remarks-national-league-cities-conference)]

**Pruitt Spoke Of Concern For Super Fund Clean-Up.** According to C-Span, “The first is a superfund area. I know that most Americans are not — we have over 1300 superfund sites across the country and some of those sites have been on the national priority list for 30 to 40 years. That is unacceptable. We need a commitment from the EPA working with local officials to achieve remediation so you can actually benefit your citizens there in those communities with jobs, opportunities to repopulate that area from the remediation and superfund status that currently has. So we have already started the process. Worked with the land and emergency management office and our office to target and make sure we are working closely with you at the local level to do something about those 1300 sites and see those sites drop as opposed to increase and stay on the national priority list for 30 to 40 years.” [C-Span, [3/14/17](https://www.c-span.org/video/?425351-1/epa-administrator-scott-pruitt-delivers-remarks-national-league-cities-conference)]

**Pruitt Said Toxic Chemicals Are Not Always Hazardous**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “As was affirmed by Congress in drafting the Lautenberg Act, hazard is only one characteristic of risk and simply stating a chemical substance has toxicity does not mean there is exposure. EPA is tasked with carrying out laws as directed by Congress and if I am confirmed, I will use the authorities vested in me to protect drinking water under the Safe Drinking Water Act.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Not Familiar With State Regulation Of Coal Ash Removal**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am not familiar with how Kentucky regulates coal ash disposal. It would be inappropriate for me to prejudge an issue that may come before me for decision if I am confirmed as Administrator. If the issue comes before me, I will ensure that the issue is fully and fairly considered with input from staff and in accordance with applicable legal requirements.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Not Familiar With EPA Rules Removing Lead From Gasoline**. Senator Cardin asked, “Do you agree that removing lead from gasoline was an important and successful EPA rulemaking? Why or why not?” According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “I have not evaluated this issue.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Refused To Answer Question On Coal Ash Removal In Oklahoma**. When asked about coal ash removal in Oklahoma, Scott Pruitt wrote, “The matter you reference was handled by Oklahoma's environmental regulators at the Department of Environmental Quality.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Did Not Commit To Supporting Diesel Emissions Reduction Act Program**. According to questions submitted to the record Senator Cory Booker asked, “have been a champion of the bipartisan Diesel Emissions Reduction Act (DERA) Program that helps replace diesel engines and helps make major sea ports and inland transportation hubs cleaner and more efficient. If confirmed can you commit to supporting the DERA program?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I committed to you during the meeting in your office, I understand there are wide ranging variety of environmental justice issues affecting urban and rural America. In fact, as you will recall, I’ve committed to work with your office and visit impacted areas with you. I am also aware that the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act Program has received bipartisan support from 2 members of the Environment and Public Works Committee. If confirmed, I would like to work with members of Congress to best direct resources to bipartisan initiatives.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Not Familiar With EPA BEACHES Program**. According to questions submitted to the record Senator booker asked, “As EPA administrator will you commit to continuing EPA's BEACHES program, which provides funding for state water quality monitoring programs that ensure healthy and safe recreation?” Pruitt replied, “I am not personally familiar with the BEACHES program, but I would expect, if confirmed, to be briefed by staff about the program. If confirmed, I would work to faithfully execute the laws EPA is responsible for administering, including those authorizing the BEACHES program, in order to protect human health and the environment for all Americans.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Consider The Montreal Protocol To Be A Successful Example.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I consider the Montreal Protocol to be a successful example of the world coming together to solve an important environmental problem and that the Montreal Protocol could serve as an example to the President as he exercises his foreign affairs powers and to the Senate as it considers ratification of any treaty that may come before it.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would Not Say If He Would Cut EPA Budget**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “am not familiar with Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality’s budget. I have no first-hand knowledge of EPA’s development of its FY 2018 budget request. If confirmed, I look forward to working with EPA’s budget staff and program offices and officials with the Office of Management and Budget on EPA's request. I will work to ensure that the limited resources appropriated to EPA by Congress are managed wisely in pursuit of that important mission and in accordance with all applicable legal authorities.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**2013: Pruitt Supported Keystone Pipeline**. According to Stillwater News Press, “In August, Pruitt joined attorneys general from 20 other states asking Secretary of State John Kerry to push President Barack Obama to approve the permit for the Keystone XL pipeline that would transport oil from western Canada’s oil sands to Cushing. Pruitt joined Associate Editor Chris Day in the NewsPress studio for a webisode of the paper’s ‘Conversations With ...’ public affairs pro-gram. Pruitt discussed Oklahoma’s legal challenges to the Affordable Care Act and U.S. appellate court’s ruling about the Environmental Protection Agency’s powerplant emissions decision as well as his re-election campaign, the Open Meetings and Open Records Acts and the attorney general’s work to fight fraud in the state. ‘Cushing is a very important factor in the analysis of the Keystone Pipeline,’ Pruitt said.” [Stillwater News Press, 8/31/13]

* **Pruitt: “The Decision Was Made, I Think Wrongfully By The Administration, Not To Have The North Portion Of The Keystone Built.”** According to Stillwater News Press, “The pipeline requires a presidential permit because it crosses an international border. The permit has been in limbo since 2010 while a new pipeline route was developed in Nebraska and a Republican attempt to force the president to approve or disapprove the permit by tying the project to continuing federal tax cuts. ‘The decision was made, I think wrongfully by the administration, not to have the north portion of the Keystone built,’ Pruitt said.” [Stillwater News Press, 8/31/13]

Congressional Testimony on Environment

In May 2016, Pruitt testified in front of the House Science, Space and Technology Committee on the state impacts of the Clean Power Plan. Pruitt called the Clean Power Plan “a regulatory cramdown-- a cramdown done over the objection of no less than 29 States who believe the Plan is unlawful.” Pruitt also stated the “EPA’s audacious assertion of authority in this Rule is more far- reaching than any previous effort by the agency.” In May 2015, Pruitt testified in front of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee about the Clean Power Plan. Pruitt stated “The EPA, under this administration, treats states like a vessel of federal will. The EPA believes the states exist to implement the policies the Administration sees fit, regardless of whether laws like the Clean Air Act permit such action.” Pruitt also acknowledged the importance of the EPA, saying “I am not one who believes the EPA has no role. The agency has played an important role historically in addressing water and air quality issues that traverse state lines.”

May 2016: CPP State Impacts – House Science, Space and Technology Committee

**2016: Pruitt: “The Clean Power Plan Represents An Extraordinary Moment In Our Constitutional History. Extraordinary In Scope, Extraordinary In Costs, And Extraordinary In Its Intrusion Into The Sovereignty Of The States. And All Done Not By This Body, But By Nameless, Faceless, And Politically Unaccountable Bureaucrats.”** [House Committee on Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Environment, [5/26/16](https://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/HHRG-114-SY18-WState-SPruitt-20160526.pdf); Congressman Jim Bridenstine Youtube, [5/26/16](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-2a4KCDaQKc)]

* **2016: Pruitt: “So To The Members Of This Committee Who Strongly Support The Clean Power Plan As A Matter Of Policy, I Say To You: Pass A Bill. Let Democracy Decide Whether The Clean Power Plan Is Right For America. But We Didn’t Get Democracy, We Got A Regulatory Cramdown-- A Cramdown Done Over The Objection Of No Less Than 29 States Who Believe The Plan Is Unlawful.”** Pruitt told a House subcommittee: “I tell you all this to help you understand Oklahoma’s objection to the Clean Power Plan. In all candor, of course we think the policy justifications for the plan are unpersuasive. We don’t think that government regulators should be in the business of picking winners and losers in the energy sector. But all of that is for you to decide. And therein lies our objection to the Plan: this body did not decide. So to the members of this committee who strongly support the Clean Power Plan as a matter of policy, I say to you: pass a bill. Let democracy decide whether the Clean Power Plan is right for America. But we didn’t get democracy, we got a regulatory cramdown-- a cramdown done over the objection of no less than 29 States who believe the Plan is unlawful.” [House Committee on Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Environment, [5/26/16](https://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/HHRG-114-SY18-WState-SPruitt-20160526.pdf); Congressman Jim Bridenstine Youtube, [5/26/16](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-2a4KCDaQKc)]

**Pruitt: “The EPA Was Never Intended To Be Our Nation's Frontline Environmental Regulator. The States Were To Have Regulatory Primacy. The EPA Was To Be A Regulator Of Last Resort.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “Those of you that know me well, however, know that I believe the EPA has a role to play in our republican form of government. Air and water quality issues can cross state lines, and can sometimes require federal intervention. At the same time, the EPA was never intended to be our Nation's frontline environmental regulator. The States were to have regulatory primacy. The EPA was to be a regulator of last resort. That construct, a construct put in place by this body, has been turned upside down by the current Administration.” [Congressional Testimony, Committee on House Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Environment, 5/26/16]

**Pruitt: “We Are A Leading Innovator In Natural Gas Production Through Hydraulic Fracking, A Technological Innovation That Has Done More To Reduce Carbon Emissions In This Country Than Any Other Technological Advancement Of Our Time.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “We produce more wind energy than all but three states, with 17% of our electricity generated by wind, while 7.4% of the clean- burning natural gas produced in the United States comes from Oklahoma. Indeed, we are a leading innovator in natural gas production through hydraulic fracking, a technological innovation that has done more to reduce carbon emissions in this country than any other technological advancement of our time. Just this month, the federal Energy Information Administration announced that as of 2015, the power generation industry has reduced carbon dioxide emissions to 1993 levels, 21 percent below 2005 levels. As EIA has concluded, it was ‘a shift in the electricity generation mix’ away from coal and toward natural gas that drove the reductions in emissions.” [Congressional Testimony, Committee on House Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Environment, 5/26/16]

**Pruitt: “Let Democracy Decide Whether The Clean Power Plan Is Right For America. But We Didn't Get Democracy, We Got A Regulatory Cramdown-- A Cramdown Done Over The Objection Of No Less Than 29 States Who Believe The Plan Is Unlawful.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “So to the members of this committee who strongly support the Clean Power Plan as a matter of policy, I say to you: pass a bill. Let democracy decide whether the Clean Power Plan is right for America. But we didn't get democracy, we got a regulatory cramdown-- a cramdown done over the objection of no less than 29 States who believe the Plan is unlawful. And to those who claim that the Clean Air Act unambiguously authorizes the EPA to enact the Clean Power Plan, I say to you this: if that were so, how do you explain the extraordinary, unprecedented step the United States Supreme Court took to stay the implementation of the plan? That stay was entered because five members of that court thought it likely that the Plan was unlawful.” [Congressional Testimony, Committee on House Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Environment, 5/26/16]

**Pruitt: “EPA’s Audacious Assertion Of Authority In This Rule Is More Far- Reaching Than Any Previous Effort By The Agency.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “EPA’s audacious assertion of authority in this Rule is more far- reaching than any previous effort by the agency. According to EPA, section 111(d) authorizes it to use the States to impose on power plants emission reduction requirements that are premised not on pollution control measures at the regulated plants, but on reducing or eliminating operations at those plants and shifting their electricity generation to competitors--something the EPA euphemistically calls ‘generation shifting.’ None of this can be reconciled with the words this body enacted in section 111. Section 111(d) authorizes EPA to establish ‘procedure[s]’ under which States set ‘standards of performance for any existing source.’ Those standards must reflect the ‘application of the best system of emission reduction’ to that ‘source,’ i.e., to a ‘building, structure, facility, or installation.’” [Congressional Testimony, Committee on House Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Environment, 5/26/16]

**Pruitt: “The Rule Is Further Barred By The Fact That Coal-Fired Electric Generating Units Are Already Regulated Under Section 112 Of The Clean Air Act.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “In other words, EPA may seek to reduce emissions only through measures that can be implemented by individual facilities. Indeed, for 45 years, EPA has consistently interpreted section 111 standards of performance in this way-not only in the five instances in which it has addressed existing sources, but also in the more than one hundred rulemakings in which it has adopted standards for new sources. The Rule is further barred by the fact that coal-fired electric generating units are already regulated under section 112 of the Clean Air Act. This body expressly prohibited EPA’s use of 111(d) to require States to regulate ‘any air pollutant ... emitted from a source category which is regulated under section [1]12.’” [Congressional Testimony, Committee on House Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Environment, 5/26/16]

**Pruitt: “Finally, The Rule Violates The Constitution. Cooperative Federalism Programs Must Provide States With A Meaningful Opportunity To Decline Implementation.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “Finally, the Rule violates the Constitution. Cooperative federalism programs must provide States with a meaningful opportunity to decline implementation. But the Rule does not do so; States that decline to take legislative or regulatory action to ensure increased generation by EPA's preferred power sources face the threat of insufficient electricity to meet demand. The Rule is thus an act of commandeering that leaves States no choice but to alter their laws and programs governing electricity generation and delivery to accord with federal policy.” [Congressional Testimony, Committee on House Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Environment, 5/26/16]

**Pruitt: “If EPA Gets Its Way, Section 111(D) Will Be Transformed From A Limited Provision Into The Most Powerful Part Of The Clean Air Act, Making The EPA A Central Planner For Every Single Industry That Emits Carbon Dioxide.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “If EPA gets its way, Section 111(d) will be transformed from a limited provision into the most powerful part of the Clean Air Act, making the EPA a central planner for every single industry that emits carbon dioxide. Congress did not intend and could not have imagined such a result when it passed the provision more than 45 years ago.” [Congressional Testimony, Committee on House Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Environment, 5/26/16]

**Pruitt: “Finally, There Are Some Who Wish To Create A False Dichotomy Between Those Who Are ‘For Clean Power’ And Those Who Are ‘Against Clean Power.’ I Urge This Committee To Resist Such Rhetoric. We Are All For Clean Power.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “Finally, there are some who wish to create a false dichotomy between those who are ‘for clean power’ and those who are ‘against clean power.’ I urge this Committee to resist such rhetoric. We are all for clean power. And no one, no bureaucrat in DC, no environmentalist in California, has a stronger interest in clean air and clean water in Oklahoma than we do. That is the air that our children breathe and the water that our grandchildren swim in. And that is why I jealously guard my state’s prerogative to craft regulations that make sense for Oklahoma. And more importantly, that is why I vigorously advocate for the rule of law, for the democratic process, and for respect for the Constitution’s separation of powers between the federal government and the States.” [Congressional Testimony, Committee on House Science, Space and Technology Subcommittee on Environment, 5/26/16]

May 2015: CPP – Senate Environment and Public Works Committee

**2015: Pruitt Described The Clean Power Plan As The “Proverbial Gun To The Head.”** “Well, thank you Mr. Chairman and I think that is we've discussed today there is a question that that that keeps coming up in my mind if [the Clean Power Plan] is such a flexible arrangement that's offered the states that this is really within the bounds of cooperative federalism why is it that the EPA presently is in the process of developing a uniform federal implementation plan that they're going to put on the shelf to then say to the states unless you act a particular way unless you act consistent with the rule this is what you're going to get. That to me does not sound like cooperation. That does not sound like partnership. That sounds like the proverbial gun to the head.” [The Harry Read Me File Youtube, [5/5/15](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E4Vl8YxzJII)]

**Pruitt: “The EPA, Under This Administration, Treats States Like A Vessel Of Federal Will. The EPA Believes The States Exist To Implement The Policies The Administration Sees Fit, Regardless Of Whether Laws Like The Clean Air Act Permit Such Action.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The EPA, under this administration, treats states like a vessel of federal will. The EPA believes the states exist to implement the policies the Administration sees fit, regardless of whether laws like the Clean Air Act permit such action. In their wisdom, Congress gave states a primary role in emissions regulation, noting in the statement of policy of the Clean Air Act that ‘air pollution control at its source is the primary responsibility of states and local governments.’ That statement respects the constitutional limits on federal regulation of air quality, and the reality that states are best suited to develop and implement such policies.” [Congressional Testimony, Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, 5/5/15]

**Pruitt: “The Clean Power Plan Proposal Throws The Cooperative Relationship Between The States And The Federal Government Off Balance.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “When the EPA respects the role of the states, the cooperative relationship works well. When the EPA exceeds the constraints placed upon the agency by Congress, the relationship is thrown out of balance and the rule of law and state sovereignty both suffer. The Clean Power Plan proposal throws the cooperative relationship between the states and the Federal government off balance. The EPA claims the proposal gives states flexibility to develop their own plans to meet the national goals of reducing carbon dioxide emissions. In reality, the Clean Power Plan is nothing more than an attempt by the EPA to expand federal bureaucrats’ authority over states’ energy power generation mixes.” [Congressional Testimony, Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, 5/5/15]

**Pruitt: “The Plan, Therefore, Must Be Viewed As An Attempt By The EPA To Force States Into Shuttering Coal-Fired Power Plants And Eventually Other Sources Of Fossil-Fuel- Generated Electricity.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The plan requires each state to submit a plan to cut carbon- dioxide emissions by a nationwide average of 30 percent by 2030. In Oklahoma, 40.5 percent of energy generation comes from coal- fired power plants while 38.1 percent comes from natural gas. Oklahoma ranks fourth in the nation with 15 percent of power generation coming from wind. This begs the question, how does the EPA expect states like Oklahoma to meet the goals of the Clean Power Plan? There are only so many ways Oklahoma can achieve the 30 percent reduction demanded by the EPA. The plan, therefore, must be viewed as an attempt by the EPA to force states into shuttering coal-fired power plants and eventually other sources of fossil-fuel- generated electricity. Additionally, the proposed rule, through its building block four, would require states to use demand-side energy efficiency measures that would reduce the amount of generation required. However, states are limited to emission standards that can actually be achieved by existing industrial sources through source-level, ‘inside-the-fence-line’ measures.” [Congressional Testimony, Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, 5/5/15]

**Pruitt: “By Going Beyond Source-Level, ‘In-Side-The-Fence-Line’ Measures, EPA’s Proposal Would Expand 111(D), And Specifically The Underlying Statutory Term ‘Best System Of Emission Reduction,’ Into ‘A Whole New Regime Of Regulation’: One That Regulates Not Only Pollutant Emission By Sources, But A State’s Entire Resource And Energy Sectors.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “EPA’s approach converts the obscure, little- used Section 111(d) into a general enabling act, giving EPA power over the entire grid from generation to light switch. By going beyond source-level, ‘in-side-the-fence-line’ measures, EPA’s proposal would expand 111(d), and specifically the underlying statutory term ‘best system of emission reduction,’ into ‘a whole new regime of regulation’: one that regulates not only pollutant emission by sources, but a state’s entire resource and energy sectors. To meet the objectives of the EPA’s proposed rule, states will be forced to rework their energy generation market. To account for the loss of coal-fired generation, states will be forced into changing their energy mix in favor of renewables. States would also be forced to alter existing regulatory framework which would threaten energy affordability and reliability for consumers, industry and energy producers.” [Congressional Testimony, Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, 5/5/15]

**Pruitt: “There Is Substantial Concern That The EPA - Before The Clean Power Plan Rule Is Even Finalized - Will Issue A Uniform Federal Implementation Plan That Will Be Forced Upon Those States That Don’t Acquiesce To The Unlawful Clean Power Plan.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “Finally, there is substantial concern that the EPA - before the Clean Power Plan rule is even finalized - will issue a uniform federal implementation plan that will be forced upon those states that don’t acquiesce to the unlawful Clean Power Plan. Such a move by the EPA would be the proverbial ‘gun to the head’ of the states, demanding the states to act as the EPA sees fit or face punitive financial sanctions. Madam Chairwoman, I can say with great confidence that if the EPA does in fact move forward with the ‘uniform FIP,’ the EPA will be challenged in court by Oklahoma and like-minded states.” [Congressional Testimony, Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, 5/5/15]

**Pruitt: “I Am Not One Who Believes The EPA Has No Role. The Agency Has Played An Important Role Historically In Addressing Water And Air Quality Issues That Traverse State Lines.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “Madam Chairwoman, I am not one who believes the EPA has no role. The agency has played an important role historically in addressing water and air quality issues that traverse state lines. However, with this rule, the agency is now being used to pick winners and losers in the energy context, by elevating renewable power generation at the expense of fossil-fuel fired generation.” [Congressional Testimony, Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, 5/5/15]

**Pruitt: “No State Should Comply With The Clean Power Plan If It Means Surrendering Decision-Making Authority To The EPA, A Power That Has Not Been Granted To The Agency.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “No state should comply with the Clean Power Plan if it means surrendering decision-making authority to the EPA, a power that has not been granted to the agency. States should be left to make decisions on the fuel diversity that best meets their power generation needs. States like Oklahoma care about these issues because we breathe the air, drink the water, and want to pre-serve the land for future generations.” [Congressional Testimony, Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, 5/5/15]

November 2013: Greenhouse Gas Standards – House Energy and Commerce Committee

**Pruitt: “In Recent Years, The EPA Has Expressed An Unwillingness To Appropriately Defer To State Authority Under The Clean Air Act.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “In recent years, the EPA has expressed an unwillingness to appropriately defer to state authority under the Clean Air Act. The prospect of aggressive performance standards for new coal- based power plants is cause for serious concern among the states. The EPA has indicated a similarly aggressive approach to existing coal-based power plants, for which the President has directed the EPA to propose standards by June 1, 2014, and to finalize the rules by June 1, 2015. While the Clean Air Act gives the EPA the authority to develop the framework for states to establish emissions standards for existing power plants, the EPA may not dictate to the states what those standards should be.” [Congressional Testimony, House Energy and Commerce Committee, 11/14/13]

**Pruitt: “The Elimination Of Coal-Based Electric Generation - Which According To The U.S. Energy Information Administration Is Projected To Provide 40 Percent Of U.S. Electricity In 2014 - Would Result In Higher Electricity Prices For Ratepayers, And Would Be Detrimental To The National And State Economies, As Well As Job-Creation In General.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The elimination of coal-based electric generation - which according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration is projected to provide 40 percent of U.S. electricity in 2014 - would result in higher electricity prices for ratepayers, and would be detrimental to the national and state economies, as well as job-creation in general. No doubt, increased electricity prices will hurt the competitiveness of American manufacturing. I and the attorneys general of 16 other states - and the senior environmental regulator of an 18th state - recently submitted to EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy a white paper outlining these concerns and our position on both the EPA and the states’ role under Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act. Unfortunately, this is not the only issue at which the states and EPA are at odds over the scope of their respective responsibilities.” [Congressional Testimony, House Energy and Commerce Committee, 11/14/13]

**Pruitt: “Many States, Including Oklahoma, Are Actively Engaged In Legal Challenges To Thwart The EPA’s Attempt To Expand Its Authority Under The Regional Haze Rule.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “Many states, including Oklahoma, are actively engaged in legal challenges to thwart the EPA’s attempt to expand its authority under the Regional Haze Rule. Under the Clean Air Act’s Regional Haze rules, a target date of 2064 was set to achieve ‘natural visibility’ in federally designated lands across the United States. Since Regional Haze deals with issues of aesthetics and visibility - and not safety or public health - the Clean Air Act gives states the primary role in establishing regulations.” [Congressional Testimony, House Energy and Commerce Committee, 11/14/13]

**Pruitt: “The EPA Rejected Oklahoma’s State Implementation Plan In Favor Of A Federal Implementation Plan, Which Could Cost State Utilities $2 Billion, Leaving Oklahoma Consumer To Foot The Bill. What’s More, The Federal Plan Would Provide Less Environmental Benefits Than The State Plan And Is Estimated To In-Crease Costs For Oklahoma Ratepayers As Much As 20 Percent Annually.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “In Oklahoma, stakeholders worked with utilities to construct a plan for regional haze that allows for fuel flexibility and balances environmental protection with the need for affordable energy. Our state plan accomplished the objectives of the regional haze rule and exceeded the target date by nearly four decades (38 years). However, the EPA rejected Oklahoma’s state implementation plan in favor of a federal implementation plan, which could cost state utilities $2 billion, leaving Oklahoma consumer to foot the bill. What’s more, the federal plan would provide less environmental benefits than the state plan and is estimated to in-crease costs for Oklahoma ratepayers as much as 20 percent annually.” [Congressional Testimony, House Energy and Commerce Committee, 11/14/13]

**Pruitt: “There Is A Great Deal Of Frustration Among The States With The EPA’s Attitude That Ignores The Proper Role Of The States As The Agency Attempts To Expand Its Authority.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “Our state made the decision to sue the EPA over its decision. This is a case of first impression that likely could wind up at the Supreme Court level. Many states are monitoring the case closely, as the decision will impact their ability to set policy within their jurisdictions. There is a great deal of frustration among the states with the EPA’s attitude that ignores the proper role of the states as the agency attempts to expand its authority. The EPA seems to view the states as merely a vessel to implement whatever policies and regulations the Administration sees fit, regardless of the wisdom, cost, or efficiency of such measures.” [Congressional Testimony, House Energy and Commerce Committee, 11/14/13]

**Pruitt: “Congress Clearly Intended For The States To Have Primacy In The Areas Of Environmental Regulation And For The EPA To Work Closely With The States To Regulate These Issues. However, The EPA Is Attempting To Usurp The Role Of The States In The Name Of Imposing The Administration’s Anti-Fossil Fuel Agenda.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “Fortunately for the states, that is not what the law allows. Congress clearly intended for the states to have primacy in the areas of environmental regulation and for the EPA to work closely with the states to regulate these issues. However, the EPA is attempting to usurp the role of the states in the name of imposing the administration’s anti-fossil fuel agenda. The extent and form of greenhouse gas regulation is important to the states. The states have the experience, expertise, and ability to regulate these issues and must be al-lowed to play their proper roles in making the significant policy judgments that are required in adopting any such regulation.” [Congressional Testimony, House Energy and Commerce Committee, 11/14/13]

**Pruitt: “We Will Attempt To Obtain Relief From The Courts, And We Also Certainly Welcome Congressional Oversight Being Brought To Bear On Federal Agencies.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “We hope that by making our concerns known, the EPA will respect the principles of cooperative federalism that are set forth in the Clean Air Act and take a more commonsense approach to any new regulations and include the States in the process. If not, we will attempt to obtain relief from the Courts, and we also certainly welcome Congressional oversight being brought to bear on federal agencies.” [Congressional Testimony, House Energy and Commerce Committee, 11/14/13]

June 2012: “Sue and Settle” – House Oversight and Government Reform Committee

**Pruitt: “The EPA’s Refusal To Follow Its Own Rules Has Denied States Due Process And Ignored The Foundation Of Co-Operative Federalism Set Forth By Congress Under The Clean Air Act. With The Backing Of The Obama Administration, The EPA Is Engaging In Super Legislative Activity That Congress Has Not Authorized, Resulting In Un-Checked Rule-Making Through Questionable Consent Decrees.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The EPA’s refusal to follow its own rules has denied states due process and ignored the foundation of co-operative federalism set forth by Congress under the Clean Air Act. With the backing of the Obama Administration, the EPA is engaging in super legislative activity that Congress has not authorized, resulting in un-checked rule-making through questionable consent decrees. These issues are of great importance to the State of Oklahoma because Oklahomans value our state’s natural resources, which provide sustenance to Oklahoma citizens and fuel our economic development. We take seriously our responsibility to preserve and protect these valuable natural assets so they may be enjoyed by future generations. This responsibility re-quires a delicate balance between environmental and economic interests. We must craft our environmental protection objectives with due consideration of the burden those objectives place on our economic development and overall well-being. With these considerations in mind, the State of Oklahoma submits that Oklahoma stakeholders, not the federal agency, should make decisions where outcomes directly affect Oklahomans.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “The CAA Does Not Give The EPA Authority To Question The Wisdom Of A State’s Choices Of Emission Limitations If They Are Part Of A Plan That Satisfies The Standards Of The Act.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “Ultimately, the CAA requires deference to State decision-making. The structure of CAA and RHR create distinct and defined duties of the State and EPA. The EPA is, for instance, charged with promulgating general regulations designed to ‘assure . . . reasonable progress toward meeting the national goal.’ Id. 7491(a)(4). The EPA must also promulgate the list of ‘mandatory Class I Federal areas’ which are to receive visibility protection under the Act. Id. 7491(a)(2). Further, the statute tasks the EPA with providing support to the states by, for instance, studying methods for redressing visibility impairment and then providing ‘guide-lines’ to the states suggesting such appropriate methods. Similarly, under section 169B of the Act, the EPA is tasked with studying regional visibility impairment, and convening regional commissions comprised of state authorities. Id. 7492(a)(1), (c). The CAA does not give the EPA authority to question the wisdom of a state’s choices of emission limitations if they are part of a plan that satisfies the standards of the Act.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “The Role Of The States Under The CAA’s Visibility Program Is Unique, As Provided By Sections 169A And 169B Of The CAA. Unlike Other Programs Where The States’ Role Is To Implement Federally Established Standards, Under The Visibility Program, The States Have Primary Responsibility For Establishing Standards.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The role of the states under the CAA’s visibility program is unique, as provided by sections 169A and 169B of the CAA. Unlike other programs where the states’ role is to implement federally established standards, under the visibility program, the states have primary responsibility for establishing standards. In particular, the states are charged with developing emissions limitations after balancing a number of factors. The EPA’s role under this program is simply one of support. Accordingly, the EPA must treat with special deference the determinations of a state, as embodied in a state’s proposed Regional Haze SIP. States also are tasked with determining ‘such emission limits, schedules of compliance and other measures as may be necessary to make reasonable progress toward meeting the national goal.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “The EPA Therefore, Cannot, Through Either Approving Or Disapproving A SIP, Interfere With The State’s Primary Role In Determining How National Ambient Air Quality Standards Should Be Met Under The CAA.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The EPA therefore, cannot, through either approving or disapproving a SIP, interfere with the state’s primary role in determining how national ambient air quality standards should be met under the CAA. 42 U.S.C.A. 7401 et seq. As long as the ultimate effect of a state’s choice of emission limitations is compliant with the national standards for ambient air, the state is at liberty to adopt whatever mix of emission limitations it deems best suited to its particular situation. Reviewing the history of section 110, and judicial interpretations of it, the court in Commonwealth of Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency, noted that as section 110 stood in 1975, and as it stood after the 1977 and 1990 amendments, the provision did not confer upon the EPA authority to condition approval of a state implementation plan on the state’s adoption of specific control measures.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “The EPA Proposed Rule Ignores The Plain Language Of The CAA And The Court Of Appeals’ Recognition Of The States’ Dominant Role In Determining BART In An Effort To Advance EPA’s Preference For Scrubbers On All EGUs.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The EPA Proposed Rule ignores the plain language of the CAA and the Court of Appeals’ recognition of the states’ dominant role in determining BART in an effort to advance EPA’s preference for scrubbers on all EGUs. EPA does not have authority to disapprove a SIP simply because it disagrees with a state’s choice in emission control measures for specific sources. Florida Power & Light Co. v. Costle, 650 F.2d 579, 581 (5th Cir. 1981) (‘If an [sic] SIP or a revised SIP meets the statutory criteria, however, the EPA must approve it’).” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “The EPA Is Proposing To Take An Action That Usurps Authority Granted To Oklahoma In The Clean Air Act… The EPA Can Set National Goals And Guidelines For The Program, But Individual States Have The Authority To Craft Plans Specific To And Appropriate For Their State’s Citizens And Interests.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The EPA is proposing to take an action that usurps authority granted to Oklahoma in the Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Act created a Regional Haze program to improve visibility in certain national parks and wilderness areas. The EPA can set national goals and guidelines for the program, but individual states have the authority to craft plans specific to and appropriate for their state’s citizens and interests. Each state has the right to select the best control technology (‘BART’) for sources of emissions that contribute to regional haze, taking into consideration five specific factors, including costs of control. Oklahoma chose the technologies that are appropriate for its sources in light of these five factors and submitted an implementation plan to EPA in February 2010. In particular, Oklahoma determined that low sulfur coal was the cost-effective way to control sulfur dioxide emissions to address haze issues. A benefit of this determination is that it gives state utilities greater flexibility to switch to generating electricity with natural gas or renewable sources. The state determined that installing scrubbers now is not cost effective and would lock the utilities into burning coal for the next 20 years.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “EPA Does Not Have The Power To Question The State’s Determination As Long As The State Relied On The Proper Factors In Making It, Which Oklahoma Did.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “EPA does not have the power to question the state’s determination as long as the state relied on the proper factors in making it, which Oklahoma did. It is estimated that the emission controls required by EPA will cost approximately $2 billion to install and result in a 15% - 20% increase in residential electric rates. EPA may disapprove a SIP and promulgate a FIP only where a State’s SIP fails to meet minimum CAA requirements. 42 U.S.C. 7410(k)(3); see also Train v. Natural Res. Def. Council, 421 U.S. 60, 79 (1975). The RHR and BART guidelines issued by EPA, 70 Fed. Reg. 39,104 (July 6, 2005), require only that States engage in the process of weighing the five statutory factors in determining BART for eligible sources in a manner consistent with the RHR, and that ‘States are free to determine the weight and significance to be assigned to each factor.’ See 76 Fed. Reg. 16,168, 16, 174 (Mar. 22, 2011). As the Oklahoma SIP clearly shows, Oklahoma did properly engage in that process in making its BART determinations for the OG&E Units.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “EPA Second Guessed Oklahoma’s Authority By Rejecting Significant Portions Of The 2009 Site-Specific Costs Estimates, In Many Instances Simply Assuming, Without Verifying, That They Resulted In The Double Counting Of Expenses.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “EPA second guessed Oklahoma’s authority by rejecting significant portions of the 2009 site-specific costs estimates, in many instances simply assuming, without verifying, that they resulted in the double counting of expenses. While OG&E disputes EPA’s conclusion regarding the 2009 cost estimates, once EPA reached the conclusion that the CCM estimates should control, the proper response by EPA should have been to return to the 2008 cost estimates, which both EPA and ODEQ had stated complied with the CCM and which support the State’s BART determinations for the OG&E Units. EPA’s attempt to create a hybrid cost estimate by selectively modifying the 2009 estimate resulted in cost estimates that were neither site-specific and real (like OG&E’s 2009 cost estimates) nor reflective of the CCM general estimates (like OG&E’s 2008 cost estimates). EPA’s ‘cherry-picking’ approach to the cost estimates for the OG&E Units in order to justify its predetermined conclusion that scrubbers were BART was, therefore, arbitrary and capricious.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “The Fundamental Flaws In EPA’s Cost-Effectiveness Analysis Not Only Demonstrate That Its Disapproval Of The Oklahoma SIP Was Arbitrary And Capricious, But Also Preclude A Finding That EPA Had A Reasoned And Proper Basis For The FIP.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “Despite the Act’s exclusive assignment to the States of the authority to weigh the statutory factors, EPA nonetheless disputes Oklahoma’s cost effectiveness analysis and seeks to use the assumptions and speculation of its consultant as the basis for disapproval of the Oklahoma SIP. EPA’s principle contention is that the 2009 site-specific cost estimates considered by Oklahoma did not comply with the CCM. To reach that result, however, EPA (i) ignored the 2008 cost estimates that it had acknowledged were prepared in accordance with the CCM; (ii) rejected the 2009 estimates by giving preference to the assumptions and speculation of its consultant over the judgment of the State; and (iii) manipulated the inputs for the cost effectiveness calculation by ignoring the requirements of its own guidelines and basic engineering principles. Even beyond these fundamental flaws in EPA’s cost effectiveness review of the Oklahoma SIP, the separate cost analysis conducted by EPA’s consultant was not supported by the record and was arbitrary in its approach. At the same time, EPA took an improper approach to visibility improvement designed to over-state the benefits from the installation of scrubbers. The fundamental flaws in EPA’s cost-effectiveness analysis not only demonstrate that its disapproval of the Oklahoma SIP was arbitrary and capricious, but also preclude a finding that EPA had a reasoned and proper basis for the FIP.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “EPA Is Not Free To Undercut The State’s Reasonable Exercise Of That Flexibility, Particularly By Substituting Its Own Arbitrary Approach. EPA Illegally Usurped State Authority In Violation Of The Plain Language Of The Act When It Rejected Oklahoma’s BART Determination For The OG&E Units And, Thus, The FIP Is Unlawful.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “‘States have flexibility in how they calculate costs.’ 70 Fed. Reg. at 39,127. Where the RHR give States flexibility and Congress has designated that States take the dominant role in determining BART, EPA is not free to undercut the State’s reasonable exercise of that flexibility, particularly by substituting its own arbitrary approach. EPA illegally usurped State authority in violation of the plain language of the Act when it rejected Oklahoma’s BART determination for the OG&E Units and, thus, the FIP is unlawful. In addition, because EPA published a notice that certain States, including Oklahoma, had initially failed to meet the dead-line for submitting regional haze SIPs, the CAA unequivocally imposed a two-year requirement for EPA to issue a FIP. See 42 U.S.C. 7410(c); Gen. Motors v. United States, 496 U.S. 530, 537 (1990) (citing CAA 110(c) as an example of ‘explicit deadlines’ established by the CAA). It is undisputed that EPA failed to promulgate a FIP within that two- year window. Thus, EPA’s attempt to promulgate the Oklahoma FIP out-side that two-year window, without first providing a new notice to re-open the two-year window for doing so, was contrary to the Act. Clearly, the EPA is going beyond its authority and abusing its power by overregulating in areas statutorily regulated by the States.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “EPA’s Issuance Of The Oklahoma FIP Was Also Procedurally Defective Because Of Its Timing. First, The CAA Does Not Give EPA Authority To Propose A FIP Prior To Final Disapproval Of The Oklahoma SIP.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “EPA’s issuance of the Oklahoma FIP was also procedurally defective because of its timing. First, the CAA does not give EPA authority to propose a FIP prior to final disapproval of the Oklahoma SIP. The Act, moreover, requires that EPA give Oklahoma a reasonable opportunity to cure any alleged defects in a dis-approved SIP. CAA Section 110(c)(1)(A) allows promulgation of a FIP after EPA ‘finds that the plan or plan revision submitted by the State does not satisfy the minimum criteria established under subsection (k)(1)(A) of this section or . . . disapproves a State implementation plan submission in whole or in part.’ 42 U.S.C. 7410(c)(1). Section 110(c) also states that EPA shall propose a FIP ‘unless the State corrects the deficien-cy,’ thereby reflecting Congress’s intention for States to have the power to design their own SIP and have an opportunity to correct a SIP before a FIP is issued. 7410(c). Simultaneous promulgation of the FIP is also inconsistent with the Act’s definition of a FIP. A FIP is defined as a plan ‘to fill all or a portion of a gap or otherwise correct all or a portion of an inadequacy in a State implementation plan.’ 7602(y). Thus, a FIP cannot properly exist until after final action has been taken on a State’s SIP.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “If EPA Is Allowed To Take Final Action On Such A SIP At The Same Time That It Issues A FIP, It Can Blur This Distinction And Impermissibly Use The FIP Process To Impose Its Preferences With Respect To The Five Statutory BART Factors Onto The States.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “EPA cannot credibly claim to be able to present the relevant factual, legal, and policy information and rationale to justify a proposed FIP before it has: (1) determined whether and to what extent the Oklahoma SIP may be deficient and un-approvable; (2) provided the public with an adequate explanation of any such de-termination in a proposed EPA rule on SIP approval or disapproval that is published for public review and comment; (3) received, considered, and responded to public comments on the proposed action; and (4) made a final determination and taken final action to disapprove the SIP in whole or in part. This due order of action by EPA is important because, as demonstrated by the discussion above regarding cost effectiveness, EPA’s authority when reviewing a Regional Haze SIP is much different than its authority when promulgating a FIP. Because the CAA delegates the power to determine BART exclusively to the States, the fact that EPA would take a different approach or reach a different conclusion is irrelevant to its approval or disapproval of a Regional Haze SIP. Yet, if EPA is allowed to take final action on such a SIP at the same time that it issues a FIP, it can blur this distinction and impermissibly use the FIP process to impose its preferences with respect to the five statutory BART factors onto the States.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “The New ‘Overnight’ Cost Method Used By EPA To Determine The Cost Effectiveness Of Scrubbers Is At The Core Of EPA’s Final Rule, Both In Disapproving The Oklahoma SIP And In Justifying Its FIP. EPA’s Failure To Raise These New Approaches As Justification For Its Proposed Actions In The Proposed Rule Deprived Petitioners Of The Right And Opportunity To Comment On Them.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The new ‘overnight’ cost method used by EPA to determine the cost effectiveness of scrubbers is at the core of EPA’s Final Rule, both in disapproving the Oklahoma SIP and in justifying its FIP. EPA’s failure to raise these new approaches as justification for its proposed actions in the Proposed Rule deprived Petitioners of the right and opportunity to comment on them. It was, therefore, improper under the APA and it deprived the State of the authority delegated to it by the CAA to determine the reasonable and appropriate methods for evaluating costs in making BART determinations. EPA’s Final Rule is fatally defective because of its failure to provide notice of this new approach and allow comment on it.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “The Final Rule Also Reveals, For The First Time, EPA’s New Methodology To Determining Visibility Improvement The So-Called ‘Number Of Days’ Approach… Again, Because This Approach Was Not Raised By EPA In The Proposed Rule, The Final Rule Is Fatally Defective.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The Final Rule also reveals, for the first time, EPA’s new methodology to determining visibility improvement the so-called ‘number of days’ approach. 76 Fed. Reg. at 81,736. Again, because this approach was not raised by EPA in the Proposed Rule, the Final Rule is fatally defective. Because the Final Rule fails the logical outgrowth test, Petitioners’ challenges to the Oklahoma FIP are likely to succeed, justifying a stay of the FIP.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “For EPA To Accomplish This Objective, It Had To Ignore Its Own Policies And Procedures For Making These Determinations And, In The Final Rule, Use New Approaches Regarding Cost Effectiveness And Visibility Improvement That It Had Not Identified In The Proposed Rule.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The administrative record shows that EPA’s ‘nothing but scrubbers’ approach led it to reject a final regional haze state implementation plan (‘SIP’) that Oklahoma sent to EPA over a year before EPA proposed to adopt the FIP. The only way that EPA could achieve this predetermined outcome was to ignore the Act and its own guidance and violate the Administrative Procedures Act (‘APA’) by raising and relying on new rules and methodologies for the first time in its final rule adopting the FIP. For EPA to accomplish this objective, it had to ignore its own policies and procedures for making these determinations and, in the Final Rule, use new approaches regarding cost effectiveness and visibility improvement that it had not identified in the proposed rule. This approach precluded public comment and violated Petitioners’ procedural rights.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “The EPA’s Action Is Sure To Raise The Costs Of Electricity To Consumers, With A Corresponding Loss Of Jobs And Economic Activity. EPA’s Illegal Adoption Of The Final Rule Will Have An Immediate And Irreparable Impact On The State Whose CAA Authority Has Been Eviscerated By EPA’s Actions.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The EPA’s action is sure to raise the costs of electricity to consumers, with a corresponding loss of jobs and economic activity. EPA’s illegal adoption of the Final Rule will have an immediate and irreparable impact on the State whose CAA authority has been eviscerated by EPA’s actions. Likewise, electricity consumers in Oklahoma will face significant electricity rate increases as a result of the costs imposed by the Final Rule. Oklahoma has demonstrated the substantial economic impact EPA’s Final Rule would have on the State. OG&E will be required to expend significant resources immediately in order to implement the installation of the scrubbers with any chance of meeting the five year deadline, Page 23 of 24 and just in the first two years, the costs will exceed $200 million. Even if OG&E were able to roll some of those costs into its rate structure, this will have an obvious adverse effect on the citizens of Oklahoma who have to pay those higher electricity rates. In today’s economic climate, those very real economic impacts of EPA’s FIP cannot and should not be ignored.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “The EPA’s Actions Here Deprive Oklahoma Of The Ability To Fashion A Regional Haze Program That Balances Costs And Visibility Improvement In A Manner That Is Appropriate For The Citizens And Economy Of This State.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “First, as noted above, Congress designated the State as the principle decision maker for BART determinations and regional haze programs. The EPA’s actions here deprive Oklahoma of the ability to fashion a regional haze program that balances costs and visibility improvement in a manner that is appropriate for the citizens and economy of this State. The EPA’s actions undermine the State’s authority and damage the ability of Oklahoma to fulfill its regulatory function as created by Congress. Second, as noted above, the EPA’s abrogation of notice and comments when imposing FIP’s on Oklahoma violates key and foundational principles of rulemaking.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “Finally, If Some Of These Costs Are Imposed On Consumers In Oklahoma, The Increased Electricity Rates Will Have An Adverse Economic Impact With Consumers Paying Higher Rates Directly And Businesses Looking To Pass Their Higher Costs To Their Customers.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “Finally, if some of these costs are imposed on consumers in Oklahoma, the increased electricity rates will have an adverse economic impact with consumers paying higher rates directly and businesses looking to pass their higher costs to their customers. Indeed, as a large electricity consumer, the State too will feel the direct economic impact of higher rates. Neither the State nor its citizens has recourse for such unnecessary costs. Thus, irreparable harm will result from continuation of the current effective date for the Oklahoma FIP.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “The EPA’s Proposed Action Disregards Clear Congressional Intent That Primary Regulatory Authority Under The Visibility Program Rests With The States. The EPA’s Proposal Would Impose The EPA’s Policy Judgments Based On The EPA’s Balancing Of Factors Where It Has No Authority To Do So.”** According to Congressional Testimony by Scott Pruitt, “The State of Oklahoma has properly exercised its discretion under the CAA’s visibility program to establish a long-term strategy for the reduction of visibility impairing pollutants, including the selection of BART. The EPA’s proposed action disregards clear congressional intent that primary regulatory authority under the visibility program rests with the States. The EPA’s proposal would impose the EPA’s policy judgments based on the EPA’s balancing of factors where it has no authority to do so. The EPA does not have the right under the Clean Air Act to substitute its judgment for that of the state when it comes to determination of the best control technology for sources in the state.” [Congressional Testimony, House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, 6/28/12]

**Pruitt: “The Question Becomes Why. There’s A Great Concern That [The Prairie Chicken Issue] Is About Land Use … In That Five State Habitat. And I Believe There Is A Direct Correlation Between This Sue And Settle Agreement … [And The Elevating Of Groups Like] … Sierra Club And Others … And It’s Under This Carbon Umbrella.”**[Pruitt Interview, Accessed [1/6/17](https://www.ok.gov/oag/Media/Radio_Interviews/)]

## Key Environmental Votes in Oklahoma State Senate

1999

**1999: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of A Bill That Addressed Natural Gas Gathering.** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted for SB 235. The measure was passed and signed by the Governor. The bill, “Addresses natural gas gathering. After being vetoed by the Governor last year and many collaborative efforts during this session; this version of gas gathering passed both houses with no opposition. The bill outlines a complaint procedure at the Corporation Commission, which provides a hearing for any person who is treated in an unfair, unjust or unduly discriminatory manner by a gas gatherer. The bill provides a method for the Commission to remedy such situations by ordering adjustments in fees or terms and conditions of service after a hearing. The bill also provides for the Commission to maintain an index of all its orders relating to this act. The index will contain findings of facts and conclusions of law and the Commission's reasoning on the case. Such information may be beneficial to parties seeking information on such issues prior to filing a complaint with the Commission. Effective 6-4-99.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu99.dir/LegisRevu99_Index.html); Oklahoma 1999 Senate Journal Volume 1, [2/24/99](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**1999: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of A Bill To “Clarify The State Environmental Agencies Areas Of Jurisdiction Over Ground And Surface Water.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted for SB 549. The measure was passed and signed by the Governor. “After interim studies by both the House and Senate and numerous meetings of interested agencies and environmental issue groups, SB 549 was introduced in an effort to clarify the state environmental agencies areas of jurisdiction over ground and surface water. The bill requires that federally required water quality reports and lists, including the 303(d) list of impaired waters, go through a formal public review process consistent with the Administrative Procedures Act. It also creates a Water Quality Standards Implementation Advisory Committee, which will review water quality standards implementation plans which the state environmental agencies are now required to develop. The bill instructs the Oklahoma Water Resources Board to report to the Legislature on the status of water quality monitoring in the state every even-numbered year. In SB 549 the OWRB is authorized to promulgate use support assessment protocols, anti-degradation policy and implementation, and policies generally affecting Oklahoma Water Quality Standards application and implementation which includes mixing zones, low flows and variances, in relation to statewide water quality standards. SB 549 further requires the Secretary of Environment to coordinate water complaint management activities and develop a common database for water quality information to be used by all state agencies. The Department of Environmental Quality is directed in the bill to develop a computerized information system of water quality data. The system will be accessible to other state agencies and the public. SB 549 clarifies for the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture statutes regarding point source discharges and nonpoint source runoff, and defines nonpoint source pollutant. The bill gives ODA authority over agriculture nonpoint source runoff. Effective 6-10-99” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu99.dir/LegisRevu99_Index.html); Oklahoma 1999 Senate Journal Volume 1, [2/22/99](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**1999: Pruitt Voted Against A Measure That “Modifies The Original Oklahoma Civil Defense And Emergency Resources Management Act Of 1967 By Renaming The State Civil Defense Agency The Oklahoma Department Of Emergency Management And Providing Statutes Governing Flood Hazard Mitigation.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted against HB 1841. The bill “Modifies the original Oklahoma Civil Defense and Emergency Resources Management Act of 1967 by renaming the State Civil Defense Agency the Oklahoma Department of Emergency Management and providing statutes governing flood hazard mitigation. The bill creates a State Hazard Mitigation Team composed of the administrative heads of 14 state agencies and a representative of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the purpose of reviewing and updating the State Comprehensive Hazard Mitigation Plan and reviewing and making recommendations for loan and grant applications to the Oklahoma Flood Hazard Mitigation Program. The Oklahoma Flood Hazard Mitigation Program is created in the bill to allow the state to assist counties and cities in their efforts to alleviate flood damages by: providing state assistance programs for public losses and needs following flood disasters; developing comprehensive disaster preparedness and assistance plans; encouraging greater coordination and responsiveness of flood relief programs; and developing land-use and construction regulations, floodplain management, and environmental planning to reduce losses from flood disasters. The bill allows for political subdivisions of the state to apply for grants or loans for flood hazard mitigation projects, which shall be reviewed and approved by the State Hazard Mitigation Team. The bill authorizes municipalities to acquire real property to reduce losses from flood disasters and allows public funds to be used for this purpose. The bill also establishes a Flood Hazard Mitigation Financial Assistance Program, declaring financing projects to mitigate flooding to be a public purpose. The bill creates a special account within the Water Resources Fund and specifies how the account will be funded and for what purposes the money may be appropriated.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu99.dir/LegisRevu99_Index.html); Oklahoma 1999 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/30/99](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

2000

**2000: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of A Bill That “Defines Forestry Activity As Any Activity Associated With The Reforesting, Growing, Managing, Protecting And Harvesting Of Timber, Wood And Forest Products. Makes Forestry An Activity That Is Not A Nuisance.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted for HB 2306. The bill passed and was signed into the. The measure “defines forestry activity as any activity associated with the reforesting, growing, managing, protecting and harvesting of timber, wood and forest products. Makes forestry an activity that is not a nuisance.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/12/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2000: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 1217, A Bill That Required “Requires The Department Of Environmental Quality To File A Recordable Notice Of Remediation Activities Related To Environmental Damages In The Land Records Of The County Where The Property Is Located”** Pruitt voted in favor of SB 1217. The measure passed the Senate. The bill “[r]equires the Department of Environmental Quality to file a recordable notice of remediation activities related to environmental damages in the land records of the county where the property is located.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [2/28/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2000: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of A Bill That “Modifies The Definitions In The Solid Waste Management Act And Prohibits State Agencies From Developing A Plan To Utilize Suitable Solid Waste To Reclaim Lands Damaged By Surface Mining Activities.”** Pruitt voted in favor of SB 1244. The measure passed the Senate and was signed by the governor. The bill “Modifies the definitions in the Solid Waste Management Act and prohibits state agencies from developing a plan to utilize suitable solid waste to reclaim lands damaged by surface mining activities.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/6/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2000: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of A Bill That “Clarifies The Jurisdictional Areas Of Responsibility Over Certain Types Of Solid Waste And Underground Injection Wells Between The Department Of Environmental Quality And The Corporation Commission.”** Pruitt voted in favor of SB. The bill passed the Senate and was signed by the governor. The measure “Clarifies the jurisdictional areas of responsibility over certain types of solid waste and underground injection wells between the Department of Environmental Quality and the Corporation Commission.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/13/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2000: Pruitt Voted For SB 1048; The Bill Had “Various Provisions Relating To Oil And Gas And Revenue And Taxation.”** The bill passed the Senate and was signed by the governor. [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/12/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

* **The Bill “Modifies Circumstances Under Which Corporation Commission May Not Order Oil Or Gas Well Plugged Or Closed … The Bill Provides That Closure Cannot Be Ordered If The Well Is Located On An Otherwise Producing Oil Or Gas Lease.”** The bill “[m]odifies circumstances under which Corporation Commission may not order oil or gas well plugged or closed. Under current law, closure cannot be ordered if the price of oil falls below $15 per barrel. The bill provides that closure cannot be ordered if the well is located on an otherwise producing oil or gas lease.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/12/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]
* **The Bill “Prohibits The Corporation Commission From Promulgating, Enforcing Or Interpreting Rules Inconsistent Or More Restrictive Than The U.S. Secretary Of Transportation For Pipeline Transportation And Pipeline Facilities; Clarifies Provisions Relating To ‘Liaisons.’”** “Prohibits the Corporation Commission from promulgating, enforcing or interpreting rules inconsistent or more restrictive than the U.S. Secretary of Transportation for pipeline transportation and pipeline facilities; clarifies provisions relating to ‘liaisons.’” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/12/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]
* **The Bill “Extends Existing Gross Production Tax Incentives Until July 1, 2003.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/12/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]
* **The Bill “Exempts Production From Secondary Recovery Property For Up To 5 Years.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/12/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]
* **The Bill “Includes Wells Which Experience Casing Leaks Or Other Failures Within The Definition Of ‘Inactive Wells.’”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/12/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]
* **The Bill “Modifies The Base Production Level For The Exemption On Production Enhancement Projects So That It Is Based On The Well’s Decline Curve.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/12/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]
* **The Bill “Exempts Production Based On Three-Dimensional Seismic Technology.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/12/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]
* **The Bill “Increases The Price Caps Above Which The Exemptions Do Not Apply From $25 To $30 For Oil And From $3 To $3.50 For Gas.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/12/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]
* **The Bill “Requires Persons Distributing Revenue To Royalty Interest Owners To Withhold 6.75% Of The Payments And Remit Such Amounts To The Tax Commission.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/LegisRevu2000/LegisRevu00_Index.html); Oklahoma 2000 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/12/00](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

2001

**2001: Pruitt Voted For SB 199. The Bill Authorized “The Department Of Environmental Quality To Hold Air Quality Enforcement Hearings Before An Administrative Law Judge Rather Than The Air Quality Council.”** Pruitt voted for SB 199 … The bill “Authorizes the Department of Environmental Quality to hold air quality enforcement hearings before an Administrative Law Judge rather than the Air Quality Council.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2001 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/6/01](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2001: Pruitt Voted for HB 1192; The Bill “Creates the Oklahoma Carbon Sequestration Enhancement Act.”** In 2001, Pruitt voted for HB 1192. The measure passed the senate. The bill “Creates the Oklahoma Carbon Sequestration Enhancement Act. The act establishes a Carbon Sequestration Advisory Committee to identify opportunities for Oklahoma agricultural and nonagricultural landowners to participate in any carbon dioxide emissions marketing and trading that may be developed in the future and to optimize potential economic benefits for Oklahoma landowners who may participate in emission trading transactions when they become available. The Committee will be administered through the Oklahoma Conservation Commission.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2001 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/2/11](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf)]

**2001: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 1377, A Bill That “Authorizes A 5% Weight Variance On The Gross Weight Of Vehicles Transporting Oilfield Equipment Or Equipment Used In Oil And Gas Well Drilling Or Exploration.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2001 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/2/11](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf)]

**2001: Pruitt Voted For SB 532; The Measure “Amends The Statue Governing Oil And Gas Well Spacing Units To Allow The Corporation Commission To Establish Certain Sized Spacing Units Specifically For Oil Production Using A Certain Method Of Reservoir Dewatering. This Amendment Eliminates The Need For A Special Commission Hearing When A Person Is Seeking A Variance For This Type Of Drilling Project.”** In 2001, Pruitt voted for SB 532. The measure passed the senate. It “Amends the statue governing oil and gas well spacing units to allow the Corporation Commission to establish certain sized spacing units specifically for oil production using a certain method of reservoir dewatering. This amendment eliminates the need for a special Commission hearing when a person is seeking a variance for this type of drilling project.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2001 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/15/01](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf)]

**2001: Pruitt Missed A Vote That Extended “The Structure Of The Gross Production Tax Rate On Oil Production.”** Pruitt missed the roll call vote for SB 119 in 200. The bill “Extends the structure of the gross production tax rate on oil production (7% if oil price greater than or equal to $17 per barrel, 4% if price from $14 to $17 and 1% if price less than $14) until June 30, 2004 (was July 1, 2001), and clarifies the definition of “workover” for purposes of the gross production tax exemption on production enhancement projects. The bill also increases from 1% to 2% the amount of oil which may be recovered from water handled by salt water disposal facilities without imposition of the 12.5% tax, and provides that for tax years beginning on or after January 1, 2001, and ending on or before December 31, 2004, the depletion allowance for major oil companies is limited to 50% of the net income of the taxpayer (other taxpayers are not limited for those years). The bill extends provisions related to the Corporation Commission Well Plugging Fund and the petroleum excise tax revenues deposited to the Fund until July 1, 2006 (was July 1, 2001). Limits provisions allowing local authorities to limit access on highways, detours and bridges to situations in which an immediate threat of serious harm or destruction can be prevented or minimized. Specifies that local authorities do not have the right to issue permits to regulate the use of overweight vehicles on their highways.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2001 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/2/11](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2001_legislative_summary.pdf)]

2002

**2002: Pruitt Voted For HB 1492, A Measure That “Expands The Department Of Wildlife Conservation Habitat Program To Include All Wildlife And Multiyear Contracts.”** HB 1492 (Smith (Dale)/Shurden): Expands the Department of Wildlife Conservation habitat program to include all wildlife and multiyear contracts. The contracts are for approved projects on privately owned lands and detail the landowners' responsibilities for encouraging wildlife habitat conservation. Requires the Department to include wildlife habitat maintenance and enhancement in the program.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2003 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/14/03](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/senate_journals/sj2003/sj2003_index.html)]

**2002: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 2349, A Measure That “Prohibits New Or Expanded Poultry Feeding Operations From Being Located In 100 Year Floodplains, Within 1 And 1/2 Miles Of A Public Water Supply, Within 1 Mile Of A Designated Scenic River, Within 1 Mile Of A Public Drinking Water Well Or 1 Mile Of Any Water Body Specified As An Outstanding Resource Water By The Oklahoma Water Resources Board.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 2349. The bill “Prohibits new or expanded poultry feeding operations from being located in 100 year floodplains, within 1 and 1/2 miles of a public water supply, within 1 mile of a designated scenic river, within 1 mile of a public drinking water well or 1 mile of any water body specified as an Outstanding Resource Water by the Oklahoma Water Resources Board. The measure further requires any land application of poultry waste be done in compliance with state law.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/8/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2002: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of Amending “The Current Statute Governing The Issuance Of The Oklahoma Water Resources Board Water Permits For Swine Feeding Operations Which Are Located Near Camps Or Recreational Sites. It Authorize[d] The Board To Take Certain Conditions Into Consideration Before Making A Determination On The Water Permit.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 2330. The bill “Amends the current statute governing the issuance of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board water permits for swine feeding operations which are located near camps or recreational sites. It authorizes the Board to take certain conditions into consideration before making a determination on the water permit.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/8/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2002: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of A That “Amends The Oklahoma Floodplain Management Act To Enable This State To Effect A Unified Program For Floodplain Management And Encourage Counties And Cities To Attend Floodplain Development Management Classes And Annual Continuing Education Classes Offered By The Oklahoma Water Resources Board.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 2228. The bill“Amends the Oklahoma Floodplain Management Act to enable this state to effect a unified program for floodplain management and encourage counties and cities to attend floodplain development management classes and annual continuing education classes offered by the Oklahoma Water Resources Board.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [4/8/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2002: Pruitt Missed A Voted That Created “A Three-Year Moratorium On The Sale Or Exportation Of Groundwater Or Surface Water Outside This State And Prohibits Any Indian Tribe From Entering Into Any Cooperative Agreements Relating To Groundwater Or Surface Water Without Consent Of The Legislature For A Period Of Three Years.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt missed a vote on SB 1410. The bill “Creates a three-year moratorium on the sale or exportation of groundwater or surface water outside this state and prohibits any Indian tribe from entering into any cooperative agreements relating to groundwater or surface water without consent of the Legislature for a period of three years. The bill further creates the Joint Committee on Water Planning made up of nineteen legislative members appointed by the President Pro Tempore, the Speaker of the House and the Governor. The work of the Committee must be finalized by January 15, 2005.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/21/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2002: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 1306, A Bill That “Authorizes The Executive Director Of The Oklahoma Water Resources Board To Transfer Water Permits For Swine Feeding Operation Under Certain Conditions, Such As A Change In Ownership Of The Operation.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted for SB 1306. The bill“Authorizes the Executive Director of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board to transfer water permits for swine feeding operation under certain conditions, such as a change in ownership of the operation.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/13/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2002: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 972, A Bill That “Requires The Secretary Of Environment To Coordinate With The Appropriate State Environmental Agencies To Create A Coordinated Watershed Restoration And Protection Strategy For Each Impaired Scenic River In This State.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted for SB 871. The bill “requires the Secretary of Environment to coordinate with the appropriate state environmental agencies to create a coordinated watershed restoration and protection strategy for each impaired scenic river in this state no later than January 31, 2003, and requires those same agencies to prepare annual reports for the Governor and Legislature beginning in 2004 reporting on their progress. The bill further allows the Governor and Legislature to take any necessary action to require any state environmental agency to meet its mandated responsibilities according to the act.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/13/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2002: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 947, A Bill That “Modifies Gross Production Taxes On Oil And Gas Production.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of SB 947. The bill “Modifies gross production taxes on oil and gas production as follows: • A three-tier tax system for gas production is established, similar to the system established for oil production in 1999. If the price of gas is $2.10 per mcf or more, the tax rate will be 7%; if the price of gas is $1.75 or more but less than $2.10, the tax rate will be 4%; and if the price of gas is less than $1.75, the tax rate will be 1%. • The new system will be in place from 1-1-02 through 6-30-07. • The duration of the exemptions for horizontal drilling and deep wells are extended. The exemption for horizontal drilling is changed from 24 months to 48 months and the exemption for deep wells is changed from 28 months to 48 months (wells of 15,000 feet or greater) or 60 months (wells of 17,500 feet or greater). The level at which the exemptions are not applicable is changed from $3.50 per MMBTU to $5.00 per mcf.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/4/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2002: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 1302, A Bill That “Provides That The Value Of Investment In Property Used Exclusively By A Small Oil Refinery That Is Used Wholly As A Facility, Device Or Method For The Desulphurization Of Gasoline Or Diesel Fuel Shall Not Be Included In The Capitalization Used In The Determination Of Fair Market Value Of A Small Oil Refinery.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 1302. The bill “Provides that the value of investment in property used exclusively by a small oil refinery that is used wholly as a facility, device or method for the desulphurization of gasoline or diesel fuel shall not be included in the capitalization used in the determination of fair market value of a small oil refinery. Application procedures are specified.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/6/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2002: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 2536, A Measure That “Redirects A Portion Of Revenues From The One-Cent Motor Fuel Assessment Which Previously Were Deposited To The Petroleum Storage Tank Release Environmental Cleanup Indemnity Fund To A Newly Created Higher Education Facilities Revolving Fund.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 2536. The bill“Redirects a portion of revenues from the one-cent motor fuel assessment which previously were deposited to the Petroleum Storage Tank Release Environmental Cleanup Indemnity Fund to a newly created Higher Education Facilities Revolving Fund. Purposes are funding construction of a weather center on the campus of the University of Oklahoma, and funding the purchase of equipment and renovation of facilities on the campus of Oklahoma State University for work on the application of advanced sensor technology for the detection of chemical and biological threats to homeland security. (NOTE: These provisions were further amended in HB 2598.) HB 2536 also requires the State Auditor and Inspector and the Director of State Finance to select an independent accounting firm to conduct an independent investigative audit of the books, records, accounts, files, programs, funds and services of the Petroleum Storage Tank Division of the Corporation Commission.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/13/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2002: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 1312, A Bill That “Changes The Title, Liquefied Petroleum Gas Inspector, To Safety Code Enforcement Officer.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of SB 1312. The bill “Changes the title, liquefied petroleum gas inspector, to safety code enforcement officer. Authorizes the transfer of Class I Dealer permits. The bill further rF If the Commission determines any operator or importer has not remitted the proper assessments, the Oklahoma Liquefied Petroleum Gas Board may suspend or revoke their permits until such assessments and penalties are paid in full. SB 1407 also authorizes the Attorney General to take necessary action to collect fees or penalties if requested to do so by the Commission.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/4/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2002: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 871, A Measure That “Prohibits The Commission On Marginally Producing Oil And Gas Wells From Using Any Of Their Funds For The Purpose Of Influencing Governmental Action Or Policy, But The Bill States They May Respond To Any Request For Information From The Legislature, Governor, Public Officials Or State Agencies.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted for SB 871. The bill “Prohibits the Commission on Marginally Producing Oil and Gas Wells from using any of their funds for the purpose of influencing governmental action or policy, but the bill states they may respond to any request for information from the Legislature, Governor, public officials or state agencies. This prohibition is similar to the restrictions already placed on the Oklahoma Energy Resources Board. SB 871 also creates a sales tax exemption for sales of electricity and associated delivery and transmission services used by certain oil and gas operation utilizing special dewatering technology. Currently, there are no projects utilizing this technology located in this state but such projects would have to be approved by the Corporation Commission to qualify for this sales tax exemption.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary/2002_legislative_summary.pdf); Oklahoma 2002 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/13/02](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

2003

**2003: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 547, A Bill That “Modifies Appointment Of The State Climatologist. Requires The Oklahoma Climatological Survey To Maintain And Operate The Oklahoma Mesonetwork. The Measure Passed 41-0.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2003 Senate Journal, [3/4/03](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/senate_journals/sj2003/sj2003_index.html)]

**2003: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 1051, A Bill That “Amends The Oklahoma Carbon Sequestration Enhancement Act By Adding Language To Enhance The Opportunity For Oil And Gas Well Operators And Mineral Owners To Participate In Carbon Dioxide Emissions Marketing By The Capturing And Sequestration Of Carbon Dioxide Emissions.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted for HB 1051. The bill “Amends the Oklahoma Carbon Sequestration Enhancement Act by adding language to enhance the opportunity for oil and gas well operators and mineral owners to participate in carbon dioxide emissions marketing by the capturing and sequestration of carbon dioxide emissions through carbon dioxide injection in marginal or abandoned oil or gas wells. The bill adds the Director of the Oklahoma Climatological Survey to the Carbon Sequestration Advisory Committee.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2003 Senate Journal, [4/8/03](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/senate_journals/sj2003/sj2003_index.html)]

**2003: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 444, The Bill “Modifies Current Statutes Governing Mining Permits To Allow Mining Permits To Be Transferred To New Owners Or Operators Provided That All Conditions And Obligations Will Be Met By The New Owners Or Operators.” The Measure Passed 44-0.** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2003 Senate Journal, [3/4/03](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/senate_journals/sj2003/sj2003_index.html)]

**2003: Pruitt Missed A Vote On A Measure That “Deletes The Statutory Fees For Permits, Inspections, Examinations And Special Assessments Required Of Persons Registered Or Regulated By The Oklahoma Liquefied Petroleum Gas Board And Authorizes The Board To Establish These Fees.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt missed a vote on HB 1214. The measure “deletes the statutory fees for permits, inspections, examinations and special assessments required of persons registered or regulated by the Oklahoma Liquefied Petroleum Gas Board and authorizes the Board to establish these fees. Creates a revolving fund for the Board and provides for the annual transfer of 20 percent of all fees collected to the General Revenue Fund.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2003 Senate Journal, [3/19/03](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/senate_journals/sj2003/sj2003_index.html)]

**2003: Pruitt Voted Against HB 1569, A Measure That “Makes It Unlawful To Locate Any Habitable Structure Within A Radius Of 125 Feet Of An Active Well Or 50 Feet From The Center Of Any Surface Equipment Necessary For The Operation Of An Active Well.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor ofHB 1569. The measure passed 27-18. The bill summary is: “This oil and gas related measure makes it unlawful to locate any habitable structure within a radius of 125 feet of an active well or 50 feet from the center of any surface equipment necessary for the operation of an active well. Alternative setback agreements may be made between operators and surface owners under the provisions of this act.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2003 Senate Journal, [4/15/03](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/senate_journals/sj2003/sj2003_index.html)]

**2003: Pruitt Voted For SB 535, A Measure That Extended “Existing Gross Production Tax Exemptions For Enhanced Recovery Projects, Horizontal Drilling, Inactive Wells, Production Enhancement Projects, Deep Wells, New Discoveries, And Three Dimensional Seismic Technology”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor ofSB 535 the measure “Makes various changes relating to taxation of oil and gas production, including the following: ♦ Modifies procedures for the computation of oil and gas prices used in the determination of the tax rate; ♦ Extends existing gross production tax exemptions for enhanced recovery projects, horizontal drilling, inactive wells, production enhancement projects, deep wells, new discoveries, and threedimensional seismic technology, until 7-1-06; ♦ Modifies procedures for payment of gross production tax refunds to prohibit claims for refunds more than 18 months after the first day of the fiscal year the refund was first available, prohibit payments to persons other than the operator or a working interest owner of record at the time of production, and require reinvestment of at least the amount of the refund in Oklahoma oil or gas production as a condition of receiving the refund; Extends the current provision limiting the depletion allowance for major oil companies to 50 percent of net income until 12-31-06; and ♦ Creates the Surface Damage Advisory Committee.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2003 Senate Journal Volume 1, [3/11/03](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/senate_journals/sj2003/sj2003_index.html)]

**2003: Pruitt Voted Against SB 288 A Bill That Created “A Moratorium On The Issuance Of Temporary Water Permits That Would Lead To Any Municipal Or Public Water Supply Use Of Groundwater From A Sensitive Sole Source Groundwater Basin.** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted against SB 288 The bill “Creates a moratorium on the issuance of temporary water permits that would lead to any municipal or public water supply use of groundwater from a sensitive sole source groundwater basin. The moratorium will remain in effect until the Oklahoma Water Resources Board completes a hydrological study and approves a maximum annual yield that will ensure any permits for removal of water from the area will not reduce the natural flow of water from streams or springs emanating from the basin.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2003 Senate Journal, [3/11/03](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/senate_journals/sj2003/sj2003_index.html)]

**2003: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of A Bill That “Clarifies Several Issues Including Modifying The Definition Of ‘Waters Of The State’ To State That Waste Treatment Systems And Prior Converted Cropland Are Not Considered Waters Of The State.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted for HB 1019. The bill passed 45-1. It was a “request bill by the Department of Environmental Quality, the measure clarifies several issues including modifying the definition of “waters of the state” to state that waste treatment systems and prior converted cropland are not considered waters of the state. To make our statutes agree with language used by the federal government, terminology relating to the “accreditation” of laboratories was amended. The bill also modifies a statute relating to the Air Quality Advisory Council by clarifying that enforcement hearings will be held before an Administrative Law Judge of the Department rather than the Advisory Council. The bill removes outdated statutes relating to the Oklahoma Landfill Closure Authority which has never been an active entity.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2003 Senate Journal, [4/15/03](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/senate_journals/sj2003/sj2003_index.html)]

2004

**2004: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB2198, A Measure That “Exempts Environmental Cleanup Activities Authorized By A Federal Or State Environmental Agency From Liability Under The Governmental Tort Claims Act”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 2198 The measure “Exempts environmental cleanup activities authorized by a federal or state environmental agency from liability under the Governmental Tort Claims Act and exempts certain persons or entities who own or lease property subject to the Oklahoma Brownfields Voluntary Redevelopment Act from liability related to pollution on the property.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [4/19/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2004: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of 2284, A Measure That “Authorizes The Oklahoma Water Resources Board To Accredit Floodplain Administrators And Requires Each Floodplain Board To Designate A Floodplain Administrator Accredited By The OWRB.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [4/12/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2004: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 2440, A Measure That “Extends The Current Three-Year Moratorium On The Sale Or Exportation Of Surface Water And/Or Groundwater Outside This State By Any State Or Local Agency Or Tribe To Five Years Or Until Such Time As The State Conducts And Completes A Comprehensive Scientific Hydrological Study Of The Water Resources Of This State.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 2440. The measure “extends the current three-year moratorium on the sale or exportation of surface water and/or groundwater outside this state by any state or local agency or tribe to five years or until such time as the state conducts and completes a comprehensive scientific hydrological study of the water resources of this state.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [4/13/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2004: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of Modifying The “Definition Of ‘Fair Field Price” Which Relates To The Value Of Natural Gas Attributed To Wells Owned By A Public Utility Or A Subsidiary Or Affiliate Of A Public Utility.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of SB 1317. The bill “Modifies the definition of ‘fair field price’ which relates to the value of natural gas attributed to wells owned by a public utility or a subsidiary or affiliate of a public utility. Amends that definition by stating the fair field price shall not apply to gas purchased pursuant to a competitive bid process.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [3/8/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2004: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 2550, A Measure That “Modifies The Corporation Commission Regulation Of The Natural Gas Gathering Industry By Allowing The Commission To Regulate Gas Processing And Establish Fees In Certain Instances Where Producers Filed Complaints Against Gathering Companies.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 2550. The measure “Modifies the Corporation Commission regulation of the natural gas gathering industry by allowing the Commission to regulate gas processing and establish fees in certain instances where producers filed complaints against gathering companies.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [4/5/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2004: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 2574, A Measure That “Modifies The Oklahoma Underground Facilities Damage Prevention Act, Also Known As The ‘Okie One-Call System’ By Modifying The Definition Of ‘Underground Facility’ To Remove Oil And Gas Pipelines Which Were Added To The Act Last Session And Include Only Refined Petroleum Product Pipelines And Other Oil And Gas Lines Which Are Located In A Public Right- Of-Way.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of a measure that “Modifies the Oklahoma Underground Facilities Damage Prevention Act, also known as the ‘Okie One-Call System’ by modifying the definition of ‘underground facility’ to remove oil and gas pipelines which were added to the act last session and include only refined petroleum product pipelines and other oil and gas lines which are located in a public right- of-way. Further amends the original act to modify the notification process required for demolition projects by shortening the notification period from 60 days to 7 business days unless an operator of an underground facility notifies the demolition company that additional time will be necessary before the demolition can be conducted.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [4/22/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2004: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 2616, A Measure That “Addresses Changes In The Statutes Relating To Regulation Of Petroleum Storage Tanks As Requested By The Corporations Commission.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 2616. The measure “Addresses changes in the statutes relating to regulation of Petroleum Storage Tanks as requested by the Corporations Commission. Many of the amendments were designed to address issues brought up in the investigative audit required by the Legislature in 2003. The amendments attempt to reconcile the statutes with the newly adopted regulatory practices of the Commission and provide greater control over the remediation efforts paid for by the Petroleum Storage Tank Indemnity Fund which is funded by a $0.01 cent per gallon assessment on petroleum fuel products.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [4/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2004: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 2091, A Measure That “Re-Creates The Commission On Marginally Producing Oil And Gas Wells.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2004 Senate Journal, [3/24/04](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

2005

**2005: Pruitt Voted Against SB 932, A Measure That Requires “Certain Government Entities Administering The Floodplain Management Act To Be Accredited By The Oklahoma Water Resources Board By Nov. 1, 2005.” Pruitt Was One Of Six Senators Who Voted Nay.** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2005 Senate Journal, [3/15/05](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2005: Pruitt Voted Against SB 19, A Measure That “Requires The Department Of Mines To Keep Certain Citizen Complaints Of Violations Confidential.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted against SB 19. The bill. “Requires the Department of Mines to keep certain citizen complaints of violations confidential. Allows the Department to perform corrective work on behalf of an operator who is found to be in violation using the operator’s surety bond. Authorizes a fine of up to $10,000 for violations.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2005 Senate Journal, [2/22/05](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2005: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 20 A Measure That “Requires New Mining Operations Using Blasting To Prove The Operator Is In Full Compliance With All Municipal Regulations If Such Operations Are Located Within Municipalities Within Counties With A Population Of 300,000 Persons.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of SB 20. The bill “Requires new mining operations using blasting to prove the operator is in full compliance with all municipal regulations if such operations are located within municipalities within counties with a population of 300,000 persons. Allows exemptions for existing operations or certain properties adjacent to existing operations.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2005 Senate Journal, [3/15/05](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2005: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 238, A Measure That “Modifies The Percentage Of Liquefied Petroleum Gas Fees And Funds Deposited Into General Revenue From 20 Percent To 10 Percent.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2005 Senate Journal, [3/10/05](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2005: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 309, A Measure That Defines “‘Economically At-Risk Oil Or Gas Leases’ And Exempts Such Leases From Payment Of A Portion Of Gross Production Taxes For Production During Calendar Years 2005, 2006 And 2007.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of SB309. The measure “SB 309 (Lerblance/Adkins): Defines “economically at-risk oil or gas leases” and exempts such leases from payment of a portion of gross production taxes for production during calendar years 2005, 2006 and 2007. Provides that the exemption is based on the tax rate in effect at the time. Modifies the apportionment of petroleum excise taxes on oil and gas under certain provisions by allocating a larger percentage to the Interstate Oil Compact Fund of Oklahoma. [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2005 Senate Journal, [3/8/05](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2005: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 470, A Bill That “Reapportions 1/3 Of 1 Percent Of Certain Gasoline Excise Taxes Currently Accruing To The General Revenue Fund To A Newly-Created Circuit Engineering District Revolving Fund.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2005 Senate Journal, [3/7/05](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

**2005: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 1194, A Measure That “Modifies The Data To Be Used By The Tax Commission In Its Determination Of The Estimated Gross Production Tax Revenue From Natural Gas.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/legislative_summary_index.htm#1999); Oklahoma 2005 Senate Journal, [4/26/05](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx)]

2006

**2006: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 1972, A Bill That “Relates To The Sale Or Lease Of Lands; Requires Specific Approval From The Commission For The Sale Or Transfer Of Land Which Will Result In A Remainder Tract Of Land Of 5 Acres Or Less.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx); Oklahoma 2006 Senate Floor Votes, [3/13/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx)]

**2006: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 2124, A Measure That “Recreates The Oklahoma Liquefied Petroleum Gas Research, Marketing And Safety Commission Until 2012.”** [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx); Oklahoma 2006 Senate Floor Votes, [4/26/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx)]

**2006: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 2411, A Bill That “Modifies Procedure By Which The Price Of Oil And Gas Is Determined When The Sale Is Between Related Entities And Defines Terms. Provides For Construction Of A Specified Section.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted for HB 2411, a measure that “Clarifies tax assessment procedures relating to any willful attempt to evade payment. Extends expiration date for certain gross production tax exemptions until 7-1-09. Modifies procedure by which the price of oil and gas is determined when the sale is between related entities and defines terms. Provides for construction of a specified section.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx); Oklahoma 2006 Senate Floor Votes, [4/26/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx)]

**2006: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 2810, A Measure That “Creates The “Oklahoma Refinery Revitalization Act” Which Establishes A Streamlined And Coordinated State, Federal, Tribal, And Local Authorization, Review And Preapplication Process For Refinery Facility Applications.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted for HB 2810. The measure creates the ‘Oklahoma Refinery Revitalization Act’ which establishes a streamlined and coordinated state, federal, tribal, and local authorization, review and preapplication process for refinery facility applications. Also directs the Corporation Commission to cooperate with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission on authorizations for crude oil or refined petroleum product pipeline facilities. Permits a taxpayer to treat certain costs of a qualified refinery property as a nonchargeable expense to a capital account and limits the deduction to certain years. Allows certain refiners to take a deduction for certain sulfur regulation compliance costs.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx); Oklahoma 2006 Senate Floor Votes, [5/26/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx)]

**2006: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 2506, A Measure That “Extends The Expiration Date For The Deposit Of Petroleum Excise Taxes Into The Corporation Commission’s Plugging Fund.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 2506. The bill “Extends the expiration date for the deposit of petroleum excise taxes into the Corporation Commission’s plugging fund. Grants the Corporation Commission jurisdiction and authority over seeping natural gas and creates a Corporation Commission Gas Seep Fund.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx); Oklahoma 2006 Senate Floor Votes, [4/5/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx), [5/26/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx)]

**2006: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of HB 1913, A Measure That “Defines The Term ‘Hearing’ As A Proceeding Before An Administrative Law Judge, Appellate Referee Or The Corporation Commission En Banc, In Order To Allow Some Standard Procedures Relating To Oil And Gas Issues To Be Done By Mail Or Other Means Rather Than In Person.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of HB 1913. The measure “Defines the term ‘hearing’ as a proceeding before an Administrative Law Judge, Appellate Referee or the Corporation Commission en banc, in order to allow some standard procedures relating to oil and gas issues to be done by mail or other means rather than in person.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx); Oklahoma 2006 Senate Floor Votes, [5/3/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx)]

**2006: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 1594, A Bill That “Updates Governing Statutes Of The Oklahoma Liquefied Petroleum Gas Board So They Can Comply With Federal Requirements, Such As Authorizing Criminal Background Checks For Certain Employees And Establishing Limitations On Liability If Customers Alter Or Modify LP Gas Burning Equipment Without The Knowledge And Consent Of The LP Gas Seller.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted in favor of SB 1594. The measure “updates governing statutes of the Oklahoma Liquefied Petroleum Gas Board so they can comply with federal requirements, such as authorizing criminal background checks for certain employees and establishing limitations on liability if customers alter or modify LP Gas burning equipment without the knowledge and consent of the LP Gas seller. SB 1594 further allows the Board to retain any monies collected from administrative penalties in their Liquefied Petroleum Gas Fund instead of the state’s General Revenue Fund.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx); Oklahoma 2006 Senate Floor Votes, [3/14/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx), [5/3/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx)]

**2006: Pruitt Voted In Favor Of SB 1463, The Measure “Modifies The Lead Impacted Communities Relocation Act To Include Relocation Assistance Based On The Risk Of Subsidence Or Sinkholes Created By Historic Mining Activity. Relocation Assistance Was First Enacted In 2004 For The Purpose Of Moving Young Children Out Of The Area To Reduce Their Exposure To Lead.”** Pruitt voted in favor of SB 1463 The bill “Modifies the Lead Impacted Communities Relocation Act to include relocation assistance based on the risk of subsidence or sinkholes created by historic mining activity. Relocation assistance was first enacted in 2004 for the purpose of moving young children out of the area to reduce their exposure to lead. The act created a public trust which is authorized to buyout property owners and renters who live in the most at-risk areas which encompass the communities of Picher and Cardin in far Northeast Oklahoma. The trust shall determine the amount each eligible resident is given for their property based on the average cost of property elsewhere in the county. The measure further terminates the Ottawa Reclamation Authority which was created in 1969 to try to reclaim hazardous lands abandoned by mining companies. The properties and activities of the Ottawa Reclamation Authority are transferred to the public trust.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx); Oklahoma 2006 Senate Floor Votes, [3/2/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx), [5/24/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx)]

**2006: Pruitt Voted Against SB 1366 On Its Third Reading, But He Voted For The Measure On The Fourth Reading. “The Bill “Modifies The Apportionment Of The One-Cent Per Gallon Fee On Motor Fuels Which Supports The Petroleum Storage Tank Indemnity Fund And The Petroleum Storage Tank Regulatory Division Of The Corporation Commission By Directing 8% Of The Annual Funds.”** According to the Oklahoma Senate, Pruitt voted for SB 1366 on 2/28/06. He then voted for the measure on 5/15/06. The bill “Modifies the apportionment of the one-cent per gallon fee on motor fuels which supports the Petroleum Storage Tank Indemnity Fund and the petroleum storage tank regulatory division of the Corporation Commission by directing 8% of the annual funds, after the first One Million Dollars which goes into the Corporation Commission Revolving Fund, go to the Department of Environmental Quality Revolving Fund for the purpose of remediating petroleum related hazardous waste sites such as abandoned refinery sites. This one-cent per gallon assessment generates approximately $24 million dollars annually. The remainder of the assessment will continue to be used to support the remediation of leaking underground petroleum tanks and the State Transportation Fund.” [Oklahoma State Senate Legislative Summary, Accessed [12/14/16](http://www.oksenate.gov/publications/journals.aspx); Oklahoma 2006 Senate Floor Votes, [2/28/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx), [5/15/06](http://www.oksenate.gov/legislation/votes/votes_2006/2006_votes.aspx)]

**Campaign Finance**

Pruitt has run for Attorney General, Lt. Governor, State Senate, and the United States Congress.

**Pruitt and His Affiliated Organizations Have Received Nearly $4 Million From Fossil Fuel Interests**. Attorney General Scott Pruitt has received a total of $348,246 from fossil fuel industries as a candidate for state office in Oklahoma. Additionally, two PACs affiliated with Attorney General Scott Pruitt have received $147,500 from fossil fuel interests. This includes $36,500 given to Pruitt’s leadership PAC Oklahoma Strong and an additional $111,000 given to the Liberty 2.0 Super PAC. The Republican’s Attorney General raised $3,443,491 from fossil fuel interests between 2013 and 2016 while Scott Pruitt was chairman, a member of the executive committee, and in the leadership of the Rule of Law Defense Fund.

State Based Races

Attorney General Scott Pruitt has received a total of $348,246 from fossil fuel industries as a candidate for state office in Oklahoma. This total includes $42,385 from electric utilities; $24,750 from mining; and $281,111 from oil and gas. Pruitt has received $10,000 from Devon Energy and $5,000 from Devon Energy founder Larry Nichols. Nicholas is a member of the National Association of Manufacturers executive committee and former chairman of the American Petroleum Industry. Pruitt received $10,000 from Koch Industries and $11,500 from Chesapeake Energy.  Additionally, Pruitt has received $6,500 from Exxon Mobil, $9,250 from Oklahoma Gas and Electric, $2,500 from Arch Coal, and $1,000 from Alpha Natural Resources. Harold Hamm, who said, “Every time we can’t drill a well in America, terrorism is being funded,” has donated $5,000 to Pruitt.

### Dirty Energy Money

**Pruitt Has Received Nearly $4 Million From Dirty Energy Interests**. Attorney General Scott Pruitt has received a total of $345,246 from fossil fuel industries as a candidate for state office in Oklahoma. Additionally, Two PACs affiliated with Attorney General Scott Pruitt have received $147,500 from dirty energy interests. This includes $36,500 given to Pruitt’s leadership PAC Oklahoma Strong and an additional $111,000 given to the Liberty 2.0 Super PAC. The Republican’s Attorney General raised $3,443,491 from fossil fuel interests between 2013 and 2016 while Scott Pruitt was chairman and member of the executive committee.

* **Pruitt Affiliated PACs Have Received More Than $147,000 From Dirty Energy Interests**. Two PACs affiliated with Attorney General Scott Pruitt have received $147,500 from dirty energy interests. This includes $36,500 given to Pruitt’s leadership PAC Oklahoma Strong and an additional $111,000 given to the Liberty 2.0 Super PAC. [CQ MoneyLine, Super PAC Donors, accessed 1/9/17; CQ MoneyLine, Oklahoma Strong Donors, accessed 1/9/17]
* **RAGA Raised $3,443,491 from Fossil Fuel Interests Between 2014 and 2016.** [CQ MoneyLine, Republican Attorneys General, accessed 12/20/16]
* **Scott Pruitt Has Received More Than $345,246 In Campaign Contributions From Fossil Fuel Interests**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, in his career, Scot Pruitt has received $348,246 from fossil fuel industries. This total includes $42,385 from electric utilities; $24,250 from mining; and $250,361 from oil and gas. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/21/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668&d-cci=36,34,33#[{1|gro=d-cci)]

Details on fundraising for his state based races are detailed below:

|  |
| --- |
| **PRUITT CAMPAIGN FINANCE TOTALS** |
| **YEAR** | **OFFICE** | **TOTAL RAISED** |
| 2014 | Attorney General | $1,088,811 |
| 2010 | Attorney General | $1,100,213 |
| 2006 | Lieutenant Governor | $883,790 |
| 2002 | Senate District 036 | $52,576 |

Pruitt Campaign Donations by Industry

|  |
| --- |
| **TOP INDUSTRY DONORS TO SCOTT PRUITT** |
| **INDUSTRY** | **AMOUNT** |
| Lawyers & Lobbyists | $298,717 |
| Oil & Gas | $281,111 |
| Balance Forward | $229,984 |
| Candidate Contributions | $220,130 |
| Automotive | $132,895 |
| Real Estate | $132,288 |
| Health Professionals | $115,595 |
| Commercial Banks | $99,260 |
| Telecom Services & Equipment | $72,450 |
| Securities & Investment | $64,290 |

Individual Donors

|  |
| --- |
| **TOP INDIVIDUAL DONORS TO SCOTT PRUITT** |
| **DONOR** | **AMOUNT** |
| PRUITT, E SCOTT | $216,850.00 |
| ROBSON, JOHN (JOE) | $17,000.00 |
| WARD, LEW O | $11,700.00 |
| WILLIAMS, DEAN | $11,000.00 |
| CANTRELL, MIKE | $11,000.00 |
| LOVE, TOM E | $10,500.00 |

**Top Individual Donor Joe Robson**. According to the National institute on Money in State Politics, Joe Robson donated $17,000 to Scott Pruitt in his career, the most of any individual (not counting donations from Pruitt himself). Robson is President of the Robson Companies, which he founded in 1986. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668&d-cci=36,34,33); Tulsa Historical Society, accessed [12/7/16](http://tulsahistory.org/hall-of-fame/hannah-and-joe-robson/)]

**Oil Tycoon Lew Ward Died In March 2016.** According to the Oklahoman, “Longtime Oklahoma oilman and entrepreneur Lew Ward died Sunday. He was 85. Ward was founder and chairman of Enid-based Ward Petroleum Corp. Born in Oklahoma City in 1930, Ward spent his life in the state’s oil and natural gas industry. His father was a driller, tool pusher and drilling superintendent, and Ward spent summers working as a roustabout and a roughneck.” [Oklahoman, [3/21/16](http://newsok.com/article/5486480)]

**Dean Williams Is Founder Of Real Estate Auction Website**. According to Tulsa World, “Dean Williams is CEOof real estate auction site Williams and Williams,which he co-founded in1986 and of which hebecame sole shareholderin 2004. A law graduate of Georgetown University, he founded the investment firm Open Lands Inc. for rural property acquisition and preservation. Williams is a licensed real estate broker in 40 states and a member of the National Association of Realtors, the Tulsa County and American bar associations, and Leadership Tulsa. He is aboard member of Family& Children’s Services of Tulsa.” [Tulsa World, [2/27/09](http://www.tulsaworld.com/business/questions-with-dean-williams/article_4d2384c6-1349-5d85-9d4c-0b5a3556c334.html)]

**Mike Cantrell Is President Of National Stripper Well Association, Former Consultant To Continental Resources.** According to his website, Mike Cantrell is Chairman of the National Stripper Well Association. Previously he was VP of Government Affairs for Continental Resources and was Chairman of Oil Center operating. [Mike Cantrell, website, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.mikecantrell.net/dyn/showpage.php?id=15)]

**Tom Love Is Chairman And CEO Of Love’s Truck Stops**. According to Forbes, “Tom & Judy love are the founders of convenience store chain Love's Travel Stops & Country Stores. The company opened 27 new locations in 2015 and is on pace to open another 40 in 2016. In March 2016, Love's purchased Trillium CNG, a compressed natural gas provider for an undisclosed sum. They got their start in 1964 when they leased a gas station in Watonga, Oklahoma for $5,000. A few years later, they launched a convenience store. Today, Love's Travel Stops & Country Stores is a national chain with more than 400 locations in 39 states. Located along interstates, they offer gas stations, convenience stores, fast food restaurants, showers and trucking supplies. The company remains family-owned and operated. Tom is chairman and CEO, and three of the couple's four children work for the company.” [Forbes, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.forbes.com/profile/tom-judy-love/)]

## State Fossil Fuel Interests Donations to Pruitt

**Scott Pruitt Has Received $345,246 In Campaign Contributions From Fossil Fuel Interests**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, in his career, Scot Pruitt has received $345,246 from fossil fuel industries. This total includes $42,385 from electric utilities; $26,250 from mining; and $276,611 from oil and gas. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [3/27/17](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668&d-cci=36,34,33#[{1|gro=d-cci)]

### Electric Utilities

**Electric Utilities Have Donated More Than $42,000 To Pruitt**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, the Electric Utilities industry has donated a total of $42,385 to Scott Pruitt in his career. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

|  |
| --- |
| **Electric Utilities Donations** |
| Gas & Electric Utilities | $35,285.00 |
| Electric Power Utilities | $6,100.00 |
| Rural Electric Cooperatives | $1,000.00 |
| **Total** | **$42,385.00** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Top Electric Utilities Donors to Scott Pruitt** |
| **Donor** | **Amount** |
| OKLAHOMA GAS & ELECTRIC CO | $9,250.00 |
| DELANEY, PETER B | $7,000.00 |
| TRAUSCHKE, ROBERT SEAN | $2,500.00 |
| AMERICAN ELECTRIC POWER | $2,000.00 |
| ITC HOLDINGS CORP | $2,000.00 |
| RENFROW, PAUL L | $1,250.00 |
| OKLAHOMA ASSOCIATION OF ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES | $1,000.00 |
| HARRIS, DANNY P & SHERI E | $1,000.00 |
| SOLOMON, STUART | $1,000.00 |
| CENTERPOINT ENERGY (OGE SUBSIDIARY) | $1,000.00 |

#### Coal/Electric Utilities Donors of Note

**$5,000 From Harold Hamm**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Harold Hamm donated $5,000 to Scott Pruitt. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

* **Hamm Started Continental Resources.** According to Continental Resources, “He went to work in the oil fields as a teenager and established Continental Resources in 1967 at the age of 21. He built a grassroots startup into an NYSE-traded, Top 10 oil producer in the U.S. Lower 48. As a voice for America’s oil and natural gas industry, he’s on a mission to help make America energy independent within the next decade.” [Continental Resources, Accessed [11/10/16](http://www.contres.com/about/leadership/harold-g-hamm)]
* **Hamm: “President Trump Will Fuel America's Future And Become The First President To Achieve American Energy Independence.”** “Four years ago, Donald Trump asked me to tell him about the American Energy Renaissance and how we had transformed the North Dakota Bakken into the largest U.S. oil discovery ever. I told him it was moving America from energy scarcity to one of abundance would change the world forever and could power America to greatness once again. He wrote that down. Donald Trump got it. President Trump will fuel America’s future and become the first president to achieve American energy independence.” [Republican National Convention, CSPAN, 7/20/16]
* **Hamm: “Every Time We Can’t Drill A Well In America, Terrorism Is Being Funded.”** “Donald Trump will restore America’s rightful place as the energy leader of the world. Every time we can’t drill a well in America, terrorism is being funded. Orlando brought this home once again. You know, it’s been 15 years since 9/11. We can’t ignore this problem any longer. It’s not going away. Climate change isn’t our biggest problem. It’s Islamic terrorism.” [Republican National Convention, CSPAN, 7/20/16]
* **Harold Hamm Chaired Pruitt 2014 Campaign For Oklahoma AG**. According to Journal Record Legislative Report, “There’s no more guessing as to whether at least one state official will seek another term. Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt will run for re-election in 2014, with the help of Continental Resources Chief Executive Officer Harold Hamm. Pruitt revealed Monday that Hamm will serve as campaign chairman. In an announcement of Hamm’s role, Pruitt called his first three years in office ‘the experience of a lifetime.’” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 7/29/13]

**$2,500 From OGE Energy CEO Sean Trauschke**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Sean Trauschke has donated $2,500 to Scott Pruitt. Trauschke is president and CEO of Oklahoma gas and Electric. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id); OGE, accessed [12/7/16](https://oge.com/wps/portal/oge/about-us/leadership/%21ut/p/a1/lZBND0NAEIZ_jasdi0Z7WzQt0oSoYC8NjS4JVtD6-1U3rX7NaWbyPMk7gyiKEK2TW8GSvuB1Uj5mujppGAywFGzDkRhAfP-Aj9iXwZBGIJ4B9tgSQzMdb63LsFf_9HcO3gJxTNNTXVOydOU3H94UgW9-iOgT8nrBHFiIOAEfMtiIspKn0z9jUqeyxhBts0vWZq14bcd13vdNtxFAgGEYRMY5KzPxzCsBlpScdz2K5iRqqiCIoHCrUOvuEAqYRg%21%21/dl5/d5/L2dBISEvZ0FBIS9nQSEh/)]

**$2,500 From Arch Coal**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Arch Coal donated $2,500 to Scott Pruitt. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

* **St. Louis Based Arch Coal Does Not Operate Mines In Oklahoma**. According to Arch Coal, the company operate mining complexes in Wyoming, Colorado, Illinois, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Virginia. Arch coal is headquartered in St. Louis Missouri. [Arch Coal, Our Mines, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.archcoal.com/aboutus/ourmines.aspx)]
* **Arch Coal Called CPP “Ill-Advised And Poorly Designed.”** According to a press release, “Arch Coal, Inc. (NYSE:ACI) issued the following statement in response to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s final ‘Clean Power Plan’ rule. ‘The Administration seems increasingly desperate to salvage an ill-advised and poorly designed rule, which won’t work, won’t pass muster with states, and won’t stand up to legal scrutiny,’ said Deck Slone, Arch’s senior vice president of strategy and public policy. ‘Even prior to the expensive overhaul announced today, seven governors had stated that they did not plan to comply. That number seems certain to grow as other governors realize that, rather than fix the rule, EPA has in many ways made matters worse.’” [Arch Coal, [8/2/15](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0ahUKEwj3weGjguPQAhXBdSYKHSeGCGoQFggiMAE&url=http%3A%2F%2Fnews.archcoal.com%2FExternal.File%3Ft%3D2%26item%3Dg7rqBLVLuv81UAmrh20Mp%2BuvFus9UVHck45XYbG5%2Bd%2BmGQRIrdGLBiKz7a%2BjPlSiE6Xa5oSZUwtwMv0V1Y4hvQ%3D%3D%26cb%3D635947766275964178&usg=AFQjCNHMX-4SHzscUQysLB1EDKxOyudxcQ)]

**$1,000 From Alpha Natural Resources**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Alpha Natural Resources donated $1,000 to Scott Pruitt. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

* **Alpha Natural Resources Operational Footprint Located In West Virginia And Kentucky**. According to Alpha Natural Resources their “operational footprint” is only in West Virginia and Kentucky. [Alpha Natural Resources, Operational footprint, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.alphanr.com/poweringthefuture/locations/Pages/default.aspx)]
* **Alpha Natural Resources Bankruptcy Used By Americans For Prosperity As Example Of Damage Done By CPP**. According to Americans for Prosperity, “Americans for Prosperity (AFP), the Commonwealth’s leading advocate for commonsense, free-market energy policies, urged Virginia leaders to decline to submit a plan to implement the Environmental Protection Agency’s sweeping and controversial ‘Clean Power Plan’ rule. Virginia’s Alpha Natural Resources has declared bankruptcy in response to the administration’s announcement and the rule is expected to have similar effects on other companies, driving up costs for consumers and destroying jobs.” [AFP, [8/4/15](https://americansforprosperity.org/afp-alpha-natural-resources-is-virginias-first-victim-of-clean-power-rule/)]

**$1,000 From Former OGE COO Danny Harris**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Danny harris donated $1,000 to Scott Pruitt. According to Bloomberg, “Mr. Danny P. Harris, Dan served as the Chief Operating Officer of OG&E Electric Services (Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company) since October 2, 2007 and its President from December 2, 2010 to December 2011. Mr. Harris served as the President at Enogex Inc., a subsidiary of OGE Energy Corp. since June 2005.” [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id); Bloomberg, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.bloomberg.com/research/stocks/people/person.asp?personId=20758829&capId=39098300&previousCapId=49140530&previousTitle=ETP%20Enogex%20Partners%20LLC)]

### Oil and Gas

**Oil And Gas Donated More Than $281,000 To Scott Pruitt**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, the oil and gas industry has donated a total of $281,110.69 to Scott Pruitt in his career. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

|  |
| --- |
| **Top Individual Oil and Gas Donors to Scott Pruitt** |
| **Donor** | **Amount** |
| WARD, LEW O | $11,700 |
| CANTRELL, MIKE | $11,000 |
| LOVE, TOM E | $10,500 |
| MCINTOSH, JAMES W | $10,000 |
| MATTOX, CARLYN D & TAMMY R | $10,000 |
| HARVEY, RALPH L | $8,700 |
| THORNTON, RODNEY D & ROBIN | $8,000 |
| WALLIS, JAMES W | $7,500 |
| MCDOUGALL, JEFFREY J (JEFF) | $5,750 |
| NICHOLS, JOHN LARRY (LARRY) | $5,000 |
| HAMM, HAROLD | $5,000 |
| HARMON, CHARLES E & EVELYN L | $5,000 |
| MILLICAN, DON P & DONNA E P | $5,000 |
| BROCK, JOHN A & DONNIE V | $5,000 |
| THORNTON, RODNEY D | $5,000 |
| BOYD, WILLIAM S | $5,000 |
| MCCUTCHEON, ROBERT D & JACKIE L | $5,000 |
| KINDRED, KIP & DEBORAH | $5,000 |
| HILL, THOMAS A & KAY K | $5,000 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Top Non-Individual Oil and Gas Donors to Scott Pruitt** |
| **Donor** | **Amount** |
| CHESAPEAKE ENERGY | $11,500.00 |
| DEVON ENERGY | $10,000.00 |
| EXXON MOBIL | $6,500.00 |
| OKLAHOMA INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION | $6,000.00 |
| MARATHON OIL | $6,000.00 |
| ONEOK INC | $5,950.00 |
| VALERO ENERGY | $5,000.00 |
| UNIT CORPORATION | $3,500.00 |
| PHILLIPS 66 | $2,500.66 |
| SPECTRA ENERGY | $2,500.00 |
| CONOCOPHILLIPS | $2,000.00 |
| NEWFIELD EXPLORATION CO | $2,000.00 |
| OKLAHOMA PETROLEUM MARKETERS ASSOCIATION | $1,000.00 |
| CHEVRON CORP | $1,000.00 |
| BP NORTH AMERICA | $500.00 |
| PHILLIPS PETROLEUM | $350.66 |
| ANADARKO PETROLEUM | $300.00 |
| SUNOCO INC | $250.00 |

#### Chesapeake Energy

**$11,500 From Chesapeake Energy**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Chesapeake Energy donated $11,500 to Scott Pruitt. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

#### Devon Energy

**$10,000 From Devon Energy**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Devon Energy donated $10,000 to Scott Pruitt. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

* **$5,000 From Larry Nichols**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Larry Nichols donated $5,000 to Scott Pruitt. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]
* **Nicholas Founded Devon Energy; Served On National Association Of Manufacturers And Was Chairman Of American Petroleum Institute**. According to Devon Energy, “J. Larry Nichols, 74, is a co-founder of Devon and served as a director between 1971 and 2016. He served as executive chairman from June 2010 to 2016 after previously holding the position of chairman since 2000 and chief executive officer since 1980. Nichols graduated from Princeton University with a bachelor’s degree in geology and he completed his juris doctorate at the University of Michigan in 1967, where he was a member of the Order of Coif and a comment editor of Law Review. Nichols served as law clerk to Chief Justice Earl Warren and Justice Tom Clark of the U.S. Supreme Court from 1967 to 1968. He then served as special assistant to Assistant Attorney General William Rehnquist in the U.S. Department of Justice in Washington, D.C. A leader in the industry, Nichols serves on the National Association of Manufacturers and is on the board of the Business Industry Political Action Committee in Washington, D.C. He is a former chairman of the American Petroleum Institute and is former chairman of the American Exploration & Production Council.” [Devon, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.devonenergy.com/about-us/chairman-emeritus)]

#### Koch

**$10,000 From Koch Industries**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Koch Industries donated a total of $10,000 to Scott Pruitt in his career. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

#### Oklahoma Gas And Electric

**$9,250 From Oklahoma Gas And Electric**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Oklahoma Gas and Electric donated $9,250 to Scott Pruitt in his career. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

* **OGE Sued EPA Over Regional Haze Plan.** According to an article in the Oklahoman, “OG&E recently challenged a federal EPA plan for regional haze, taking its fight to the U.S. Supreme Court, which declined to hear an appeal. ‘We’re well on our way to compliance with the plans we have in place,’ said Randy Swanson, the utility’s director of public affairs.” [Oklahoman, [8/16/15](http://newsok.com/article/5440466)]
* **OGE Pleased That Federal Court Delayed CPP**. According to EE News, “Oklahoma-based OGE Energy Corp. was pleased with the stay ‘even though OGE is well on track in making reductions in CO2 emissions due to our compliance with [a] regional haze rule as previously mandated,’ said Randy Swanson, an OGE spokesman. He said the stay could provide ‘some breathing room’ as well as ‘more certainty on compliance decisions pertaining to the rule as the rule goes through litigation.’” [EE News, [2/11/16](http://www.eenews.net/stories/1060032232)]

**$7,000 From Enable CEO Peter Delany.** According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Peter B Delany has donated $7,000 to Scott Pruitt. Delany was interim CEO of Enable Midstream Partners. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed 12/7/16; Enable, [6/1/15](http://investors.enablemidstream.com/press-release/financial-news/enable-midstream-announces-leadership-changes)]

**$6,500 From Exxon Mobil**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Exxon Mobil donated $6,500 to Scott Pruitt. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

**$5,000 From Lucas Forrest**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Lucas Forrest donated a total of $5,000 to Scott Pruitt in his career. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

#### Sunoco

**2016: Sunoco Paid U.S. Government $850,000 In Civil Penalties To Resolve Environmental Claims Tied To Crude Oil Spills From The Company's Barbers Hill, Texas, Facility And From The Cromwell, Oklahoma, Facility.** According to the Texas Lawyer, “Sunoco Pipeline will pay the U.S. government $850,000 in civil penalties to resolve environmental claims tied to crude oil spills from the company's Barbers Hill, Texas, facility and from the Cromwell, Oklahoma, facility. Sunoco Pipeline is a subsidiary of Sunoco Logistics Partners Operations.On July 11, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency filed the complaint and proposed consent decree in the U.S. District Court of the Southern District of Texas, Galveston.” [Texas Lawyer, [7/20/16](http://www.texaslawyer.com/id%3D1202763176324/Sunoco-Settles-with-EPA-Over-Oil-Spills-in-Texas-and-Oklahoma?slreturn=20161108125316)]

* **“The Complaint Alleged Sunoco In 2009 Discharged About 1,900 Barrels Of Crude Oil From The Barbers Hill Station Near Mont Belvieu, Texas, And 1,742 Barrels Of Crude Oil, Two Years Later, From The Cromwell Tank Farm.”** According to the Texas Lawyer, “The complaint alleged Sunoco in 2009 discharged about 1,900 barrels of crude oil from the Barbers Hill Station near Mont Belvieu, Texas, and 1,742 barrels of crude oil, two years later, from the Cromwell Tank Farm. Kevin Dunleavy, Sunoco's chief counsel, on Wednesday declined to talk in any detail about the allegations. The company resolved the case through in-house counsel, he said. The company did not admit liability related to the spills. Sunoco agreed to implement corrective measures for alleged violations of the Clean Water Act, according to the consent decree.” [Texas Lawyer, [7/20/16](http://www.texaslawyer.com/id%3D1202763176324/Sunoco-Settles-with-EPA-Over-Oil-Spills-in-Texas-and-Oklahoma?slreturn=20161108125316)]

**2010: Sunoco Paid $81,000 In Penalties For Failing To Notify Federal And State Environmental Agencies Immediately About An Accidental Release Of Benzene Into The Air In January 2007 From Its Oil Refinery Facility In Philadelphia.** According to EPA, “Sunoco, Inc. will pay $81,000 in penalties for failing to notify federal and state environmental agencies immediately about an accidental release of benzene into the air in January 2007 from its oil refinery facility in Philadelphia, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency announced today. According to EPA, on Jan. 28, 2007 Sunoco experienced a non-permitted release of 1,608 pounds of benzene from its facility at 3144 Passyunk Ave., Philadelphia and did not immediately notify the National Response Center, Pennsylvania Emergency Management Agency or local emergency officials as required by the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act. According to EPA, Sunoco also allegedly failed to provide accurate emergency and hazardous chemical inventory forms to the local emergency groups for hazardous chemicals stored at the facility. As part of the settlement, Sunoco neither admitted nor denied liability for the alleged violations.” [EPA, [6/15/10](https://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/0/5C0EF909092A2C2085257743004EE59A)]

**2008: Ruptured Sunoco Pipeline Caused A 12,000 Gallon Gasoline Spill In Pennsylvania.** According to State Impact Pennsylvania, “A 12,000-gallon gasoline spill from a ruptured pipeline in Westmoreland County in 2008 could cost Sunoco Logistics Partners more than $2.3 million in civil penalties from the state. The Department of Environmental Protection filed a complaint Friday with the Pennsylvania Environmental Hearing Board asking it to impose a fine of at least $2.38 million against Sunoco Logistics and its subsidiary Sunoco Pipeline.” [State Impact Pennsylvania, 3/5/14]

**2005: Sunoco Reached A $700 Million Settlement With The Department Of Justice To Settle Clean Air Act Violations Dating Back To 1998 At The Company’s Four Refineries.** According to the Toledo Blade, “It stems from an agreement Sunoco reached with the U.S. Department of Justice in June of 2005 to settle Clean Air Act violations dating to 1998 at the company’s four refineries. The deal was part of a $700 million package involving 14 refineries in six states, one of the largest ever negotiated by Justice Department and U.S. EPA attorneys. Sunoco and two San Antonio companies, Valero and Tesoro, were defendants. Sunoco also owns two refineries in Pennsylvania, one in Marcus Hook, Pa., and one in Philadelphia, as well as a refinery in Tulsa, Okla. It also is making substantial upgrades at those three.” [Toledo Blade, 8/28/06]

#### Anadarko Petroleum Environmental Violations

**2014: Anadarko Petroleum Agreed To Pay $5.1 Billion For A Vast Environmental Cleanup.** According to the New York Times, “A giant Texas oil company, Anadarko Petroleum, has agreed to pay $5.1 billion for a vast environmental cleanup, a sum the Justice Department said was the largest it had ever won in such a case. The settlement, announced on Thursday, is aimed at restoring thousands of sites polluted by toxins and compensating thousands of people with personal injury claims. The case stretches back almost a decade, originating with claims against Kerr-McGee, an Oklahoma energy and chemical company that is now a subsidiary of Anadarko, one of the country’s most successful oil and gas producers.” [New York Times, [4/3/14](https://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/04/business/energy-environment/anadarko-petroleum-to-pay-5-1-billion-to-settle-pollution-case.html)]

* **“The Case Was Brought By A Trust Representing The U.S. Government, 11 States, Indian Tribes And Individuals Affected By The Contamination, And Sought Funds For Cleanups At 2,700 Sites In 47 States.”** According to State Impact NPR, “Anadarko Petroleum on Thursday agreed to pay more than $5 billion for an immense environmental cleanup that includes U.S. sites contaminated by nuclear fuel, rocket fuel waste and wood creosote. The case was brought by a trust representing the U.S. government, 11 states, Indian tribes and individuals affected by the contamination, and sought funds for cleanups at 2,700 sites in 47 states. ‘If you are responsible for 85 years of poisoning the earth, then you are responsible for cleaning it up,’ U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara said in a statement about the settlement. ‘That’s why this case was brought.” [State Impact NPR, [4/4/14](https://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2014/04/04/anadarkos-5-billion-environmental-settlement-4-things-okies-should-know/)]
* **Court Decision “Held Kerr-McGee And Related Subsidiaries Of Anadarko Liable For Fraudulently Conveying Assets In An Attempt To Evade Their Liabilities For Cleanups At Toxic Sites Around The Country.”** The settlement was reached following a 34-day trial and the U.S. Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York’s December 2013 decision, which held Kerr-McGee and related subsidiaries of Anadarko liable for fraudulently conveying assets in an attempt to evade their liabilities for cleanups at toxic sites around the country.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, accessed [12/8/16](https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/case-summary-settlement-agreement-anadarko-fraud-case-results-billions-environmental)]
* **DOJ: “This Settlement Resolves Fraudulent Conveyance Claims Brought By The United States And The Anadarko Litigation Trust, The Trust Against Anadarko Petroleum Corporation And Its Affiliates, The Defendants, In The Bankruptcy Of Tronox Inc. And Its Subsidiaries.”** According to the Department of Justice, “This settlement resolves fraudulent conveyance claims brought by the United States and the Anadarko Litigation Trust, the trust against Anadarko Petroleum Corporation and its affiliates, the defendants, in the bankruptcy of Tronox Inc. and its subsidiaries. Today, pursuant to the settlement agreement, the defendants paid $5.15 billion, plus interest, to the trust. The trust is expected to distribute more than $4.4 billion to fund environmental clean-up and for environmental claims. The settlement constitutes the largest payment for the clean-up of environmental contamination ever obtained in a lawsuit brought by the Department of Justice.” [U.S. Department of Justice, [1/23/15](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/historic-515-billion-environmental-and-tort-settlement-anadarko-petroleum-corp-goes-effect-0)]
* **DOJ: “Pursuant To The Terms Of Prior Agreements In The Tronox Bankruptcy, The Government Estimates That More Than $4.4 Billion Of This Recovery Will Be Paid To The United States, State Governments, The Navajo Nation And Four Environmental Response Trusts Created In The Bankruptcy To Clean Up Contaminated Property.”** According to the Department of Justice, “Today, under the settlement agreement, the defendants paid $5.15 billion, plus interest from Apr. 3, 2014, to the trust. Pursuant to the terms of prior agreements in the Tronox bankruptcy, the government estimates that more than $4.4 billion of this recovery will be paid to the United States, state governments, the Navajo nation and four environmental response trusts created in the bankruptcy to clean up contaminated property. An estimated more than $600 million will be paid to a trust created to pay tort victims.” [U.S. Department of Justice, [1/23/15](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/historic-515-billion-environmental-and-tort-settlement-anadarko-petroleum-corp-goes-effect-0)]

**2011: Anadarko Petroleum Agreed To Pay More Than $17 Million To Resolve Charges That It Violated The False Claims Act By Knowingly Underpaying Royalties On Gas Produced From Federal And Indian Leases.** According to Platts Gas Daily, “In a case brought by a whistleblower 15 years ago, Anadarko Petroleum has agreed to pay more than $17 million to resolve charges that it violated the False Claims Act by knowingly underpaying royalties on gas produced from federal and Indian leases, the Department of Justice said Monday. ‘This case is one in a series of significant oil and gas settlements that demonstrate our commitment to ensuring that companies pay all of the royalties they owe,’ Tony West, assistant attorney general for DOJ’s Civil Division, said in a statement. ‘When companies pay natural gas royalties for the privilege to extract non-renewable resources from public lands, that income supports vital federal programs from which we all benefit.’ DOJ said the settlement arises from a 1996 lawsuit Harrold Wright filed under the False Claims Act in the US District Court for the Eastern District of Texas. Under the whistleblower provisions of the act, private citizens may file actions on behalf of the government and share in any recovery.” [Platts Gas Daily, 6/21/11]

**2007: Anadarko Petroleum Corp Agreed To Install $18 Million In Pollution Controls To Settle Allegations That Its Former Kerr-McGee Corp Violated Federal Air Quality Laws At Natural Gas Production Facilities In Utah And Colorado.** According to the Oklahoman, “Anadarko Petroleum Corp. has agreed to install $18 million in pollution controls to settle allegations that its former Kerr-McGee Corp. violated federal air quality laws at natural gas production facilities in Utah and Colorado, the government said Thursday. Kerr-McGee found violations at natural-gas compressor stations and disclosed the violations to regulators.” [Oklahoman, 5/18/07]

#### Conoco Phillips

**2015: ConocoPhillips Was Ordered To Pay $266,000 To Chinese Farmers Who “Livelihoods Were Hurt By Oil Spills Off China’s Northeastern Coast In 2011.”** According to Reuters, “A Chinese court has ordered ConocoPhillips to pay compensation to nearly two dozen aquaculture farmers who said their livelihoods were hurt by oil spills off China’s northeastern coast in 2011. The U.S. oil company was told to pay 1.68 million yuan ($266,000) to the 21 farmers, who did not participate in a previous settlement reached in 2012 with ConocoPhillips and its partner, Chinese state-owned oil major China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC), the Tianjin Maritime Court said in a statement on its website.” [Reuters, [10/30/15](http://www.businessinsider.com/r-chinese-court-orders-conocophillips-to-pay-266000-over-2011-oil-spills-2015-10)]

**2012: ConocoPhillips Has Agreed To Pay State And Federal Environmental Regulators $312,000 In Penalties And Other Costs Related To A Pair Of Oil Spills At The Kuparuk Unit Facility On Alaska’s North Slope.** According to Alaska Dispatch News, “ConocoPhillips has agreed to pay state and federal environmental regulators $312,000 in penalties and other costs related to a pair of oil spills at the Kuparuk Unit facility on Alaska’s North Slope. The state will receive $267,000 for the 2006 and 2007 spills, both of which stemmed from corroded pipelines. The charge includes $155,000 in fines and $112,000 to repay the state for the investigation that followed the spill.” [Alaska Dispatch News, [9/27/12](https://www.adn.com/alaska-news/article/conocophillips-will-pay-alaska-312000-after-north-slope-oil-spills/2012/12/18/)]

**2012: ConocoPhillips Was Accused Of “Profiting Off Pollution And Defrauding Taxpayers Out Of Millions Of Dollars In Oklahoma And Other States.”** According to the Oklahoman, “Two huge multinational oil companies profited off pollution and defrauded taxpayers out of millions of dollars in Oklahoma and other states, lawsuits allege. ConocoPhillips and BP, along with their predecessor companies and subsidiaries, filed false statements to get insurance companies and taxpayers to double-pay them for the cleanup of fuel leaking from underground storage tanks located beneath filling stations, the civil lawsuits claim. [Oklahoman, [10/12/12](http://newsok.com/article/3718446)]

* **“ConocoPhillips’ Attorneys Also Resorted To Bribery, Blackmail, Threats, Extortion, Corruption And Legislative Pressure To Get Oklahoma Corporation Commissioners To Tap The Petroleum Storage Tank Release Indemnity Fund To Pay The Company Millions Of Dollars For Ineligible Expenses.”** According to the Oklahoman, “ConocoPhillips’ attorneys also resorted to bribery, blackmail, threats, extortion, corruption and legislative pressure to get Oklahoma Corporation Commissioners to tap the Petroleum Storage Tank Release Indemnity Fund to pay the company millions of dollars for ineligible expenses, documents filed in one lawsuit claim.” [Oklahoman, [10/12/12](http://newsok.com/article/3718446)]
* **“The Oklahoma Taxpayers Group Alleges ConocoPhillips Received $7,541,170 In Improper Payments From The Indemnity Fund In Connection With 46 Environmental Remediation Cases.”** According to the Oklahoman, “ConocoPhillips is accused of similar fraudulent misconduct in the lawsuits filed by Oklahoma taxpayers and the states of Colorado, Montana and Utah. The Oklahoma taxpayers group alleges ConocoPhillips received $7,541,170 in improper payments from the Indemnity Fund in connection with 46 environmental remediation cases. The taxpayers group is seeking to recover those costs plus triple that amount in damages. But the group’s allegations against ConocoPhillips go way beyond double-collecting from insurance companies and the Indemnity Fund for cleanup expenses.” [Oklahoman, [10/12/12](http://newsok.com/article/3718446)]

**2007: ConocoPhillips Spilled 2,870 Gallons Of Contaminated Water And 1,386 Gallons Of Crude In Alaska.** According to Alaska Dispatch News, “In December 2007, Conoco spilled 2,870 gallons of contaminated water and 1,386 gallons of crude. An investigation determined that incorrectly manufactured pipe insulation allowed water to be drawn to the pipe’s sidewall, the state said. In that incident, Conoco and contracted responders built snow berms to contain the spill and constructed a 300-yard-long ice road in subzero cold to improve access to the site, the EPA reported. The teams removed the pollution with shovels and hot water, and the oil was eventually separated and recovered from the snow.” [Alaska Dispatch News, [9/27/12](https://www.adn.com/alaska-news/article/conocophillips-will-pay-alaska-312000-after-north-slope-oil-spills/2012/12/18/)]

**2006: ConocoPhillips Spilled About 500 Gallons Of Water Contaminated With Small Amounts Of Crude In Alaska.** According to Alaska Dispatch News, “The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency will receive $45,000 for the 2007 incident. In March 2006, Conoco spilled about 500 gallons of water contaminated with small amounts of crude, the state said in a written statement. A number of factors caused internal corrosion, leading to the leak, an investigation found.” [Alaska Dispatch News, [9/27/12](https://www.adn.com/alaska-news/article/conocophillips-will-pay-alaska-312000-after-north-slope-oil-spills/2012/12/18/)]

#### Chevron

**2016: More Than Two Dozen People Sued Chevron Corporation “For Damages Related To A Chemical Spill In A University Building In The Fall Of 2014 Involving A Mixture That Contained A Radioactive Isotope.”** According to Tulsa World, “More than two dozen people have sued the University of Tulsa, Chevron Corp. and a chemical company for damages related to a chemical spill in a university building in the fall of 2014 involving a mixture that contained a radioactive isotope. The plaintiffs allege TU, Chevron and Tracerco, an oil and gas subsidiary of British company Johnson Matthey, were ‘grossly negligent, reckless and wanton’ in their handling of a teaspoon-sized spill of the mixture, which contained about a milligram of cesium-137.” [Tulsa World, [10/18/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/courts/university-of-tulsa-chemical-company-sued-in-radioactive-chemical-spill/article_bc4cf16b-f951-55ed-a1ee-694d4e08194b.html)]

**2012: EPA Found “49 Failures By Chevron To Effectively Operate A Risk Management Plan For The Refinery, Where A Pipe Ruptured On A Crude Distillation Unit On August 6 2012, Igniting A Massive Blaze And Sending A Huge Plume Of Black Smoke And Particulates Over The San Francisco Bay Area.”** According to Reuters, “The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on Tuesday notified Chevron Corp. that it found dozens of failures to comply with federal environmental laws in an investigation stemming from a 2012 fire at the company's Richmond, California, refinery, according to documents provided by EPA. No workers were injured in the fire, but in the days following, 15,000 San Francisco Bay area residents sought treatment for respiratory irritation due to the smoke plume. The agency said it found 49 failures by Chevron to effectively operate a risk management plan for the refinery, where a pipe ruptured on a crude distillation unit on August 6 2012, igniting a massive blaze and sending a huge plume of black smoke and particulates over the San Francisco Bay area.” [Reuters, [12/17/13](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-refinery-chevron-epa-citations-idUSBRE9BH01V20131218)]

**2011: Brazil’s Environmental Agency Fined Chevron Nearly $28 Million For A Continuing Oil Spill Off The Rio De Janeiro Coast.** According to the Oklahoman, “Brazil’s environmental agency said Monday it will fine Chevron nearly $28 million for a continuing oil spill off the Rio de Janeiro coast, and the company could face several more similar fines in the coming days. The agency said through its press office that it will fine the oil company the maximum 50 million reals allowed under current Brazilian law. Environment Minister Izabella Teixeira said at a press conference in Brasilia, however, that as an investigation into the leak continues, Chevron could face ‘five or six’ other fines of the same amount if more infractions are found.” [Oklahoman, [11/21/11](http://newsok.com/article/feed/319620)]

**2010: Chevron Pipeline Crude Oil Spill In Red Butte Creek, Utah Spilled Around 20,000 Gallons Of Oil.** According to the Deseret News, “Containment of a crude oil spill estimated at around 20,000 gallons into Red Butte Creek is expected to last well into the night and continue through Sunday as multiple agencies work to mitigate impacts to the stream and wildlife. The fracture of the Chevron pipeline sent oil gushing into the riparian corridor, leaving the thick, tacky substance clinging to rocks, soil and any fish and birds in its path.” [Deseret News, [6/12/10](http://www.deseretnews.com/article/700039797/Oil-spill-in-Red-Butte-Creek-threatens-waters-wildlife.html?pg=all)]

* **Chevron Took “Full Responsibility” For The Spill, Intended To “Cover All Financial Costs Of The Containment And Cleanup.”** According to Deseret News, “Chevron spokesman Mark Sullivan said the company takes full responsibility for the spill and intends to cover all financial costs of the containment and cleanup. The pipeline was last inspected in 2008, he added, and showed no problems that would raise concern. Most pipeline fractures are due to water-caused corrosion, he said. ‘We understand the sensitivity surrounding the oil industry right now, and we take responsibility for fixing this,’ he said. Becker also stressed that the city ‘would work with Chevron, but we won’t leave it to Chevron.’” [Deseret News, [6/12/10](http://www.deseretnews.com/article/700039797/Oil-spill-in-Red-Butte-Creek-threatens-waters-wildlife.html?pg=all)]

**2003: Chevron Paid A $3.5 Million Civil Penalty And $4 Million On Further Emissions Controls And Other Environmental Projects In Communities Around The Company's Refineries.** According to EPA, “Chevron also will pay a $3.5 million civil penalty and spend more than $4 million on further emissions controls and other environmental projects in communities around the company's refineries. Part of the penalty is to resolve claims for hazardous substance release reporting violations at its El Segundo, Calif., refinery. The states of Hawaii, Mississippi, and Utah and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District will share in the cash penalties and the benefits of the environmental projects to be performed by Chevron.” [EPA, accessed [12/8/16](https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/chevron-usa-clean-air-act-settlement)]

### Mining

**Mining Industry Has Donated $24,250 To Pruitt**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, the mining industry has donated a total of $24,250 to Scott Pruitt in his career. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

|  |
| --- |
| **Mining Donations** |
| Coal mining | $24,750.00 |
| Non-metallic mining | $1,000.00 |
| Metal mining & processing | -$1,500.00 |
| **Total** | **$24,250.00** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Top Mining Donors to Scott Pruitt** |
| **Donor** | **Amount** |
| CRAFT, JOSEPH | $10,000.00 |
| CRAFT III, JOSEPH W & KATHLEEN S | $5,000.00 |
| ALLIANCE COAL | $3,500.00 |
| ARCH COAL | $2,500.00 |
| PALMER, FREDRICK D | $1,000.00 |
| OKLAHOMA TAXPAYERS ACCOUNTABILITY COALITION | $1,000.00 |
| ALPHA NATURAL RESOURCES | $1,000.00 |
| HARRISON, CHARLES | $1,000.00 |

#### Alpha Natural Resources

**Alpha Natural Resources Paid The Government More Than $30 Million Dollars For Safety Violations.** According to Charleston Gazette-Mail, “The prosecution and conviction of former Massey Energy Co. CEO Don Blankenship for conspiracy to violate mine safety rules - labeled a landmark case by legal experts and mine safety advocates - came under fire Tuesday from somewhat unusual quarters: The campaign of Democratic gubernatorial candidate Jim Justice, himself a controversial coal operator, with a history of not paying his federal safety fines on time … Assistant U.S. Attorney Steve Ruby, lead prosecutor in the Blankenship case, would not comment on how much the office spent on its more than five-year investigation and prosecution following the worst U.S. coal-mining disaster in a generation. Part of the investigation, though, resulted in Alpha Natural Resources paying the government more than $30 million in fines that were pending for Massey safety violations. Goodwin said Justice was criticizing him for ‘taking down his criminal buddies, noting reports, originally published by the Courier-Journal, in Louisville, that Blankenship was Justice’s guest at a Kentucky Derby event in 2012. Herring said Justice ‘is not friends with Don Blankenship, and that the Kentucky Derby story is not accurate.” [Charleston Gazette-Mail, 4/13/16]

* **The Courier-Journal: “In 2014 … EPA-Led [A] $27.5 Million Fine Against Coal-Producer Alpha Natural Resources And Dozens Of Its Subsidiaries. It Was Said To Be The Largest Penalty Ever Assessed For Water Permit Violations That The EPA Said Had Occurred Across Several States.”**  [The Courier-Journal, 11/23/15]

**Pittsburgh Business Times: “Consol Energy Inc. Has Agreed To Pay $515,000 To Settle Lawsuits Over Selenium Discharges From Mining Operations In West Virginia. Consol, Along With Alpha Natural Resources, Was Sued Earlier This Year By Citizen And Environmental Groups, Including The Sierra Club, For Allegedly Violating Clean Water Standards.”** According to Pittsburgh Business Times, “Consol Energy Inc. has agreed to pay $515,000 to settle lawsuits over selenium discharges from mining operations in West Virginia. Consol, along with Alpha Natural Resources, was sued earlier this year by citizen and environmental groups, including the Sierra Club, for allegedly violating clean water standards. The groups said the companies had allowed discharges containing selenium at concentrations that exceeding their permits. ‘Selenium from these companies’ mines pollutes our steams, kills off fish and other aquatic life, and wipes away our Appalachian heritage. These agreements will help stop further pollution, and for that we can be thankful,’ said Bill Price, a Sierra Club organizer, in a statement. ‘Unfortunately, the burden of holding these companies accountable continues to fall on citizen groups. The state of West Virginia has failed, once again, to protect our waterways.’ To settle its lawsuits, Alpha has agreed to pay $350,000. A Consol representative couldn’t be reached for comment Wednesday.” [Pittsburgh Business Times, 12/24/14]

**Charleston Gazette: “A Federal Judge Has Ruled That Alpha Natural Resources Is Illegally Discharging Excess Levels Of Toxic Selenium From A Raleigh County Coal-Slurry Impoundment.”** According to Charleston Gazette, “A federal judge has ruled that Alpha Natural Resources is illegally discharging excess levels of toxic selenium from a Raleigh County coal-slurry impoundment, in a case that illustrates a potentially major flaw in a U.S. government pollution settlement with the coal giant. U.S. District Judge Robert C. Chambers found that Alpha subsidiary Marfork Coal violated water quality standards and its state-issued pollution permit with the excess selenium discharges from its long-controversial Brushy Fork slurry impoundment, located on Little Marsh Fork south of Whitesville. In an 11-page ruling issued last Thursday, Chambers cited selenium samples that showed violations of the state’s water quality standard for the pollutant, which has been linked to aquatic life deformities downstream from mountaintop removal coal-mining operations. The judge ruled in a case brought by the Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition, the West Virginia Highlands Conservancy, Coal River Mountain Watch and the Sierra Club. The citizen groups were represented by Derek Teaney, a lawyer with Appalachian Mountain Advocates.” [Charleston Gazette, 4/27/14]

#### Alliance Coal

**2010: Two Miners Died In Kentucky Mine Operated By Alliance Coal.** According to the Huffington Post, “A rescue team has found a second Kentucky miner dead after a roof collapse at an underground coal mine with a long history of safety problems. Kentucky Office of Mine Safety and Licensing spokesman Dick Brown said the two miners were found dead Thursday after the accident at the Dotiki Mine in western Kentucky. State and federal records show more than 40 closure orders over safety violations since January 2009. Officials with mine operator Alliance Coal Co. didn’t return calls seeking comment.” [Huffington Post, [4/29/10](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/04/29/kentucky-mine-accident-2-_n_556851.html)]

* **“A Roof Collapsed In A Large Underground Coal Mine That Had A History Of Safety Violations.”** According to the Huffington Post, “Two western Kentucky miners were missing Thursday and rescuers were unable to contact them after a roof collapsed in a large underground coal mine that had a history of safety violations, officials said. Rescue crews were in the mine on Thursday morning, said Ricki Gardenhire, a spokeswoman for the Kentucky Office of Mine Safety and Licensing. Mine operators told a news conference that they are holding out hope of finding the miners alive. U.S. Mine Safety and Health Administration spokeswoman Amy Louviere said rescue crews entered the Webster County Coal Dotiki Mine about 11:30 p.m., and traveled approximately four miles to the area where the miners are trapped. Their efforts to stabilize the roof and haul away rock were temporarily halted about 4:50 a.m. because of ‘adverse roof conditions.’” [Huffington Post, [4/29/10](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/04/29/kentucky-mine-accident-2-_n_556851.html)]
* **Since January 2009, There Were 31 Orders To Close Sections Of The Mine Or To Shut Down Equipment Because Of Safety Violations.** According to the Huffington Post, “Records show inspectors from the Kentucky Office of Mine Safety and Licensing have issued 31 orders to close sections of the mine or to shut down equipment because of safety violations since January 2009. Those records also show an additional 44 citations for safety violations that didn’t result in closure orders.” [Huffington Post, [4/29/10](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/04/29/kentucky-mine-accident-2-_n_556851.html)]
* **The Same Mine Owned By Alliance Resources Partners, Was “At Least Partially Idled In 2004 When A Supply Tractor Caught Fire And Spread Flames To The Coal, Timbers And Other Equipment.”** According to the Huffington Post, “The mine is owned by Alliance Resource Partners, based in Tulsa, Okla. The company’s website says it purchased the mine in 1971 and produces high-sulfur coal there. The mine was at least partially idled in 2004 when a supply tractor caught fire and spread flames to the coal, timbers and other equipment. The 70 miners who were underground were all safely evacuated and the mine returned to full production in about a month.” [Huffington Post, [4/29/10](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/04/29/kentucky-mine-accident-2-_n_556851.html)]

**2010: Western Kentucky Mining Company Owned By Alliance Coal Was Cited Three Times For Violating Conditions Of A Mining Permit It Obtained Through “A Controversial State Policy.”** According to the Associated Press, “A western Kentucky mining company owned by Alliance Coal has been cited three times this spring for violating conditions of a mining permit it obtained through a controversial state policy. The citations against Warrior Coal for mining in Hopkins County came in April, May and this month, The Courier-Journal reported. Warrior is a subsidiary of Tulsa, Okla.-based Alliance.” [Associated Press, [6/23/10](http://www.wkyt.com/home/headlines/97032479.html?site=full)]

* **“The State Policy The Permits Were Acquired Through Has Been Criticized By Environmentalists And Former State Director Of Mine Permits Ron Mills, Who Was Fired In November.”** According to the Associated Press, “Officials of the Department of Natural Resources were reviewing the citations and said it would be July before they determine how much to fine Warrior Coal. The state can fine $5,000 to $25,000 per day for each day a violation existed. The state policy the permits were acquired through has been criticized by environmentalists and former state Director of Mine Permits Ron Mills, who was fired in November. It allows permits for applicants who haven’t obtained mining rights for as much as one-third of the property covered by the permit. Officials said in regards to the citations, Alliance had largely obtained the permission it needed but had not notified the state.” [Associated Press, [6/23/10](http://www.wkyt.com/home/headlines/97032479.html?site=full)]
* **Warrior Coal, Owned By Alliance Coal, Was Cited Three Times For Illegally Mining Areas “Where It Has No Documented Entry Rights And Hadn’t Obtained A Revised Permit.”** According to the Associated Press, “The newspaper obtained state records that showed Warrior Coal was cited three times for illegally mining in areas where it has no documented entry rights and hadn’t obtained a revised permit. The first time, on April 20, Warrior was cited for having mined all the coal within seven parcels of land without documentation proving it had permission to enter. The remaining citations were issued on May 28 and June 14 for mining other unauthorized parcels.” [Associated Press, [6/23/10](http://www.wkyt.com/home/headlines/97032479.html?site=full)]

#### Arch Coal

**2016: Harlan County Coal Miner Died From “From Operator Failures That Included Not Properly Inspecting The Mine Or Correcting An Obvious Hazard” At An Arch Coal Mine.** According to Lexington Herald-Leader, “The death of a Harlan County coal miner who was crushed in a rock fall resulted from operator failures that included not properly inspecting the mine or correcting an obvious hazard, according to federal regulators. The findings were in a report issued by the U.S. Mine Safety and Health Administration on the death of Mark Frazier, 48, at Lone Mountain Processing’s Huff Creek No. 1 mine, an underground mine near Holmes Mill. MSHA cited the mine for several violations related to the fatal rock fall. The current controller for the mine is Arch Coal. It produced more than 560,000 tons of coal in 2015 and listed 110 employees in the second quarter of this year.” [Lexington Herald-Leader, 7/21/16]

**2014: District Court Stopped Expansion Of Arch Coal’s West Elk Mine Into The Sunset Roadless Area Of The Gunnison National Forest Because The Federal Government Had Failed To Take A ‘Hard Look’ At Potential Contributions To Climate Change As Required By The National Environmental Policy Act.** According to High Country News, “In his September order, District Court Judge R. Brooke Jackson also stopped the expansion of Arch Coal’s West Elk Mine into the Sunset Roadless Area of the Gunnison National Forest because the federal government had failed to take a ‘hard look’ at potential contributions to climate change as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. Jackson’s ruling was the first to require the government to calculate climate impacts when it approves extraction of fossil fuels from federal lands, as HCN.org reported.” [High Country News, [4/8/15](http://www.hcn.org/articles/forest-service-sticks-up-for-coal-mining-on-roadless-lands-1)]

**2011: Arch Coal Agreed To A Pay A $4 Million Penalty To Settle Alleged Violations Of The Clean Water Act In Virginia, West Virginia And Kentucky.** According to the Department of Justice, “Arch Coal Inc., the second largest supplier of coal in the United States, has agreed to pay a $4 million penalty to settle alleged violations of the Clean Water Act in Virginia, West Virginia and Kentucky, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the U.S. Department of Justice announced today. Under the settlement, Arch Coal will implement changes to its mining operations in Virginia, West Virginia and Kentucky to ensure compliance with the Clean Water Act.” [Department of Justice, [3/1/11](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/arch-coal-pay-4-million-settle-clean-water-act-violations-appalachian-mining-operations)]

* **“As Part Of The Settlement, Arch Coal Has Agreed To Take Measures That Will Prevent An Estimated Two Million Pounds Of Pollution From Entering The Nation’s Waters Each Year.”** According to the Department of Justice, “As part of the settlement, Arch Coal has agreed to take measures that will prevent an estimated two million pounds of pollution from entering the nation’s waters each year. Arch will also implement a treatment system to reduce discharges of selenium, a pollutant found in mine discharges. Selenium runoff from mining operations can build up in streams and have an adverse impact on aquatic organisms.” [Department of Justice, [3/1/11](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/arch-coal-pay-4-million-settle-clean-water-act-violations-appalachian-mining-operations)]
* **“A Joint Federal-State Complaint Filed In U.S. District Court In The Southern District Of West Virginia By The United States, West Virginia And Kentucky Alleged Numerous Violations Of Arch Coal’s Permits That Set Limits On Pollutants To Be Discharged Into Streams.”** According to the Department of Justice, “A joint federal-state complaint filed in U.S. District Court in the Southern District of West Virginia by the United States, West Virginia and Kentucky alleged numerous violations of Arch Coal’s permits that set limits on pollutants to be discharged into streams. The alleged excess discharges of iron, total suspended solids, manganese and other pollutants reflect deficiencies in operation and maintenance of wastewater treatment systems in place at four of the company’s mining facilities: Coal Mac Inc; Lone Mountain Processing Inc; Cumberland River Coal Co.; and Mingo Logan Coal Co.” [Department of Justice, [3/1/11](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/arch-coal-pay-4-million-settle-clean-water-act-violations-appalachian-mining-operations)]
* **Arch Coal Agreed To “Implement A Series Of Inspections, Audits And Tracking Measures To Ensure Treatment Systems Are Working Properly And That Future Compliance Is Achieved.”** According to the Department of Justice, “As part of the settlement, the company has agreed to implement a series of inspections, audits and tracking measures to ensure treatment systems are working properly and that future compliance is achieved. The company is also required to develop and implement a compliance management system to help foster a top-down, compliance and prevention-focused approach to Clean Water Act issues. Under the settlement, $2 million of the $4 million civil penalty will be paid to the United States and the remaining $2 million will be divided between West Virginia and Kentucky based on the percentage of alleged violations in each state.” [Department of Justice, [3/1/11](https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/arch-coal-pay-4-million-settle-clean-water-act-violations-appalachian-mining-operations)]

### Chemical Industry

**Chemical And Related Manufacturing Donated $16,750 To Pruitt.** According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, the chemical manufacturing industry has donated a total of $16,750 to Scott Pruitt in his career. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

|  |
| --- |
| **Top Chemical Industry Donors to Scott Pruitt** |
| **Donor** | **Amount** |
| KOCH INDUSTRIES | $10,000.00 |
| LUCAS, FORREST D | $5,000.00 |
| HUDSON, RICK | $1,000.00 |
| AREND, JOHN R | $750.00 |

Other Donations of Note

**$15,000 From Joseph Craft And Family**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, joeph Craft and Kathleen Craft have donated a total of $15,000 to Scott Pruitt. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

* **Billionaire Joseph Craft Was CEO Of Alliance Resource Partners**. According to Forbes, “A lawyer's son, Craft was reared in coal country. He became a lawyer, and then joined diversified coal company MAPCO as an assistant general counsel in 1980. He became president in 1987. Craft was rewarded with a big stake for leading the firm's LBO and conversion into a tax-efficient public master limited partnership in 1996; it was renamed Alliance Resource Partners three years later. He has been chief executive since and overseen subsequent expansion across Appalachia and the Midwest as revenue increased to $390 million. Craft donated $6 million to finish the basketball practice facility at the University of Kentucky where he got his undergraduate and law degrees. Craft and his wife Kathy divorced in late 2011; the net worth reflected here also includes the assets belonging to his former spouse.” [Forbes, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.forbes.com/profile/joseph-craft/)]
* **Craft Listed As #913 On Forbes Billionaire List**. [Forbes, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.forbes.com/profile/joseph-craft/)]

**$11,700 From Lew Ward**. According to the National Institute on Money in State Politics, Lew Ward donated $11,700 to Scott Pruitt. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

* **Oil Tycoon Ward Died In March 2016.** According to the Oklahoman, “Longtime Oklahoma oilman and entrepreneur Lew Ward died Sunday. He was 85. Ward was founder and chairman of Enid-based Ward Petroleum Corp. Born in Oklahoma City in 1930, Ward spent his life in the state’s oil and natural gas industry. His father was a driller, tool pusher and drilling superintendent, and Ward spent summers working as a roustabout and a roughneck.” [Oklahoman, [3/21/16](http://newsok.com/article/5486480)]

Congressional Race

**Pruitt Lost Republican Primary For Congress In 2001.** According to the Encyclopedia of American Politics, Scott Pruitt ran in the Republican Primary for the United States Congress in 2001. Pruitt lost the nomination, finishing third. [Encyclopedia of American Politics, accessed [12/7/16](https://ballotpedia.org/Scott_Pruitt)]

**Pruitt Raised $253,000 For Congressional Republican Primary**. According to CQ MoneyLine, Scott Pruitt raised a total of $253,554 for his congressional race in 2001. [CQ MoneyLine, Scott Pruitt, 2001-2002 election cycle, accessed 12/7/16]

## Pruitt Affiliated PACs

Liberty 2.0

**Super PAC Located At Pruitt Campaign Office; Primary Consultant Shared With Pruitt PAC Oklahoma Strong**. According to Oklahoma Watch, “Pruitt’s name does not appear on any of the documents establishing either PAC. However, not only are the PACs located in his campaign office, but the primary consultant and fundraiser for his state campaign, Tamara Cornell, is the main consultant, incorporator, record-keeper, vice-treasurer and a board member for both Oklahoma Strong and Liberty 2.0.” [Oklahoma Watch, [11/30/15](http://oklahomawatch.org/2015/11/30/pacs-tied-to-pruitt-reach-out-nationally-for-donors/)]

**Consultant Not Employed By Any Campaign Except Pruitt’s**. According to Oklahoma Watch, “Oklahoma Ethics Commission records show Cornell has not been employed by any other state campaign except Pruitt’s. Cornell declined comment on the two PACs.” [Oklahoma Watch, [11/30/15](http://oklahomawatch.org/2015/11/30/pacs-tied-to-pruitt-reach-out-nationally-for-donors/)]

**Individual Donors**

**Liberty 2.0 Raised $257,000**. According to CQ MoneyLine, Liberty 2.0 Super PAC raised a total of $257,248 in 2016. [CQ MoneyLine, Super PAC Donors, accessed 1/9/17]

|  |
| --- |
| **Top Liberty 2.0 Donors** |
| **Donor** | **Contributions** | **Total** |
| Murray, Robert E (also Murray Energy Corp.) | 1 | $50,000.00 |
| SPANO, PETER F. | 3 | $25,000.00 |
| McDougall, Jeffrey | 1 | $25,000.00 |
| FREEDE, JOSEPHINE W | 1 | $25,000.00 |
| WOODVINE GROUP LLC | 1 | $25,000.00 |
| Green, David M (also Hobby Lobby Sores Inc) | 1 | $15,000.00 |
| AMERICAN ENERGY PARTNERS LP | 1 | $10,000.00 |
| TURNER, GRAHAM | 1 | $10,000.00 |

**Dirty Energy Donations**

**$50,000 From Murray Energy CEO**. Murray Energy CEO Robert Murray donated $50,000 to the Liberty 2.0 Super PAC on August 26, 2016. [CQ MoneyLine, Super PAC Donors, accessed 1/9/17]

**$25,000 From JMA Energy President**. JMA Energy President Jeffery McDougall donated $25,000 to Liberty 2.0 Super PAC on August 19, 2016. According to JMA Energy, “JEFFREY J. MCDOUGALL is the President and principal owner of JMA Energy Company which he founded in 1986; JMA along with its affiliated companies are headquartered in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. Mr. McDougall is an active member of the Oklahoma Independent Petroleum Association (OIPA).” [CQ MoneyLine, Super PAC Donors, accessed 1/9/17; JMA Energy, accessed [1/9/17](http://jmaenergy.com/members/jeffrey-j-mcdougall/)]

**$25,000 From American Energy Partners**. According to CQ MoneyLine, American Energy Partners, LP donated $25,000 to Liberty 2.0 on June 26, 2015. [CQ MoneyLine, Super PAC Donors, accessed 1/9/17]

**$5,000 From Sandridge Energy CEO**. According to CQ MoneyLine, Sandridge Energy CEO James Bennet donated $5,000 to Liberty 2.0 Super PAC on August 10, 2016. [CQ MoneyLine, Super PAC Donors, accessed 1/9/17]

**$5,000 From Rockford Exploration CEO John Brock**. According to CQ MoneyLine, Rockford Exploration CEO John Brock donated $5,000 to Liberty 2.0 on August 19, 2016. [CQ MoneyLine, Super PAC Donors, accessed 1/9/17]

**$1,000 From Cimarron Production Company Oilman Fred Brown**. According to CQ MoneyLine, Cimarron Production Oilman Fred Brown donated $1,000 to Liberty 2.0 on September 8, 2016. According to their website, “Cimarron Energy Inc. is a leading manufacturer of engineered production, process, and environmental equipment for the upstream and midstream energy industries.” [Q MoneyLine, Super PAC Donors, accessed 1/9/17; Cimarron Energy, About Us, accessed [1/9/17](http://www.cimarronenergy.com/about-us/)]

Oklahoma Strong

**Oklahoma Strong Super PAC Has Raised More Than $391,000**. According to CQ MoneyLine, Oklahoma Strong PAC has raised a total of $391,004 for the 2016 cycle. [CQ MoneyLine, 1/9/17]

**PAC Donations**

**Oklahoma Strong Has Received $40,000 From PACs**. According to CQ MoneyLine, Oklahoma Strong has received $40,000 in contributions from other PACs. [CQ MoneyLine, 1/9/17]

|  |
| --- |
| **Oklahoma Strong PAC Donors** |
| **Donor** | **Amount** |
| Pinnacle West Capital Corporation PAC | $5,000  |
| BNSF Railway Company RAILPAC (BNSF RAILPAC) | $5,000  |
| Apollo Education Group Inc Political Organization For Legislative Leadership | $5,000  |
| Alliance Coal, LLC PAC | $5,000  |
| Hollyfrontier Corporation PAC | $2,500  |
| The Home Depot Inc Political Action Committee | $2,500  |
| Smiths Group Services Corporation Political Action Committee | $2,000  |
| Twenty-First Century Fox, Inc PAC (Fox PAC) | $2,000  |
| Wal-Mart Stores Inc PAC For Responsible Government | $1,500  |
| Citigroup Inc PAC - State (Citi Pac-state) | $1,000  |
| Cozen O'Connor Political Action Committee | $1,000  |
| Aaron'S, Inc Political Action Committee | $1,000  |
| National Shooting Sports Foundation, Inc Political Action Committee  | $1,000  |
| Echostar Corporation And Dish Network Corporation PAC  | $1,000  |
| Pitney Bowes Inc Political Action Committee | $1,000  |
| American Resort Development Association Resort Owners Coalition PAC  | $1,000  |
| Security Finance Corporation Of Spartanburg And Affiliates PAC | $1,000  |
| Checksmart Financial LLC PAC | $1,000  |
| General Electric Company Political Action Committee (GEPAC) | $500  |
| Pinnacle West Capital Corporation PAC | $5,000  |
| TOTAL | $40,000 |

**Dirty Energy PAC Contributions**

**Dirty Energy PACs Donated $12,500 To Oklahoma Strong**. According to CQ MoneyLine, political action committees associated with electric utilities, coal mining, and oil and gas donated $12,500 to the Oklahoma Strong PAC. [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17]

|  |
| --- |
| **Dirty Energy Contributions** |
| **Industry** | **Amount** |
| Coal Mining | $5,000 |
| Electric Utilities | $5,000 |
| Oil and Gas | $2,500 |
| **TOTAL** | **$12,500** |

**Alliance Coal PAC Donated $5,000 To Oklahoma Strong PAC On March 2, 2015**. According to CQ MoneyLine, Alliance Coal PAC donated $5,000 to Oklahoma Strong PAC on March 2, 2015. [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17]

**Oil and Gas Company Hollyfrontier PAC Donated $2,500 To Oklahoma Strong PAC On February 18, 2016**. According to the Hollyfrontier website the company is, “An independent petroleum refiner in the United States with operations throughout the mid-continent, southwestern and Rocky Mountain regions. Subsidiaries of HollyFrontier produce and market gasoline, diesel, jet fuel, asphalt, heavy products and specialty lubricant products.” [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17; Hollyfrontier, accessed [1/9/17](http://www.hollyfrontier.com/about-us/corporate-profile/default.aspx)]

**Arizona Electric Utility Company Pinnacle West Donated $5,000 On February 27, 2015**. According to CQ MoneyLine, Pinnacle West Capital Corporation PAC donated $5,000 to Oklahoma Strong PAC on February 27, 2015. According to their website, “Pinnacle West Capital Corporation (NYSE: PNW) is an investor owned electric utility holding company based in Phoenix, Arizona with consolidated assets of about $15 billion. For over 125 years, Pinnacle West and our affiliates have provided energy and energy-related products to people and businesses throughout Arizona -- our history and Arizona’s history are bound together.” [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17; Pinnacle West, accessed [1/9/17](http://www.pinnaclewest.com/about-us/default.aspx)]

Individual Donors

**Oklahoma Strong Raised More Than $343,000 From Individuals.** According to CQ MoneyLine, Oklahoma Strong PAC raised a total of $343,918 from individual donations. [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17]

|  |
| --- |
| **Top Individual Donors to Oklahoma Strong PAC** |
| **Donor** | **Contributions** | **Total** |
| CRAFT, JOSEPH W. MR. III | 2 | $10,000 |
| CASE, MIKE D. MR. | 2 | $10,000 |
| BARTMANN, BILL MR. | 2 | $10,000 |
| HENRY, JOHN A. MR. III | 2 | $7,500 |
| RIVKIN, DAVID B. MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| BROWN, REGINALD J. MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| GLOVER, JAMES E. MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| CRAFT, JOSEPH W. MR. IV | 1 | $5,000 |
| PRICE, WILLIAM STUART MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| CRAFT, LAUREN MRS. | 1 | $5,000 |
| FREEDE, JOSEPHINE W. MRS. | 1 | $5,000 |
| WARD, LEW O. MR. | 2 | $5,000 |
| GREEN, DAVID M. MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| KANBAR, MAURICE MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| NORTON, JAMES C. MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| CRAFT, MOLLIE MRS. | 1 | $5,000 |
| NICHOLS, J. LARRY MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| CRAFT, RYAN MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| OSH HOLDINGS LLC | 1 | $5,000 |
| CROW, HARLAN R. MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| RICH, HOWARD MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| CURRY, MARK E. MR. | 2 | $5,000 |
| SMITH, GARY D. MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| FAIRCHILD, MARIO MAX MR. | 1 | $5,000 |
| WILDER, JOHN C. | 1 | $5,000 |

**Notable Dirty Energy Individual Donations**

**Alliance Coal CEO Donated $10,000 To Oklahoma Strong**. Joseph Craft III has donated a total of $10,000 to Oklahoma Strong. According to Alliance Coal, “Joseph W. Craft III has been President, Chief Executive Officer and a Director since August 1999 and has indirect majority ownership of our managing general partner. Mr. Craft also serves as President, Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the Board of Directors of AGP, the general partner of AHGP. Previously Mr. Craft served as President of MAPCO Coal Inc. since 1986.” Craft donated $5,000 on March 2, 2015 and $5,000 on September 30, 2016. [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17; Alliance Coal, accessed [1/9/17](https://www.arlp.com/about/leadership-team.htm#craftiii)]

* **Son Joe Craft IV Donated $5,000**. According to CQ MoneyLine, Joseph Craft IV donated $5,000 to Oklahoma Strong on April 24, 2015. He is listed as the Vice President of Marketing for Alliance Coal. [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17]

**Magellan Midstream CEO Donated $1,000**. According to CQ MoneyLine, Magellan Midstream CEO Michael Mears donated $1,000 to Oklahoma Strong PAC on October 23, 2015. [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17]

**Pinnacle West Vice President Of Federal Affairs Donated $500**. Pinnacle West Vice President of Federal Affairs Robert Aiken donated $500 on March 20, 2015. [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17]

**Ward Petroleum CEO Donated $5,000**. Ward Petroleum CEO Lew Ward donated a total of $5,000 to Oklahoma Strong. Ward donated $4,000 on April 3, 2015 and $1,000 on March 4, 2015. [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17]

**ACCCE President Donated $1,000**. American Coalition For Clean Coal Electricity President Robert Duncan donated $1,000 to Oklahoma Strong on March 3, 2015. [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17]

**American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturing VP Donated $500**. American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturing Vice President Of Strategic Initiatives Sarah Magruder donated $500 on March 2, 2015. [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17]

**Rockford Exploration President John Brock Donated $1,000 On October 16, 2015**. According to Bloomberg, “Mr. John A. Brock has been President and Owner of Rockford Exploration, Inc. for more than five years. He also serves as a Secretary, Treasurer, Trustee, and Board Member of Oklahoma Capital Investment Board. Mr. Brock founded the Sarkeys Energy Center at the University of Oklahoma. He has outstanding expertise and experience in both private and public companies during his lengthy career in the oil and gas industry.” [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17; Bloomberg, accessed [1/9/17](http://www.bloomberg.com/research/stocks/people/person.asp?personId=1308497&capId=3536396&previousCapId=26632999&previousTitle=Foothills%20Resources%2C%20Inc.)]

Other Notable Donations

**Williams And Jensen CEO Steven Hart Donated $1,000 To Oklahoma Strong On March 2, 2015**. According to the United States Senate Lobbying Database, Steven Hart lobbied on behalf of Cheniere Energy on the issue of exportation of natural gas as well as the Producers for American Crude Oil Exports. [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17; United States Senate Lobbying Database, [10/17/16](https://soprweb.senate.gov/index.cfm?event=getFilingDetails&filingID=1F0F9049-F052-4F18-AF63-AA2693BD8A87&filingTypeID=69); [1/13/16](https://soprweb.senate.gov/index.cfm?event=getFilingDetails&filingID=68876502-F456-4DFD-8C0F-976609D5CB8B&filingTypeID=78)]

**Baker Hostetler Attorney David Rivkin Donated $500 To Oklahoma Strong On September 30, 2016**. According to Baker Hostetler, “David handled the development and implementation of President George H.W. Bush’s deregulatory initiatives, which entailed review of all existing federal regulatory strictures and the application of a more rigorous cost-effective standard to new regulations. His substantive areas of responsibility included international sanctions, energy, environment, and tax issues.” [Baker Hostetler, accessed [1/9/17](https://www.bakerlaw.com/davidbrivkinjr#experience); CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17]

Other Notable Donations

**Williams And Jensen CEO Steven Hart Donated $1,000 To Oklahoma Strong On March 2, 2015**. According to the United States Senate Lobbying Database, Steven Hart lobbied on behalf of Cheniere Energy on the issue of exportation of natural gas as well as the Producers for American Crude Oil Exports. [CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17; United States Senate Lobbying Database, [10/17/16](https://soprweb.senate.gov/index.cfm?event=getFilingDetails&filingID=1F0F9049-F052-4F18-AF63-AA2693BD8A87&filingTypeID=69); [1/13/16](https://soprweb.senate.gov/index.cfm?event=getFilingDetails&filingID=68876502-F456-4DFD-8C0F-976609D5CB8B&filingTypeID=78)]

**Baker Hostetler Attorney David Rivkin Donated $500 To Oklahoma Strong On September 30, 2016**. According to Baker Hostetler, “David handled the development and implementation of President George H.W. Bush’s deregulatory initiatives, which entailed review of all existing federal regulatory strictures and the application of a more rigorous cost-effective standard to new regulations. His substantive areas of responsibility included international sanctions, energy, environment, and tax issues.” [Baker Hostetler, accessed [1/9/17](https://www.bakerlaw.com/davidbrivkinjr#experience); CQ MoneyLine, accessed 1/9/17]

Statements

**Pruitt: “I Solicited Funds For Oklahoma Strong PAC From A Broad Array Of Individuals And Corporations.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I solicited funds for Oklahoma Strong PAC from a broad array of individuals and corporations representing many different industries. While I do not recall specific solicitations, given my state's deep ties to farming and oil and gas, I do not doubt that I at some point fundraised from individuals with some connection to those industries. Staff members of the Oklahoma Strong PAC may have records of such solicitations, so requests for details would have to be made to that entity.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Have On Occasion Solicited Funds For Liberty 2.0.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I have on occasion solicited funds for Liberty 2.0, and records of those solicitations may be maintained by the staff of that organization, so requests for details would have to be made to that entity. I do not recall the contents of any specific conversations that I may have had in this context” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Claimed No Knowledge Of Remaining Funds For Oklahoma Strong And Liberty 2.0 PAC**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “I do not have any knowledge of where remaining funds from Oklahoma Strong PAC or Liberty 2.0 went after the entities closed. Both entities are managed by a staff and decisions are made independently of me.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Deflected When Asked If Oklahoma Strong Or Liberty 2.0 PAC Took Money From Fossil Fuel Industries**. When asked, “Has Oklahoma Strong or Liberty 2.0 taken money from the fossil fuel industry?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “This question would have to be directed to those that operate those entities.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said He Had No Personal Knowledge Of Who Gave To Oklahoma Strong Or Liberty 2.0 PAC**. When asked, “Before being confirmed, will you disclose who has contributed to the Oklahoma Strong PAC and Liberty 2.0 Super PAC?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “I do not personally have records of who has contributed to Oklahoma Strong PAC or Liberty 2.0 Super PAC. That information is publicly available on campaign finance reports, and in the possession of the staff of those entities.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt “Not Personally Aware Of Any Contracts” Shared Between Oklahoma Strong And Liberty 2.0 PAC**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “It is my understanding that both entities have been wound down. I previously served as Honorary Chairman of Oklahoma Strong PAC, I have not served in any similar role with Liberty 2.0. My understanding is that there have been common vendors between Oklahoma Strong PAC and my previous campaigns, but I am not personally aware of any contracts those vendors might have with the PACs, so your question regarding the details of any such relationships would need to be directed to the PACs or the vendors.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

## Personal Financial Disclosures

### Attorney General

**Pruitt Reported That He Received No Income Outside His Salary As Attorney General**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2013-2015]

**Pruitt Reported Stocks, Bonds, Or Mutual Funds Greater Than $5,000 With LPL Financial**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2013-2015]

**Pruitt Reported That He And His Wife Received No Income From Registered Lobbyists**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2013-2015]

**Pruitt Reported That He Held No Office Or Trusteeship With An Entity That Did Business With Any State Agency In Oklahoma**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2013-2015]

**Pruitt Reported That He And His Wife Had No Contracts With Any State Agencies**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2013-2015]

**Pruitt Reported That He, His Wife, Or Their Children Had No Material Financial Interests In By Any Entities Regulated By The Attorney General**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2013-2015]

**2010: Pruitt Reported Income As Baseball Owner Of OKC Red Hawks**. According to the Oklahoma Ethic Commission, Scott Pruitt reported income greater than $5,000 as a “baseball owner” for the OKC Red Hawks. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2010]

**2010: Pruitt Reported Commission As An Executive Partner At Giant Partners**. According to the Oklahoma Ethic Commission Pruitt reported income greater than $5,000 as an executive partner at Giant Partners. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2010]

* **Giant Partners Offered Coaching Services To Business Leaders**. According to Bloomberg, “Giant Partners LLC offers coaching services to leaders and companies to help them grow. The company conducts programs for CEOs, presidents, directors, senior executives, and division managers to learn how to reduce stress and develop executive communication skills. Giant Partners LLC was founded in 2002 and is based in Edmond, Oklahoma with an additional office in London.” [Bloomberg, accessed [12/9/16](http://www.bloomberg.com/research/stocks/private/snapshot.asp?privcapId=21823168)]

**2010: Pruitt Reported Commissions Of Greater Than $5,000 As An Attorney**. According to the Oklahoma Ethic Commission Pruitt reported income greater than $5,000 as an attorney. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2010]

**2010: Pruitt Reported FBC Broken Arrow Gave Him An Honorarium Valued At $1,000**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2010]

* **FBC Broken Arrow Is A Community Baptist Church In Broken Arrow, Oklahoma**. [FBC Broken Arrow, accessed [12/9/16](http://fbcba.org/)]

**2010: Pruitt Reported Merrill Lynch Securities Of More Than $5,000**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2010]

**2011: Pruitt Reported Salary Of More Than $5,000 With OKC Athletic Club**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2011]

**2011: Pruitt Reported Stocks, Bonds, Or Mutual Funds Greater Than $5,000 With LPL Financial**. [Oklahoma Ethics Commission, Scott Pruitt Financial Disclosure Statement, 2011]

### State Legislature

*Records requested.*

**Fossil Fuel Industry Connections**

**Pruitt Set Up The Rule Of Law Defense Fund That “Allows Companies Benefiting From The Actions Of Mr. Pruitt And Other Republican Attorneys General To Make Anonymous Donations, In Unlimited Amounts.”** According to the New York Times, “In addition to the American Petroleum Institute, major energy companies — ConocoPhillips, the oil and gas company; Alpha Natural Resources, a coal mining giant; and American Electric Power, the nation’s biggest coal consumer — have recently joined the Republican Attorneys General Association, bringing in hundreds of thousands of additional dollars to the group, internal documents show. By last year, the association was starting to pull in so much money under Mr. Pruitt’s leadership that it decided to break free from its partnership with the Republican State Leadership Committee, a group that represents state elected officials. Within months, the association also set up the Rule of Law Defense Fund, yet another legal entity that allows companies benefiting from the actions of Mr. Pruitt and other Republican attorneys general to make anonymous donations, in unlimited amounts. Fund-raising skyrocketed.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/07/us/politics/energy-firms-in-secretive-alliance-with-attorneys-general.html)]

American Electric Power

In 2011, Pruitt “came down fully behind American Electric Power-Public Service Company of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co” in their legal battle with the EPA over sulfur dioxide emissions. In 2012, he joined the company in suing over EPA rules requiring the energy providers “to limit emissions of nitrogen oxides during summer months.” The next year, “Pruitt … asked the [Oklahoma’s] environmental agency to delay a hearing Monday on a new plan by Tulsa-based utility Public Service Co. of Oklahoma to deal with regional haze.”

**2013: The Daily Oklahoman: “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt Has Asked The State’s Environmental Agency To Delay A Hearing Monday On A New Plan By Tulsa-Based Utility Public Service Co. Of Oklahoma To Deal With Regional Haze.”** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt has asked the state’s environmental agency to delay a hearing Monday on a new plan by Tulsa-based utility Public Service Co. of Oklahoma to deal with regional haze. But Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality officials said the hearing will proceed as planned at 1 p.m. Monday in Oklahoma City. Pruitt sent a letter to the department on Wednesday outlining his concerns over a revised state implementation plan for limiting power plant emissions affecting visibility at federal parks and wilderness areas. In his letter, Pruitt said new information about PSO’s future power requirements could affect cost estimates for its revised implementation plan for regional haze. PSO wants to phase out the last two coal units at its Northeastern Station plant by 2026.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 5/18/13]

**2012: The Daily Oklahoman: “Oklahoma Gas And Electric Co., Public Service Co. Of Oklahoma, Western Farmers Electric Coop, And Scott Pruitt Fought EPA Rules Requiring The Energy Providers To Limit Emissions Of Nitrogen Oxides During Summer Months.”** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “A federal appeals court Tuesday struck down Environmental Protection Agency rules regulating power plant air pollution that crosses state lines in a case that affected Oklahoma and 27 other states. Under the rules, Oklahoma utilities with coal plants were required to limit emissions of nitrogen oxides during summer months. The state fell under a section of the cross-state air pollution rules to help stop the formation of ozone, which can cause breathing difficulties. Several utilities, including Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co., Public Service Co. of Oklahoma and Western Farmers Electric Coop, fought the rules. They were joined by Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 8/22/12]

**2012: Pruitt Sued The EPA Over A Rule That Affected Public Service Company, A Subsidiary Of American Electric Power.**According to The Claremore Daily Progress, “Public Service Company of Oklahoma and the Environmental Protection Agency have reached an agreement on federal air quality rules for PSO’s two coal-fired power plants in Oologah. Under the agreement, the first 473 megawatt coal-burning unit at the Northeastern Plant will be retired by Dec. 31, 2017. The second unit, also 473 megawatts, will remain online but will have pollution controls installed by Dec.31, 2017. Between 2017 and 2026, AEP-PSO will dramatically reduce the amount of coal burned at the unit until it is decommissioned no later than Dec. 31, 2026. The Oklahoma Attorney General’s office sued the EPA in May to allow more time for the state to craft a solution. The agreement allows PSO to comply with EPA rules, while protecting Oklahoma consumers and ratepayers. Fallin says the agreement provides certainty for PSO and its customers as well as real environmental benefits for all Oklahomans. The Sierra Club joined Gov. Fallin, Attorney General Scott Pruitt, US EPA, and American Electric Power subsidiary Public Service Co. of Oklahoma (AEP-PSO), in announcing an agreement in principle in pending federal court litigation over the state’s clean air protections. The agreement sets firm dates for retiring both units at AEP-PSO’s Northeastern coal-fired power plant near Oologah.” [The Claremore Daily Progress, 4/24/12]

**2011: Tulsa World: “Attorney General Scott Pruitt … Came Down Fully Behind American Electric Power-Public Service Company Of Oklahoma And Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., Which Own The Plants, And Against The EPA.”** According to Tulsa World, “A fight over new proposed federal regulations on coal-fired electric generation has set up a confrontation between two of the state’s leading natural gas producers - and political donors - and its two largest electric utilities. Earlier this month, the federal Environmental Protection Agency said it had rejected part of the state’s plan to reduce sulfur dioxide and ordered ‘scrubbers’ that could cost nearly $1 billion installed in coal-fired plants at Red Rock, Oologah and Muskogee. On Wednesday, the Oklahoma Corporation Commission held a hearing on the issue, with speakers representing interests from the Sierra Club to the coal industry in attendance. Attorney General Scott Pruitt, speaking first, came down fully behind American Electric Power-Public Service Company of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., which own the plants, and against the EPA.” [Tulsa World, 3/24/11]

Campaign Finance

Stuart Solomon was CFO Of American Electric Power-Public Service Company of Oklahoma, a business interest Pruitt supported in his official capacity as Attorney General. In 2011, Solomon said it was “not physically possible to meet the federal haze mandate.” Pruitt filed suit for AEP over the federal haze ruling in 2012. Solomon made a $500 contribution to Pruitt in 2010 and another $500 contribution in 2014.

**Stuart Solomon Was CFO Of American Electric Power-Public Service Company of Oklahoma.** According to Tulsa World, “AEP-PSO Chief Operating Officer Stuart Solomon says it’s ‘not physically possible’ to meet the federal haze mandate in three years. April 2012: Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt files suit against the EPA rules on behalf of OG&E and other parties.” [Tulsa World, 8/14/13]

**Solomon Donated a Total of $1,000 to Pruitt.** Solomon donated $500 to Pruitt on September 24, 2010, and another $500 on May 13, 2014. [National Institute on Money in State Politics, accessed [12/7/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=6583668#[{1|gro=d-id)]

Devon Energy

During his 2010 race, a PAC for oil and gas company Devon Energy contributed $5,000 to Pruitt, and the company’s chairman donated another $5,000. On September 2, 2011, the head of lobbying and public affairs at Devon Energy sent a draft letter to EPA to Pruitt’s staff opposing EPA’s methodology for estimating methane emissions related to fracking operations. On October 4, 2011, a lobbyist for Devon followed up to check on the status of the letter (and to see if Pruitt was going to make significant changes), and was told by Pruitt’s chief of staff that it was being circulated to other Attorney Generals for their signature. The final letter, which was sent on October 12, 2011, had Pruitt as the sole signatory; he changed less than 40 words from Devon’s original draft in the more than 1,000 word document. In an email dated October 19, 2011, the director of government relations at Devon Energy stated at the time that the “timing of the letter [was] great.”

The relationship with Devon continued during Pruitt’s time as Attorney General and as Chairman of the Republican Attorney Generals’ Association. On March 31, 2014, Devon Energy made a $125,000 contribution to RAGA; on April 2, 2014, Pruitt authored a letter to the EPA protesting the agency’s plan to study the environmental impacts of fracking. In 2014, Pruitt defended his work on behalf of Devon Energy and other companies, stating, “That’s actually called representative government in my view of the world.”

Devon Energy was sued by the Oklahoma Sierra Clubover violations that place people at “immediate risk from major man-made earthquakes induced by defendants waste disposal practices.” Devon Energy has a history of spills; 7,000 gallons of oil and wastewater were spilled in New Mexico in 2013. In 2012, a Devon Energy production-water spill in Odessa, Texas was in “violation of state water-protection rules.” In 2008, Devon Energy was responsible for a gas leak in Wyoming, the company claimed “the release may have been caused intentionally through an act of vandalism” but admitted vandalism would be “difficult to prove.”

**Rep. Takano On Pruitt’s Collaboration With Devon Energy, “The Ethical Issues This Presents Are Disturbing. I Think It’s Unfortunate That The Majority Continues To Chase Headlines Instead Of Chasing Truth.”** According to E&E News, “But Takano argued that if Republicans want to look into the collaboration between state attorneys general and environmental groups, they should also look into collaboration that Republican attorneys general have had with the fossil fuel industry. He cited a 2014 investigation in The New York Times that found close coordination between Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt -- who was testifying at the hearing -- and oil and gas company Devon Energy Corp. The news investigation showed that Devon had drafted letters for the attorney general’s office on Obama administration regulations. ‘The ethical issues this presents are disturbing,’ Takano said, adding, ‘I think it’s unfortunate that the majority continues to chase headlines instead of chasing truth.’” [E&E News, 5/26/16]

**2015: Scott Pruitt And Devon Energy Executive Chairman Larry Nicholas Were Conference Speakers At The 2015 Southern Republican Leadership Conference May 21-23 At The Cox Convention Center In Oklahoma City.** According to the Daily Ardmoreite, “Energizing America was the theme for the 2015 Southern Republican Leadership Conference May 21-23 at the Cox Convention Center in Oklahoma City. Twelve Southern Oklahoma Republican Women members and associate members joined 2,000 people from 14 states to hear Republican presidential candidates share their vision for America. Scott Walker, Chris Christie, Jeb Bush, Bobby Jindal, Rick Perry, Carly Fiorina, Rick Santorum and Ben Carson were on site to address conference attendees. Ted Cruz, Marco Rubio and Lindsey Graham were unable to attend due to a crucial U.S. Senate vote but spoke via video along with former Governor Mike Huckabee who was also represented in person by his wife Oklahoma Governor Mary Fallin, Lieutenant Governor Todd Lamb, Attorney General Scott Pruitt, former United Nations Ambassador John Bolton, Congressman Markwayne Mullin and Devon Energy Executive Chairman Larry Nichols were among the conference speakers.” [Daily Ardmoreite, 5/31/15]

**Scott Pruitt’s Office “Lightly Edited Many Of The Documents [Written By Devon Employees] Before Sending Them To Federal Departments. Pruitt’s Office Changed 37 Words, Out Of More Than 1,000, In One 2011 Letter To U.S. EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson On Air Regulations.”** According to E&E News, “In the same month Crosby met with Exxon, Tom Keating was fuming in New York, disturbed by money and influence in politics after reading a series published in The New York Times that had uncovered a cozy relationship between Devon Energy Corp., the Oklahoma energy company, and the state government. The newspaper’s investigation found Devon employees had written several letters to Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt (R), whose office, in turn, lightly edited many of the documents before sending them to federal departments. Pruitt’s office changed 37 words, out of more than 1,000, in one 2011 letter to U.S. EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson on air regulations.” [E&E News, 5/27/15]

* **Devon Energy Official To Pruitt: “Just A Note To Pass Along The Electronic Version Of The Draft Letter To Lisa Jackson At E.P.A. We Have No Pride Of Authorship, So Whatever You Do On This Is Fine.”** According to the New York Times, “While some of the exchanges were general in character, others were quite explicit, especially the communication about the E.P.A.’s methane regulations that had prompted Mr. Whitsitt, the Devon official, to propose that Mr. Pruitt send a letter to the agency. ‘‘Just a note to pass along the electronic version of the draft letter to Lisa Jackson at E.P.A.,’’ said one September 2011 letter to Mr. Pruitt’s chief of staff from Mr. Whitsitt. ‘‘We have no pride of authorship, so whatever you do on this is fine.’’ Mr. Pruitt took the letter and, after changing just 37 words in the 1,016-word draft, copied it onto his state government letterhead and sent it to Ms. Jackson, the E.P.A. administrator.” [New York Times, 12/7/14]
* **Email Exchange Between Devon Energy And Scott Pruitt “Offers A Hint Of The Unprecedented, Secretive Alliance That Mr. Pruitt And Other Republican Attorneys General Have Formed With Some Of The Nation’s Top Energy Producers To Push Back Against The Obama Regulatory Agenda.”** According to the New York Times, “The email exchange from October 2011, obtained through an open-records request, offers a hint of the unprecedented, secretive alliance that Mr. Pruitt and other Republican attorneys general have formed with some of the nation’s top energy producers to push back against the Obama regulatory agenda, an investigation by The New York Times has found. Attorneys general in at least a dozen states are working with energy companies and other corporate interests, which in turn are providing them with record amounts of money for their political campaigns, including at least $16 million this year.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/07/us/politics/energy-firms-in-secretive-alliance-with-attorneys-general.html)]

**“Lobbyists And Company Officials Have Been Notably Solicitous, Helping Him [Pruitt] Raise His Profile As President For Two Years Of The Republican Attorneys General Association, A Post He Used To Help Start What He And Allies Called The Rule Of Law Campaign, Which Was Intended To Push Back Against Washington.”** According to the New York Times, “For Mr. Pruitt, the benefits have been clear. Lobbyists and company officials have been notably solicitous, helping him raise his profile as president for two years of the Republican Attorneys General Association, a post he used to help start what he and allies called the Rule of Law campaign, which was intended to push back against Washington. That campaign, in which attorneys general band together to operate like a large national law firm, has been used to back lawsuits and other challenges against the Obama administration on environmental issues, the Affordable Care Act and securities regulation. [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/07/us/politics/energy-firms-in-secretive-alliance-with-attorneys-general.html)]

**Since 2006, Pruitt’s Campaign Received The Maximum $5,000 Contribution From Devon Energy’s PAC, Even Though Pruitt Was Re-Elected Months Later With No Opponent.** According to Tulsa World, “Devon Energy’s political action committee and executive chairman have poured nearly $1 million since 2006 into the campaign funds of GOP candidates for state offices and party committees supporting them, a Tulsa World analysis shows. Among the top individual recipients during that time is Attorney General Scott Pruitt, whose campaign received the maximum $5,000 contribution from Devon Energy’s PAC this year, even though Pruitt was re-elected months later with no opponent. The contribution came in April, about two weeks after Pruitt wrote a letter to the EPA protesting the agency’s plans to study fracking.” [Tulsa World, 12/16/14]

* **“The Contribution Came In April, About Two Weeks After Pruitt Wrote A Letter To The EPA Protesting The Agency’s Plans To Study Fracking.”** According to Tulsa World, “Devon Energy’s political action committee and executive chairman have poured nearly $1 million since 2006 into the campaign funds of GOP candidates for state offices and party committees supporting them, a Tulsa World analysis shows. Among the top individual recipients during that time is Attorney General Scott Pruitt, whose campaign received the maximum $5,000 contribution from Devon Energy’s PAC this year, even though Pruitt was re-elected months later with no opponent. The contribution came in April, about two weeks after Pruitt wrote a letter to the EPA protesting the agency’s plans to study fracking.” [Tulsa World, 12/16/14]

**2010: “During His 2010 Race, Pruitt’s Campaign Fund Received $5,000 From Devon’s PAC And $5,000 From Executive Chairman Larry Nichols, Records Show.”** According to Tulsa World, “During his 2010 race, Pruitt’s campaign fund received $5,000 from Devon’s PAC and $5,000 from Executive Chairman Larry Nichols, records show. Neither contributed to Pruitt’s challenger in the primary or his Democratic opponent in the general election. Connections between Pruitt and Devon Energy Corp., a $32 billion energy company based in Oklahoma City, were the focus of national attention following a recent New York Times investigation.” [Tulsa World, 12/16/14]

**Devon Energy Executive Chairman: It’s My Company’s “Civic Duty” To Communicate With Pruitt And Other Political Leaders About Issues Affecting The Energy Industry.** According to Tulsa World, “The story reported on a 2011 letter to the EPA written by Devon attorneys and signed by Pruitt on state letterhead with only minor changes. The letter, also obtained by the World, protested the EPA’s handling of a study into methane gas emitted from natural gas wells. Nichols told the World last week that it’s his company’s ‘civic duty’ to communicate with Pruitt and other political leaders about issues affecting the energy industry. ‘We make donations to a variety of elected officials and candidates, as does every interest group out there,’ he said.” [Tulsa World, 12/16/14]

**2013: Devon Energy Executive VP Emailed Pruitt’s Staff To Set Up Conference Call To Discussing BLM Fracking Rules And Sent A Draft Letter For Pruitt To Submit To Agency, “The Attached Draft Letter (Or Something Like It That Scott Is Comfortable Talking From And Sending To The Acting Director To Whom The Letter Is Addressed) Could Be The Basis For The Meeting Or Call.”** According to Tulsa World, “Numerous emails between Devon’s top officials and Pruitt’s office show how engaged the company was in partnering with Pruitt to defeat proposed energy regulations affecting its bottom line. In an email sent to several Pruitt staff members last year, Whitsitt discussed setting up a conference call with officials at the U.S. Bureau of Land Management who were considering new rules on hydraulic fracturing - or fracking. He attached a draft letter for Pruitt to submit to the agency. ‘The attached draft letter (or something like it that Scott is comfortable talking from and sending to the acting director to whom the letter is addressed) could be the basis for the meeting or call,’ Whitsitt’s email states.” [Tulsa World, 12/9/14]

**Pruitt Used 3 Page Letter Written By Devon Energy Stating EPA Was Overestimating The Amount Of Air Pollution Generation From Natural Gas Wells In Oklahoma, Devon Energy Responded “The Timing Of The Letter Is Great, Given Our Meeting This Friday With Both EPA And The White House.”** According to E&E News, “When Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt (R) wrote to U.S. EPA to argue the agency was overestimating the amount of air pollution generated from natural gas wells in his state, he used a three-page letter written by Devon Energy that he presented as his own. ‘The timing of the letter is great, given our meeting this Friday with both EPA and the White House,’ wrote William Whitsitt, the then-director of government relations for Devon Energy, who delivered the letter to Pruitt.” [E&E News, 12/8/14]

**2002: Nichols Favored Jail Terms And Big Fines For Executive Lawbreakers, “I’m Shocked By The Shenanigans Going On. The Book Ought To Be Thrown At Them.”** According to USA Today, “Accounting rules don’t even make sense sometimes to Larry Nichols, CEO of Devon Energy, a company with 3,600 employees. But that’s no excuse not to follow them, and Nichols says Devon sails through audits. Nichols is on a small but growing list of CEOs who have come out in favor of jail terms and big fines for executive lawbreakers. ‘I’m shocked by the shenanigans going on. The book ought to be thrown at them.’” [USA Today, 7/5/02]

Devon Energy and RAGA

**2014: “Records Also Show That Devon Contributed $125,000 To RAGA, Led By Pruitt On March 31, Two Days Before Pruitt Wrote His Letter To The EPA Protesting A Proposed Fracking Regulation.”** According to Tulsa World, “Hundreds of emails reviewed by the World show frequent communication among Devon’s top lobbyist, other company officials and Pruitt’s office on a variety of state and federal regulatory issues. Records also show that Devon contributed $125,000 to an association led by Pruitt on March 31, two days before Pruitt wrote his letter to the EPA protesting a proposed fracking regulation. For the contribution to the Republican Attorneys General Association, Devon received special access to attorneys general during four annual conferences and other perks. Pruitt is a two-time past chairman of the association and continues to serve on its executive committee.” [Tulsa World, 12/16/14]

* **“For The Contribution To The Republican Attorneys General Association, Devon Energy Received Special Access To Attorneys General During Four Annual Conferences And Other Perks.”** According to Tulsa World, “For the contribution to the Republican Attorneys General Association, Devon received special access to attorneys general during four annual conferences and other perks. Pruitt is a two-time past chairman of the association and continues to serve on its executive committee.” [Tulsa World, 12/16/14]

**2014: Two Days After Devon Energy Contributed $125,000 To RAGA, Pruitt Wrote A Letter To The EPA Protesting Its Proposal To Study The Impact Of Fracking.** According to Tulsa World, “Two days after Devon Energy contributed $125,000 to a national association that Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt helps lead, Pruitt wrote a letter to the EPA protesting its proposal to study the impact of fracking, records show.” [Tulsa World, 12/9/14]

* **“For Its Contribution On March 31, Devon, An Oklahoma City-Based Fortune 500 Company, Qualified For The Highest Level Of Access Offered By The Republican Attorneys General Association At Its Four Annual Conferences.”** According to Tulsa World, “For its contribution on March 31, Devon, an Oklahoma City-based Fortune 500 company, qualified for the highest level of access offered by the Republican Attorneys General Association at its four annual conferences. The association frequently works behind the scenes to defeat federal regulations, including those affecting the energy industry. Pruitt is a two-time past chairman of the association and now serves on its executive committee.” [Tulsa World, 12/9/14]

**Devon Energy Executive VP In Email To Pruitt’s Chief Of Staff: “Outstanding! The Timing Of The Letter Is Great. ... Please Pass Devon’s Thanks To Attorney General Pruitt.”** According to Tulsa World, “The draft was written by Devon’s attorneys and sent to Pruitt’s office by the company’s top lobbyist. Pruitt signed the letter and sent it, with few changes, to the EPA on state letterhead, records show. Apparently Devon was pleased with the results, according to records obtained by the World. ‘Outstanding!’ wrote Bill Whitsitt, executive vice president for public affairs, in an email to Crystal Drwenski, then Pruitt’s chief of staff. ‘The timing of the letter is great. ... Please pass Devon’s thanks to Attorney General Pruitt.’” [Tulsa World, 12/9/14]

**RAGA’s Top Contributors Include Devon Energy Production.** According to Tulsa World, “The Times story also focused on the role of the Republican Attorneys General Association in partnering with special interests affected by federal regulations. The association is an issue advocacy group that is allowed to spend unlimited amounts of money to influence public policy. The Republican Attorneys General Association raised at least $7.4 million in the 2014 election cycle, according to the Center for Public Integrity’s website, opensecrets.org. Among its top contributors are Koch Industries, $129,000; Devon Energy Production, $125,000; and Exxon Mobil, $60,000.” [Tulsa World, 12/9/14]

**Devon Energy Direct Of Government Affairs To Pruitt Staff: “As Promised, We Are Sending You The Attached Draft Of The R.G.A./RAGA Follow-Up Letter To President Obama Opposing B.L.M.’S Proposed Rule.”** According to the New York Times, “That was just one of his challenges to Washington. Devon officials also turned to Mr. Pruitt to enlist other Republican attorneys general and Republican governors to oppose a rule proposed by the Bureau of Land Management that would regulate hydraulic fracturing, or fracking, on federal land. ‘As promised, we are sending you the attached draft of the R.G.A./RAGA follow-up letter to President Obama opposing B.L.M.’s proposed rule,’ Brent Rockwood, Devon’s director of government affairs, wrote to Mr. Pruitt’s staff in late 2012, in an email marked ‘confidential.’” [New York Times, 12/7/14]

**Pruitt on Corporate Influence: “That’s Actually Representative Government.”** “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt on Monday took strong exception to a weekend article in The New York Times that characterized him as participating in a ‘secretive alliance’ with energy companies to push back against the Obama administration’s regulatory agenda.‘I don’t think there is anything secretive in what we’ve done,’ Pruitt said. ‘We’ve been very open about the efforts of my office in responding to federal overreach….Clearly, this administration has had anti-fossil fuel mentality,’ Pruitt said, accusing the federal government of interfering in oil and gas regulatory matters that fall within the purview of state government. ‘That’s a state interest that has to be protected and we’ve been unapologetic about that,’ he said… ‘That’s actually called representative government in my view of the world,’ he said.” [The Oklahoman 12/9/14]

Devon Energy Environmental Violations/Spills

**2016: Oklahoma Sierra Club Sued Devon Energy Over Violations That Place People At “Immediate Risk From Major Man-Made Earthquakes Induced By Defendants’ Waste Disposal Practices.”** According to the Journal Record, “The Oklahoma Sierra Club on Tuesday filed a federal lawsuit against three Oklahoma energy companies, asking the court to order an immediate reduction of wastewater being injected underground. The plaintiff cited violations of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act by Chesapeake Operating LLC, Devon Energy Production Co. and New Dominion LLC. ‘This action is brought to enforce significant and ongoing violations of RCRA (the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act), Section 7002(a)(1)(B), that are placing people and the environment in Oklahoma and Kansas at significant and immediate risk from major man-made earthquakes induced by Defendants’ waste disposal practices,’ the Sierra Club argued in the petition.” [Journal Record, 2/16/16]

**2013: Devon Energy Well Spouted 7,000 Gallons Of Oil And Wastewater.** According to E&E News, “In New Mexico on Feb. 9, 2012, Devon Energy Corp. was fracking a well when an older producing well 600 feet away started spouting 7,000 gallons of oil and wastewater. The fracks had hit the older well and pushed fluids out. If the well had not been properly cemented -- a possibility with older wells -- the fluids could have migrated outside the well bore and directly entered groundwater aquifers.” [E&E News, [8/5/13](http://www.eenews.net/stories/1059985587)]

**2012: Devon Energy Production-Water Spill In Odessa, Texas Was In “Violation Of State Water-Protection Rules.”** According to the Odessa American, “Cleanup is under way on a production-water spill discovered last week in south Odessa, according to officials at the Railroad Commission of Texas. On Friday the RRC was notified of the spill located off of Loop 338 in south Odessa on a site operated by Devon Energy. During the initial investigation Friday, RRC inspectors noted that spill was a violation of state water-protection rules and ordered the cleanup of the site. The spill was discovered during a flyover of the area Friday, said Dan Boggs, president of the Gardendale Accountability Project or GARDAP.” [Odessa American, 6/3/12]

* **Devon Energy Officials: Spill Was Due To A Break In Newly Laid Pipe On A Site Encompassing About Three-Quarters Of An Acre.** According to the Odessa American, “Devon Energy officials said spill was due to a break in newly laid pipe on a site encompassing about three-quarters of an acre. The location of the break was not near a production site and it is unknown how long the pipe was leaking. ‘We just discovered it on Friday,’ said Chip Minty, a spokesman for Devon Energy, adding that if the break had been near a production site it would have been discovered sooner since the company conducts routine inspections at production sites.” [Odessa American, 6/3/12]

**2010: Well At Devon Energy Canadian Oil Sands Operations Blew Out, Took 35 Hours To Get Under Control.** According to Reuters, “A well at Devon Energy Corp’s Canadian oil sands operations had a blowout on Saturday that took nearly 35 hours to get under control, Alberta regulators said. The well, part of Devon’s Jackfish project in northern Alberta, blew a mixture of steam and oil over the project area. Regulators are as yet unsure how much oil was released and will audit production records to determine how much was spilled. In the interim, the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board, which oversees energy projects in the province, has shut down six other nearby wells at the 35,000-barrel-per-day oil project.” [Reuters, [7/13/10](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-devon-blowout-idUSTRE66C3WK20100713)]

**2008: Devon Energy Gas Leak In Beaver Creek, Wyoming Caused “A Pungent Foul Odor In Riverton.”** According to the Wind River News, “State agency says Beaver Creek gas leak does not warrant reprimand A November gas leak from Devon Energy’s Beaver Creek field that caused a pungent foul odor in Riverton is not an air pollution violation, according to the Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality. Greg Meeker, District 4 engineer for the department’s Air Quality Division in Lander, said in an interview on Monday the agency is working with Devon on preventive measures but not considering the leak a violation.” [Wind River News, 1/15/09]

* **Gas Leak Released “An Estimated Maximum Of 282 Pounds Of Hydrogen Sulfide And 161 Pounds Of What Are Called Volatile Organic Compounds.”** According to the Wind River News, “The Nov. 25 leak at the Beaver Creek gas field about 12 miles southeast of Riverton released an estimated maximum of 282 pounds of hydrogen sulfide and 161 pounds of what are called volatile organic compounds, according to a Dec. 5 letter from Devon to the state. ‘It’s not a big volume but, of course, H2S (hydrogen sulfide) can be a really powerful odor at low concentrations,’ Meeker said. Hydrogen sulfide can be toxic at high concentrations, especially indoors, and carries a foul odor.” [Wind River News, 1/15/09]
* **Devon Energy: Gas Leak May Have Been Valve Problem Or “The Release May Have Been Caused Intentionally Through An Act Of Vandalism.”** According to the Wind River News, “In a response to the agency’s requests, Devon stated about its investigation the gas leak may be due to a problem with a valve. ‘The well had previously been plagued with continual loading and freezing problems, and was left shut in late in the afternoon prior to the release due to the well loading up,’ according to Devon’s Dec. 5 letter. ‘It is conceivable that the valve may have been unable to fully close due to a partial ice / hydrate blockage which, when unlodged during he night, could have allowed pressurized wellbore fluids to escape,’ the document states. Devon also proposed ‘the release may have been caused intentionally through an act of vandalism,’ but the company states die scenario is ‘less likely’ and ‘admittedly difficult to prove.’” [Wind River News, 1/15/09]

**2006: A Leaking Vessel At Devon Energy’s North Tarrant Saltwater Disposal Well Required An “Emergency Cleanup… 105 Barrels Of Radioactive Residue Were Removed.”** According to the Dallas Morning News, “Based in Andrews and one of a dozen Texas firms licensed to decontaminate radioactive waste, Lotus disposed of 100 barrels of contaminated material from Devon’s Bridgeport pipe yard in February 2006 in Lotus disposal facilities. In October 2006, Lotus workers made an emergency cleanup around a leaking vessel at Devon’s North Tarrant saltwater disposal well in Saginaw. They removed about 105 barrels of radioactive residue. Doug Bridwell, an environmental and health specialist for Devon Energy’s central division, said the tank involved in the spill was inside a secondary containment area, which is designed to prevent soil contamination.” [Dallas Morning News, 11/11/07]

**2004: Securities And Exchange Commission Examined Payments By Devon Energy To The African Nation Of Equatorial Guinea And Businesses They Controlled, At Issue Is “Whether U.S. Anti-Bribery Laws Were Violated In The Companies’ Activities In Equatorial Guinea, A Poor Country Cited By The State Department For Human-Rights Abuses, Corruption And Diversion Of Oil Revenues To Government Officials.”** According to the Orlando Sentinel, “The Securities and Exchange Commission is examining payments by five big U.S. oil companies to officials of the African nation of Equatorial Guinea and businesses they controlled, as government inquiries related to the Riggs Bank affair proliferate. Spokesmen for the companies -- Amerada Hess, ChevronTexaco, Devon Energy, Exxon Mobil and Marathon -- confirmed Friday that they had recently received letters from the SEC and said the companies were cooperating in the inquiry. An SEC spokesman would not comment. At issue is whether U.S. anti-bribery laws were violated in the companies’ activities in Equatorial Guinea, a poor country cited by the State Department for human-rights abuses, corruption and diversion of oil revenues to government officials.” [Orlando Sentinel, 8/7/04]

#### Pruitt Denied Connection

**Pruitt Denied Secret Alliance With Devon Energy**. According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt on Monday took strong exception to a weekend article in The New York Times that characterized him as participating in a ‘secretive alliance’ with energy companies to push back against the Obama administration’s regulatory agenda.’ I don’t think there is anything secretive in what we’ve done,’ Pruitt said. ‘We’ve been very open about the efforts of my office in responding to federal overreach.’” [The Daily Oklahoman, 12/9/14]

* **Pruitt Said The Times Article ‘Did Not Accurately Reflect What Motivates My Service And How We Seek To Make Decisions On Advancing These Cases.’** According to Tulsa World, “In an email to the World on Monday, Pruitt said the Times article ‘did not accurately reflect what motivates my service and how we seek to make decisions on advancing these cases.’ ‘Our responsibility is to protect Oklahoma’s interest when any federal agency seeks to displace the authority granted to the state under federal law. This administration has given us plenty of opportunity to litigate those matters in regards to energy, the environment, and health care and that is what is driving us, nothing more or nothing less.’” [Tulsa World, 12/9/14]

**Pruitt: It Should Come As No Surprise That I Am Working Diligently With Oklahoma Energy Companies, The People Of Oklahoma And The Majority Of Attorneys General To Fight The Unlawful Overreach Of The EPA And Other Federal Agencies.”** According to Tulsa World, “Pruitt has formed a ‘federalism unit’ in his office and has filed at least six lawsuits challenging various federal regulations, including energy regulations. ‘It should come as no surprise that I am working diligently with Oklahoma energy companies, the people of Oklahoma and the majority of attorneys general to fight the unlawful overreach of the EPA and other federal agencies,’ Pruitt’s statement says.” [Tulsa World, 12/9/14]

**Larry Nichols Said NYT Devon Energy Story Was “Much Ado About Nothing.”** According to Tulsa World, “Devon Energy executive chairman Larry Nichols said Wednesday that it’s his company’s ‘civic duty’ to communicate with Oklahoma’s attorney general and other political leaders about issues affecting the energy industry. In an interview with the Tulsa World, Nichols called a Sunday New York Times investigation into Devon’s connections to Attorney General Scott Pruitt ‘much ado about nothing.’ The story described a ‘secretive alliance’ between energy firms and attorneys general, including Pruitt, to battle federal regulations.” [Tulsa World, 12/11/14]

Oklahoma Gas and Electric

In September of 2013, Oklahoma Gas and Electric held a fundraiser for Pruitt, raising approximately $18,000 from 56 company employees, including the CEO. Six days after the fundraiser and two days before 55 of the 56 checks were delivered, Pruitt filed a new appeal to the Tenth Circuit in an effort to block the EPA’s regional haze rule, asking the court to determine if the Environmental Protection Agency acted appropriately in rejecting the state’s plan to address visibility at national parks and wildlife areas. OG&E joined Pruitt in the appeal, which was denied in October of 2013.

**2015: Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt Asked State Regulators Monday To Drop A $413 Million Plan To Replace An Aging Oklahoma Gas And Electric Co. Plant From An Ongoing Case Before Regulators.** According to the Daily Oklahoman, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt asked state regulators Monday to drop a $413 million plan to replace an aging Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. plant from an ongoing case before regulators. Pruitt, whose office represents consumers in utility cases at the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, said the case should be limited to OG&E’s plans for federal environmental compliance. The utility expects to spend about $700 million to install emissions-reduction equipment to meet federal rules for regional haze and mercury and air toxics standards. OG&E said that part of the plan could raise residential customer bills 12 percent by 2019.” [Daily Oklahoman, 3/23/15]

**2015: Pruitt Asked Oklahoma Gas And Electric Co. To Drop Plans To Replace Its Aging Mustang Plant.** According to the Daily Oklahoman, “After facing criticism for his office’s lack of involvement in a $1.1 billion Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. case before state regulators, state Attorney General Scott Pruitt is expected to ask the company to drop plans to replace its aging Mustang plant. The request could come as soon as Wednesday, said Pruitt spokesman Aaron Cooper. He said the attorney general’s office continues to work toward a settlement.’ The attorney general’s office believes a settlement that limits the case to consideration of only the requirements imposed by the EPA is in the best interests of consumers,’ Cooper said in a statement. Testimony began Tuesday at the Oklahoma Corporation Commission on OG&E’s plan, which includes spending $700 million on environmental upgrades to comply with federal rules under the Clean Air Act.” [Daily Oklahoman, 3/4/15]

**2014: Devon Energy And Oklahoma Gas & Electric Were Speakers At The “Western Governors’ Drought Forum.”** According to the Edmond Sun, “The next session addressed the drought’s impact on the energy sector that highlighted the ways energy producers and managers plan for drought and decreased water supplies. Speakers included Mike Mathis, regulatory affairs, Continental Resources; Darren Smith, environmental manager, Devon Energy Corporation; Usha Turner, director, Corporate Environmental, Oklahoma Gas & Electric; Sylvia Bender, deputy director, Energy Assessments Division, California Energy Commission; Mike Sorenson, senior manager of fuels and water resources, Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association. Smith discussed water sustainability principles that Devon Energy Corporation adheres to, including the notion that water is a needed resource for business, as well as an essential part of the ecosystem and vital to the health, social and economic well-being of communities.” [Edmond Sun, 9/19/14]

**2013: Pruitt And Oklahoma Gas & Electric Planned To Seek Supreme Court Review Of A Precedent-Setting Appellate Court Ruling That Backed EPA’s Power To Reject State’s Regional Haze Air Quality Plans If They Do Not Follow Agency Guidelines.** According to Energy Washington Week, “Oklahoma and utilities plan to seek Supreme Court review of a precedent-setting appellate court ruling that backed EPA’s power to reject state’s regional haze air quality plans if they do not follow agency guidelines, with the groups saying the ruling’s ‘substantial’ implications for federalism in part warrant the high court taking the case. The groups, in a Nov. 6 motion, ask the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit to stay its mandate that finalizes the ruling pending a bid for the Supreme Court to review the case and its precedent -- which the 8th Circuit adopted in a recent ruling, and the 9th Circuit could consider in a pending lawsuit over Arizona’s regional haze plan. Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt (R), Oklahoma Gas & Electric (OG&E) and manufacturers say in the motion that the 10th Circuit’s ruling in State of Oklahoma, et al. v. EPA, et al. deferring to the agency is contrary to the ‘unprecedented State-Federal partnership role established by Congress for regional haze,’ adding that the federalism issues raised in the case will provide ‘substantial incentive for the Supreme Court to take this case.’” [Energy Washington Week, 12/4/13]

* **Pruitt And OG&E: “The Court’s Decision, Including The Lifting Of The Stay, Is Not Final, And The Court Retains Jurisdiction To Take Further Action.”** According to Energy Washington Week, “But Pruitt and OG&E, in the Nov. 6 motion, say that until the mandate is issued, ‘the Court’s decision, including the lifting of the stay, is not final, and the Court retains jurisdiction to take further action.’ The motion says if the stay on the FIP was lifted immediately with the ruling, OG&E would have to start work to install the sulfur scrubbers immediately, even while the court considered the petitions for rehearing, which ‘makes no practical sense and is contrary to the legal significance attached to the issuance of the mandate.” [Energy Washington Week, 12/4/13]

**2013: Oklahoma Gas And Electric Joined Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt In Requesting A Rehearing To Determine If The Environmental Protection Agency Acted Appropriately In Rejecting The State’s Plan To Address Visibility At National Parks And Wildlife Areas.** According to Electrical Apparatus, “Oklahoma Gas and Electric recently joined Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt in requesting a rehearing to determine if the Environmental Protection Agency acted appropriately in rejecting the state’s plan to address visibility at national parks and wildlife areas. A panel ruled in July that the EPA lawfully exercised its authority to impose a federally mandated plan on the state. If upheld, the panel’s ruling is expected to result in large rate increases for Oklahoma electric consumers, according to OGE Energy Corp.” [Electrical Apparatus, October 2013]

* **OG&E: “The Majority Opinion Gives EPA The Ability To Replace The State Of Oklahoma’s Decision With Its Own. This Is Especially Egregious Considering The Errors Made By The EPA When It Conducted Its Own Analysis.”** According to Electrical Apparatus “‘This is among the first decisions in the country to address EPA’s review under the Clean Air Act’s regional haze provisions,’ said OG&E spokesman Brian Alford. ‘The majority opinion gives EPA the ability to replace the State of Oklahoma’s decision with its own. This is especially egregious considering the errors made by the EPA when it conducted its own analysis.’ The utility, along with the state attorney general, the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, and others, has argued that a plan developed by the State of Oklahoma ‘would be more effective than costly pollution control technology, or scrubbers, and cost far less’ than the federal mandate.” [Electrical Apparatus, October 2013]

**2013: Oklahoma Gas And Electric And Pruitt Requested In A Filing That All The Active Judges On The 10th Circuit Court Of Appeals Revisit A Lawsuit Against The Federal Environmental Protection Agency And The Sierra Club.** According to the Journal Record, “The state’s top lawyer and a major utility have asked an appellate court for a rehearing in an air pollution case. On Tuesday, Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. and Attorney General Scott Pruitt requested in a filing that all the active judges on the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals revisit a lawsuit against the federal Environmental Protection Agency and the Sierra Club. But it's unlikely the 10th Circuit Court will grant the hearing, said legal scholar and professor Gary Allison.” [Journal Record, 9/4/13]

**2013: A Divided Appeals Court Upheld A Costly Federal Plan Opposed By Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt And Oklahoma Gas And Electric Co. To Reduce Pollutants From Two Oklahoma Power Plants.** According to the Daily Oklahoman, “A divided appeals court Friday upheld a costly federal plan opposed by Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt and Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. to reduce pollutants from two Oklahoma power plants. The 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled 2-1 that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency was within its authority to reject a state pollution-control plan for the plants and instead impose a more stringent plan. The coal-burning plants near Pawnee and Muskogee emit large amounts of pollutants that cause haze and damage air quality in a multistate region. The emissions are subject to EPA regulations for haze and other types of pollution under the federal Clean Air Act.” [Daily Oklahoman, 7/20/13]

* **“Pruitt And OG&E Had Asked The Denver-Based Court To Overturn The EPA Plan, Contending The Agency Usurped The State’s Authority And That The Plan Will Require Unnecessary, Sizable Expenditures On Scrubber Technology.”** According to the Daily Oklahoman, “Pruitt and OG&E had asked the Denver-based court to overturn the EPA plan, contending the agency usurped the state’s authority and that the plan will require unnecessary, sizable expenditures on scrubber technology. The EPA plan would cost the utility, and ultimately its customers, much more than the state plan. Pruitt and OG&E contend the EPA plan would cost more than $1 billion in the next five years. EPA contends that figure is grossly exaggerated. At issue in the case are parts of the federal Clean Air Act meant to protect visibility at certain national parks and wildlife areas.” [Daily Oklahoman, 7/20/13]

**2012: Pruitt Filed Suit Against EPA Regional Haze And Mercury Rules On Behalf Of OG&E.** According to Tulsa World, “The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and AEP-PSO came to an agreement on regional haze and mercury rules in April. The Tulsa-based utility, which is owned by Columbus, Ohio-based AEP, dropped a lawsuit against the EPA protesting the rules’ timelines. AEP-PSO needs Corporation Commission approval for its EPA compliance plan, cost recovery for the new purchased power and depreciation rates for the retiring coal-fired units. The utility did not detail how much it would pay Calpine for the purchased-power contract that runs from 2016 to 2031. Oklahoma Gas and Electric, the state’s largest utility, is continuing its legal battle against the EPA over the rules. In April, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt filed suit against the new EPA rules on behalf of OG&E. Utilities argued that the EPA was too aggressive in its timeline to enforce the regional haze rules. Two months later, the 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, based in Denver, granted OG&E a stay of the EPA rules.” [Tulsa World, 9/27/12]

**2011: Pruitt Sued The EPA Over Air Pollution Cleanup Plan, Oklahoma Gas & Electric Joined The Lawsuit.** According to the Journal Record, “Oklahoma’s cleanup plan has been contentious. The EPA rejected the state’s plan in March 2011, and the federal agency began developing one for Oklahoma to follow. Public Service Company of Oklahoma began to work with the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality and the office of the secretary of energy and the environment, upgrade one of its coal-fired power plants and add more wind power to the grid. In the meantime, Attorney General Scott Pruitt sued the federal agency, and Oklahoma Gas & Electric joined the lawsuit. Pruitt eventually lost the lawsuit. The U.S. Supreme Court denied Pruitt’s appeal, declining on May 27 to hear the case. OG&E is creating a plan to meet federal guidelines. That ruling shows the high court is willing to uphold EPA rules, Vaught said. She said there is a good chance Texas will also fight the EPA’s plan to clean up the Lone Star State’s air pollution.” [Journal Record, 11/24/14]

* **Oklahoma Gas And Electric Lawsuit Failed In Court, The Company Faced Compliance Under Federal Plan For Regional Haze.** According to the Daily Oklahoman, “Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. faces compliance under the federal plan for regional haze after unsuccessfully fighting it in the courts along with Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt. DEQ spokeswoman Erin Hatfield said the agency is reviewing Costello's letter.” [Daily Oklahoman, 7/16/14]

**2011: EPA Rejected Part Of Oklahoma’s Plan To Reduce Sulfur Dioxide And Ordered ‘Scrubbers’ That Could Cost Nearly $1 Billion Installed In Coal-Fired Plants At Red Rock, Oologah And Muskogee, Plants Owned By OG&E.** According to Tulsa World, “A fight over new proposed federal regulations on coal-fired electric generation has set up a confrontation between two of the state’s leading natural gas producers - and political donors - and its two largest electric utilities. Earlier this month, the federal Environmental Protection Agency said it had rejected part of the state’s plan to reduce sulfur dioxide and ordered ‘scrubbers’ that could cost nearly $1 billion installed in coal-fired plants at Red Rock, Oologah and Muskogee. On Wednesday, the Oklahoma Corporation Commission held a hearing on the issue, with speakers representing interests from the Sierra Club to the coal industry in attendance.” [Tulsa World, 3/24/11]

* **Pruitt Spoke At EPA Hearing On Supporting OG&E, “The Authority Of The State Has Been Usurped By An Overreaching Administrator.”** According to Tulsa World, “Attorney General Scott Pruitt, speaking first, came down fully behind American Electric Power-Public Service Company of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., which own the plants, and against the EPA. ‘As attorney general, my job is first and foremost to protect the people of Oklahoma,’ Pruitt said. ‘The authority of the state has been usurped by an overreaching administrator.’ Pruitt said he will file a federal lawsuit if necessary to prevent the EPA rules, which have not yet been formally adopted, from taking effect.” [Tulsa World, 3/24/11]

Campaign Finance

**2013: Oklahoma Gas & Electric Held A Fundraiser For Pruitt, Four Days Later Pruitt Filed A New Appeal In Their Case Against The EPA.** According to the New York Times, “The fund-raising has taken place on the state level as well. Oklahoma Gas & Electric — a for-profit utility that Mr. Pruitt joined with in federal court to fight the E.P.A. — invited its employees to the Petroleum Club in downtown Oklahoma City late last year for a fund-raising event for Mr. Pruitt, drawing donations from about 45 company employees, including the chief executive. Four days later, Mr. Pruitt filed a new appeal in the case — timing that the utility said was a coincidence.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/07/us/politics/energy-firms-in-secretive-alliance-with-attorneys-general.html)]

**Paul Renfrow Was Vice-President Of Public Affairs And Corporate Administration At OEG.** According to Times Record, “The utility faces a January 2019 deadline to meet the regional haze rules designed to restore visibility at federal parks and wilderness areas by 2064. OG&E fought the haze rules all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court, which declined in May to take up an appeal brought by the utility, state Attorney General Scott Pruitt and the Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers group. Paul Renfrow, vice president of public affairs and corporate administration, said the state and OG&E’s plan for regional haze compliance was more cost-effective than a plan proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency.” [Times Record, 8/8/14]

**AP: “Paul Renfrow, Lobbyist For OGE Energy Corp., Spent $120 On Meals For Sen. Scott Pruitt, R-Broken Arrow, And His Wife, And Another $120 On Meals For Sen. Kathleen Wilcoxson, R-Oklahoma City, And Her Husband Aug. 10. The Meals Were Bought At A Legislative Conference In Orlando, Fla.”** [The Associated Press State & Local Wire,1/25/03]

Oklahoma Gas and Electric Environmental Violations

In 2013, the Sierra Club brought a lawsuit against Oklahoma Gas and Electric, stating, “OG&E modified a boiler at a coal-fired power plant it operates in Muskogee in March and April 2008 without first obtaining an emission-regulating permit as required under the Clean Air Act.” In 2016, a Federal Appeals court dismissed the lawsuit, ruling “it was filed more than five years after construction began on the plant and was barred by the statute of limitations.” The ruling was upheld by the 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. In 2013, a transformer fractured at an Oklahoma Gas and Electric substation in Fort Smith, Arkansas. In 2007, American Electric Power-Public Service Company of Oklahoma alleged that Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co was in violation of a 26-year-old agreement between the companies. AEP-PSO claimed that they had the exclusive right to provide power in the disputed area of Oklahoma. AEP-PSO claimed that over the last five years, OG&E violated a 1981 pact by providing service in subdivisions including Country Woods of Jenks, Country Woods of Jenks II, Woodlakes of Jenks, South Woods of Jenks and Southern Reserve.

**2016: Federal Appeals Court Has Stand The Dismissal Of A Sierra Club Lawsuit That Accused Oklahoma Gas And Electric Co. Of Violating Provisions Of The Federal Clean Air Act.** According to the Lawton Constitution, “A federal appeals court has let stand the dismissal of a Sierra Club lawsuit that accused Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. of violating provisions of the federal Clean Air Act.A 2013 lawsuit alleged OG&E modified a boiler at a coal-fired power plant it operates in Muskogee in March and April 2008 without first obtaining an emission-regulating permit as required under the Clean Air Act. As a result, the lawsuit alleges the plant emitted pollution in amounts that violated its federal permit.A federal judge in Muskogee dismissed the lawsuit, ruling that it was filed more than five years after construction began on the plant and was barred by the statute of limitations. That ruling was upheld on Tuesday by the 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.” [Lawton Constitution, 3/10/16]

* **“A 2013 Lawsuit Alleged OG&E Modified A Boiler At A Coal-Fired Power Plant It Operates In Muskogee In March And April 2008 Without First Obtaining An Emission-Regulating Permit As Required Under The Clean Air Act.”** According to the Lawton Constitution, “A 2013 lawsuit alleged OG&E modified a boiler at a coal-fired power plant it operates in Muskogee in March and April 2008 without first obtaining an emission-regulating permit as required under the Clean Air Act. As a result, the lawsuit alleges the plant emitted pollution in amounts that violated its federal permit.A federal judge in Muskogee dismissed the lawsuit, ruling that it was filed more than five years after construction began on the plant and was barred by the statute of limitations. That ruling was upheld on Tuesday by the 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.” [Lawton Constitution, 3/10/16]
* **2013: DOJ Asked U.S. District Court For The Western District Of Oklahoma Declare That OG&E Failed To Assess The Impact That Several Construction Projects Between 2003 And 2006 Would Have On Future Emissions.** According to SNL Electric Utility Report, “The U.S. Department of Justice on July 8 moved to take enforcement actions against OGE Energy Corp. over alleged air violations committed at two plants operated by subsidiary Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. On behalf of the U.S. EPA, the Department of Justice asked that the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma declare that OG&E failed to assess the impact that several construction projects between 2003 and 2006 would have on future emissions. The agency also asked the court to require OG&E to conduct and submit to the EPA an emissions assessment of the projects. The plants at issue are OG&E’s 1,510-MW coal-fired Muskogee power plant in Muskogee County, Okla., and its 1,038-MW coal-fired Sooner power plant in Noble County, Okla.” [SNL Electric Utility Report, 7/15/13]

**2013: Transformer Fractured At An Oklahoma Gas And Electric Substation In Fort Smith, Arkansas.** According to Arkansas Online, “The Environmental Protection Agency says crews are working to clean up a mineral oil spill in western Arkansas. EPA spokesman Jennah Durant says Monday that officials discovered the spill Saturday after a transformer apparently fractured at an Oklahoma Gas and Electric substation in Fort Smith. Durant says officials are working to determine the extent of the spill and whether any oil reached a nearby creek. Durant says the oil has been contained, though it's not clear what caused the spill in the first place.” [Arkansas Online, 6/3/13

**2007: American Electric Power-Public Service Company Of Oklahoma Alleged That Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. Is In Violation Of A 26-Year-Old Agreement Between The Companies.** According to Tulsa World, “The right to provide electric service in and around part of Jenks -- and potentially collect millions of dollars in revenue -- is at stake in a lawsuit filed this week in Tulsa County District Court. American Electric Power-Public Service Company of Oklahoma alleges that Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. is in violation of a 26-year-old agreement between the companies. [Tulsa World, 8/25/07]

* **AEP-PSO Claimed “OG&E Has Violated A 1981 Pact By Providing Service In Subdivisions Including Country Woods Of Jenks, Country Woods Of Jenks II, Woodlakes Of Jenks, South Woods Of Jenks And Southern Reserve.”** According to Tulsa World, “It is asking the court to rule that AEP-PSO has the exclusive right to provide electric service in the disputed area. AEP-PSO claims that over the last five years, OG&E has violated a 1981 pact by providing service in subdivisions including Country Woods of Jenks, Country Woods of Jenks II, Woodlakes of Jenks, South Woods of Jenks and Southern Reserve. AEP-PSO also is seeking court intervention in connection with the Country View subdivision, which is in the early stages of dirt work, according to the lawsuit. OG&E has contracted to serve Country View customers after homes are built there, the complaint says.” [Tulsa World, 8/25/07]

**2001: A Federal Appeals Court Ruled That Oklahoma Gas & Electric Did Not Violate Federal Antitrust Laws In Competing With Trigen, Overturning The 1998 Verdict Against OG&E, “Saying The Utility’s Actions Against Trigen Are Immune From Federal Antitrust Laws Because OG&E’s Revenue From The Sale Of Electricity Is Regulated By The Oklahoma Corporation Commission.”** According to the Journal Record, “Last April, a federal appeals court ruled that Oklahoma Gas & Electric did not violate federal antitrust laws in competing with Trigen. In a 3-0 ruling, the 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Denver overturned the 1998 verdict against OG&E, saying the utility’s actions against Trigen are immune from federal antitrust laws because OG&E’s revenue from the sale of electricity is regulated by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission. The court ruled that the Oklahoma Constitution manifests the state’s intent to displace competition with regulation over electric utilities.” [Journal Record, 10/30/01]

Exxon Mobil

**Exxon Mobil Donated $160,000 to RAGA Between 2014 and 2016.** [CQ MoneyLine, Republican Attorneys General Association 527, accessed 12/20/16]

**April 26, 2016: Exxon Mobil Donated $50,000 to RAGA.** [CQ MoneyLine, Republican Attorneys General Association 527, accessed 12/20/16]

Pruitt Defended Exxon Mobil Against Climate Change Attacks

**Pruitt Penned An Op-Ed In Response To “Democratic Attorneys General In New York And Other States Who Were Investigating Whether Exxon Mobil Had Quashed Its Internal Research On Climate Change.”** According to Politico, “His LinkedIn biography boasts that he is ‘a leading advocate against the EPA’s activist agenda,’ and says that as chairman of the Republican Attorneys General Association he ‘led the charge with repeated notices and subsequent lawsuits against the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for their leadership’s activist agenda and refusal to follow the law.’ Pruitt’s op-ed with Strange, which asserted that scientists disagree about climate science, was written to criticize Democratic attorneys general in New York and other states who were investigating whether Exxon Mobil had quashed its internal research on climate change. That dispute — known as ‘#ExxonKnew’ after the Twitter hashtag — quickly escalated into a battle between Democrats looking for evidence of fraud at the oil and gas giant and Republican attorneys general who argued the Democrats were stomping on Exxon’s free speech rights. Various court battles related to that dispute are ongoing.” [Politico, [12/7/16](http://www.politico.com/blogs/donald-trump-administration/2016/12/oklahoma-ag-pruitt-epa-chief-232319); National Review, [5/17/16](http://www.nationalreview.com/article/435470/climate-change-attorneys-general)]

**Bloomberg: “Oklahoma And Alabama Accused A Coalition Of U.S. States Investigating Whether Exxon Mobil Corp. And Other Energy Companies Misled Investors And The Public About How Climate Change Might Affect Their Businesses Of Trying To Silence Critics.”** According to Bloomberg, “Oklahoma and Alabama accused a coalition of U.S. states investigating whether Exxon Mobil Corp. and other energy companies misled investors and the public about how climate change might affect their businesses of trying to silence critics. ‘Reasonable minds can disagree about the science behind global warming, and disagree they do,’ Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt and Alabama Attorney General Luther Strange said in a statement Wednesday. The debate ‘should not be silenced with threats of criminal prosecution by those who believe that their position is the only correct one and that all dissenting voices must therefore be intimidated and coerced into silence.’ Massachusetts on Tuesday became the latest participant in an investigation of climate science and energy companies – including Exxon Mobil, the world’s largest – that was started in November by New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman and also includes California and Virgin Islands. The probe aims to discover whether energy companies intentionally distorted or misrepresented scientific data to minimize the effects of global warming and sway public opinion and policy. They’re part of a 17-state and territories’ coalition exploring legal avenues for fighting climate change.” [Bloomberg, [3/30/16](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-03-30/oklahoma-alabama-support-exxon-mobil-in-ny-led-climate-probe)]

**Houston Chronicle: “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt Described The Investigation Into Exxon As An Attempt To Punish Those Who Disagree On The Science Behind Global Warming And Said He Would Likely File A Court Brief In Support Of Paxton.”** According to Houston Chronicle, “On Monday, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt described the investigation into Exxon as an attempt to punish those who disagree on the science behind global warming and said he would likely file a court brief in support of Paxton. ‘It seems to be an effort to criminalize free speech,’ he said. ‘They’re basically alleging Exxon has minimized the supposed impact of fossil fuels. But if the minimization is fraud, as they claim, then the exaggeration is fraud, too.’” [Houston Chronicle, [5/16/16](http://www.houstonchronicle.com/news/article/Paxton-joins-Exxon-climate-change-fight-7517562.php)]

**Pruitt Defended Exxon Mobil Corp. Against Investigations From The Attorneys General Of Massachusetts And New York Into The Oil Company's Track Record On Climate Change.** According to E&E News, “Strange, Paxton and Pruitt have defended Exxon Mobil Corp. against investigations from the attorneys general of Massachusetts and New York into the oil company's track record on climate change.” [E&E News, [7/28/16](http://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2016/07/28/stories/1060040903)]

**Pruitt Accused “A Coalition Of U.S. States Investigating Whether Exxon Mobil Corp. And Other Energy Companies Misled Investors And The Public About How Climate Change Might Affect Their Businesses Of Trying To Silence Critics.”** According to Bloomberg, “Oklahoma and Alabama accused a coalition of U.S. states investigating whether Exxon Mobil Corp. and other energy companies misled investors and the public about how climate change might affect their businesses of trying to silence critics.” [Bloomberg, [3/30/16](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2016-03-30/oklahoma-alabama-support-exxon-mobil-in-ny-led-climate-probe)]

**Executive Director 350.Org: “You Couldn’t Pick A Better Fossil Fuel Industry Puppet. Pruitt Formed A Secret Alliance With Oil And Coal Companies To Gut Our Environmental Regulations And Has Defended Exxonmobil’s Climate Cover-Up.”** According to International Business Times, “ Pruitt has also pushed back against Democratic attorneys general in the country who have sought to investigate Exxon Mobil over concerns that the company had misled investors and the public about the dangers of climate change. ‘You couldn’t pick a better fossil fuel industry puppet. Pruitt formed a secret alliance with oil and coal companies to gut our environmental regulations and has defended ExxonMobil’s climate cover-up,’ May Boeve, the executive director of 350.org, an environmental advocacy group, said in a statement. ‘This is a man who cares more about the profits of coal company CEOs than the health of our children or the future of our planet.’” [International Business Times, [12/7/16](http://www.ibtimes.com/who-scott-pruitt-trump-epa-pick-has-strong-energy-firm-ties-major-critic-agency-2456590)]

Harold Hamm, Continental Resources

Recently nominated EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt is closely tied to Oklahoma oil baron Harold Hamm. Hamm served as Pruitt’s campaign chairman in 2014 and the attorney general has lauded Hamm as a “visionary and icon [who] … embodies … leadership, integrity and diligence.” *The Guardian* reported that “two transition sources say [Hamm] … pushed for Oklahoma … attorney general Scott Pruitt to run the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).” For years, Pruitt has been a champion for Hamm and Continental Resources. In 2016, Pruitt and the Domestic Energy Producers Alliance, which Hamm chairs, filed separate suits challenging the EPA’s proposed methane rule. Pruitt also praised Hamm’s executive staff. In 2015, the attorney general said of Continental’sVice President of Government and Regulatory Affairs: he “has worked diligently to champion economic development and private property rights … he is ensuring a legacy of prosperity for future generations of Oklahomans … [he] is one of those rare individuals who has the courage to not only envision a better future, but also make it happen.”

On March 17, 2014, Oklahoma joined the Domestic Energy Producers Alliance, an organization chaired by Continental Resources CEO Harold Hamm, in filing suit against the Interior Department’s proposal to add the lesser prairie chicken; Sprague’s pipit, a songbird; the Rabbitsfoot mussel; and the Arkansas Darter, a small fish to a list of endangered species, which would halt drilling activity on tens of thousands of acres. Mike McDonald, the president of the Domestic Energy Producers Alliance, stated that, “We just came to the conclusion he would be the best person to be the lead attorney on this…He has exceeded our expectations.” On March 31, 2014, Continental Resources donated $25,000 to the Republican Attorney Generals Association.

Continental Resources has a history of unsafe business practices that caused detrimental environmental impacts and Mr. Hamm has used his influence to further his company’s interest at the expense of the public. From 2006 to 2011, Continental Resources experienced 11 blowouts on its North Dakota wells. The first ten incidents resulted in 115,000 gallons being spilt. When an incident occurred in the summer of 2013, “continental waited some 10 hours to notify the local authorities” after “oil, water and chemicals [had] shot 40 feet into the air” and polluted surrounding areas. The company has also been charged with killing migratory birds in a North Dakota spill.

Pruitt And Continental Resource Founder Harold Hamm

**2016: Hamm Pushed For Trump To Name Pruitt EPA Administrator.** According to The Guardian, “Several Koch network donors who backed Trump, such as Robert Mercer, Joe Craft, Doug Deason, Harold Hamm, Diane Hendricks, and Stan Hubbard, have reason to be pleased that his early cabinet picks align with their views on expanding fossil fuels, spurring charter schools, repealing Obamacare, and slashing government regulations and taxes … Further, Trump’s key energy adviser for months has been fracking multibillionaire Hamm, who has been mentioned as a potential energy secretary. While Hamm is expected to keep running his oil and natural gas company Continental Resources, two transition sources say he has pushed for Oklahoma governor Mary Fallin to be named interior secretary, and the state’s attorney general Scott Pruitt to run the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which he has sued to block climate change curbs.” [The Guardian, 12/7/16]

**2016: Pruitt And Hamm’s Domestic Energy Producers Alliance Filed Separate Suites Challenging The Proposed Methane Rule.** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Oklahoma has joined a dozen other states in a lawsuit challenging federal regulations for methane emissions from new equipment at oil and natural gas sites. Attorney General Scott Pruitt joined the effort Tuesday led by West Virginia’s attorney general. The rules are part of the Obama administration’s goal to cut methane emissions from the oil and gas industry more than 40 percent from 2012 levels by 2025.Methane is a greenhouse gas that is 25 times more potent than carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The deadline to file challenges to the rule was Tuesday. In separate filings, Texas and North Dakota challenged the regulations last week. Several industry groups, including the Oklahoma Independent Petroleum Association and the Domestic Energy Producers Alliance, joined together in their own lawsuit against the regulations. Pruitt spokesman Will Gottenby said Pruitt and his fellow attorneys general believe the EPA is acting outside its statutory framework. The rules apply to new and modified oil-field equipment. Cost-benefit analysis’ The industry has been steadily lowering methane emissions levels for years, and had the Obama administration conducted a proper cost-benefit analysis, which they are required to do, we are confident they would have found that the cost of this new rule outweighs the benefit,’ Gattenby said in an email.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 8/4/16]

**2015: Pruitt Praised Hamm’s VP Of Government And Regulatory Affairs: Blu Hulsey “Has Worked Diligently To Champion Economic Development And Private Property Rights … He Is Ensuring A Legacy Of Prosperity For Future Generations Of Oklahomans … Blu Is One Of Those Rare Individuals Who Has The Courage To Not Only Envision A Better Future, But Also Make It Happen.”** According to The Journal Record, “Blu Hulsey’s passion for Oklahoma’s oil and gas industry is making a difference not only in his home state, but across the world. As vice president of government and regulatory affairs for Continental Resources Inc., Hulsey has been an invaluable advocate for Oklahoma’s most vital industry while advancing our nation’s march toward energy independence. ‘I have had the good fortune of working with Blu for the past six years as Oklahoma’s oil and natural gas industry has helped launch America’s energy renaissance,’ said Harold Hamm, chairman and CEO of Continental Resources. ‘Blu has been a positive force at the core of this renaissance. Through his countless achievements, Hulsey is a key player in positioning Oklahoma as a game-changer among oil- and gas-producing states nationwide. ‘ Prior to joining Continental Resources, Hulsey’s career included stints in city government and the legislative arena. He served as city manager for the city of Bixby and was town coordinator and economic development director for the town of Skiatook. He also served as counsel for the U.S. Senate Environment and Public Works Committee for Sen. Jim Inhofe in Washington, D.C., and as a field representative in Inhofe’s Tulsa office. ‘(Hulsey) has worked diligently to champion economic development and private property rights at home and across the U.S. Through these efforts, he is ensuring a legacy of prosperity for future generations of Oklahomans - and Americans - to come,’ said Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt. ‘Blu is one of those rare individuals who has the courage to not only envision a better future, but also make it happen. ‘“ [The Journal Record, 5/21/15]

**2014: The New York Times: “But Mr. Pruitt’s Ties With Industry Are Clear. One Of His Closest Partners Has Been Harold G. Hamm, The Billionaire Chief Executive Of Continental Resources, Which Is Among The Biggest Oil And Gas Drilling Companies In Both Oklahoma And North Dakota.”** According to The New York Times, “But Mr. Pruitt’s ties with industry are clear. One of his closest partners has been Harold G. Hamm, the billionaire chief executive of Continental Resources, which is among the biggest oil and gas drilling companies in both Oklahoma and North Dakota. This year, Mr. Pruitt joined with a group aligned with Mr. Hamm to sue the Interior Department over its plan to consider adding animals such as the lesser prairie chicken to the endangered species list, a move that Mr. Hamm has said could knock out ‘some of the most promising land for oil and gas leases in the country.’ The suit was filed after Mr. Hamm announced that he would serve as the chairman of Mr. Pruitt’s re-election campaign. ‘Time and time again, General Pruitt has stood up and bravely fought for the rights of Oklahomans in those instances when the federal government has overextended its hand,’ Mr. Hamm said as his role in Mr. Pruitt’s re-election effort was announced.” [The New York Times, 12/7/14]

**March 17, 2014: State of Oklahoma Joined with the Domestic Energy Producers Alliance to Oppose Four Endangered Species Candidate Species: Lesser-Prairie Chicken, Sprague’s Pipit, Rabbitsfoot Mussel, and Arkansas Darter***.* [State of Oklahoma and Domestic Energy Producers Alliance vs. the Department of Interior, et al. Complaint, 3/17/14]

* **The New York Times: “Mr. Pruitt Joined With A Group Aligned With Mr. Hamm To Sue The Interior Department Over Its Plan To Consider Adding Animals To The Endangered Species List, A Move That Mr. Hamm Has Said Could Knock Out ‘Some Of The Most Promising Land For Oil And Gas Leases In The Country.’”** According to The New York Times, “But Mr. Pruitt’s ties with industry are clear. One of his closest partners has been Harold G. Hamm, the billionaire chief executive of Continental Resources, which is among the biggest oil and gas drilling companies in both Oklahoma and North Dakota. This year, Mr. Pruitt joined with a group aligned with Mr. Hamm to sue the Interior Department over its plan to consider adding animals such as the lesser prairie chicken to the endangered species list, a move that Mr. Hamm has said could knock out ‘some of the most promising land for oil and gas leases in the country.’ The suit was filed after Mr. Hamm announced that he would serve as the chairman of Mr. Pruitt’s re-election campaign. ‘Time and time again, General Pruitt has stood up and bravely fought for the rights of Oklahomans in those instances when the federal government has overextended its hand,’ Mr. Hamm said as his role in Mr. Pruitt’s re-election effort was announced.” [The New York Times, 12/7/14]
* **New York Times: “Mike McDonald …The President Of A Group That Calls Itself The Domestic Energy Producers Alliance [A Hamm Affiliated Group]: ‘Pruitt Has Exceeded Our Expectations.’”** According to The New York Times, “Energy producers, for instance, wanted to sue the Interior Department as it considered adding animals such as the sage grouse -- which nests near sites of oil and gas drilling -- to a list of endangered species, a move that could put tens of thousands of acres off limits to new drilling. The energy companies could have sued on their own, but their executives believed that the case would be more potent by bringing in Mr. Pruitt and the weight of the State of Oklahoma. ‘We just came to the conclusion he would be the best person to be the lead attorney on this,’ said Mike McDonald, an owner of Triad Energy, a small oil and gas exploration company, and the president of a group that calls itself the Domestic Energy Producers Alliance. ‘He has exceeded our expectations.’” [The New York Times, 12/7/14]
* **The New York Times: Oil And Gas Lobbied Used Pruitt “To Sue The Interior Department As It Considered Adding Animals Such As The Sage Grouse -- Which Nests Near Sites Of Oil And Gas Drilling -- To A List Of Endangered Species, A Move That Could Put Tens Of Thousands Of Acres Off Limits To New Drilling.”** According to The New York Times, “Energy producers, for instance, wanted to sue the Interior Department as it considered adding animals such as the sage grouse -- which nests near sites of oil and gas drilling -- to a list of endangered species, a move that could put tens of thousands of acres off limits to new drilling. The energy companies could have sued on their own, but their executives believed that the case would be more potent by bringing in Mr. Pruitt and the weight of the State of Oklahoma. ‘We just came to the conclusion he would be the best person to be the lead attorney on this,’ said Mike McDonald, an owner of Triad Energy, a small oil and gas exploration company, and the president of a group that calls itself the Domestic Energy Producers Alliance. ‘He has exceeded our expectations.’” [The New York Times, 12/7/14]

**March 31, 2014: Hamm’s Continental Resources Donated 25,000 To The Republican Attorneys General Association; Pruitt Was The Organization’s Chairman.** On March 31, 2014,“The RAGA … received $25,000 from Continental Resources, an independent oil company based in Oklahoma City.” According to Scott Pruitt’s LinkedIn, Pruitt has served as chairman of Republican Attorneys General Association (RAGA) for two terms. [Scott Pruitt LinkedIn, accessed [11/28/16](https://www.linkedin.com/in/e-scott-pruitt-3b771653); Tulsa World, 12/9/14; CQ Moneyline, Republican Attorneys General Association, Accessed 12/22/16]

* **2014: The Daily Oklahoman: “Oklahoma Attorney General, Energy Group Sue U.S. Fish And Wildlife Service Over Endangered Species Settlements.”** [The Daily Oklahoman, 3/18/14]

**2013-2014: The Daily Oklahoma: “Harold Hamm, Chief Executive Officer Of Oklahoma City-Based Continental Resources Inc., Will Serve As Chairman Of State Attorney General Scott Pruitt’s Re-Election Campaign.”** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Harold Hamm, chief executive officer of Oklahoma City-based Continental Resources Inc., will serve as chairman of state Attorney General Scott Pruitt’s re-election campaign, it was announced Monday. Pruitt, a Republican elected to the post in 2010, kicked off his re-election bid by announcing that Hamm will head up his campaign. Hamm in 2012 served as chairman of Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney’s energy policy advisory group. In May 2012, Hamm held a Romney fundraiser at his house, which attracted about 750 people who contributed about $2 million. Hamm, who was born in Lexington, said he agreed to head up Pruitt’s campaign because the attorney general ‘has stood up and bravely fought for the rights of Oklahomans in those instances when the federal government has overextended its hand.’” [The Daily Oklahoman, 7/30/13]

* **2013-2014: Mr. Hamm … Severe[d] As The Chairman Of Mr. Pruitt’s Re-Election Campaign.** According to The New York Times, “But Mr. Pruitt’s ties with industry are clear. One of his closest partners has been Harold G. Hamm, the billionaire chief executive of Continental Resources, which is among the biggest oil and gas drilling companies in both Oklahoma and North Dakota. This year, Mr. Pruitt joined with a group aligned with Mr. Hamm to sue the Interior Department over its plan to consider adding animals such as the lesser prairie chicken to the endangered species list, a move that Mr. Hamm has said could knock out ‘some of the most promising land for oil and gas leases in the country.’ The suit was filed after Mr. Hamm announced that he would serve as the chairman of Mr. Pruitt’s re-election campaign. ‘Time and time again, General Pruitt has stood up and bravely fought for the rights of Oklahomans in those instances when the federal government has overextended its hand,’ Mr. Hamm said as his role in Mr. Pruitt’s re-election effort was announced.” [The New York Times, 12/7/14]
* **2013: Pruitt: “Harold Hamm Is A Dedicated Businessman, Visionary And Icon Here In Oklahoma … Harold Embodies The Leadership, Integrity And Diligence That Will Define My Re-Election Campaign. I Am Honored To Have Harold Hamm As A Part Of My 2014 Team.”** According to Journal Record Legislative Report, “In an announcement of Hamm’s role, Pruitt called his first three years in office ‘the experience of a lifetime.’ ‘Harold Hamm is a dedicated businessman, visionary and icon here in Oklahoma,’ Pruitt said. ‘Harold embodies the leadership, integrity and diligence that will define my re-election campaign. I am honored to have Harold Hamm as a part of my 2014 team. ‘ In his own statement, Hamm said Oklahomans are well-served with Pruitt as AG.” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 7/29/13]
* **2013: Hamm: “Time And Time Again, General Pruitt Has Stood Up And Bravely Fought For The Rights Of Oklahomans In Those Instances When The Federal Government Has Over-Extended Its Hand … From The Affordable Care Act To An Over-Zealous Environmental Protection Agency - We Need Scott’s Continued Leadership Here In Oklahoma.”** According to Journal Record Legislative Report, “‘Time and time again, General Pruitt has stood up and bravely fought for the rights of Oklahomans in those instances when the federal government has over-extended its hand,’ Hamm said. ‘From the Affordable Care Act to an over-zealous Environmental Protection Agency - we need Scott’s continued leadership here in Oklahoma.’ Pruitt was elected attorney general in November 2010, the second Republican in state history to hold the office. Previously, he served eight years in the Oklahoma Senate. For about seven years, Pruitt was co-owner and managing general partner of the Oklahoma City RedHawks baseball team.” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 7/29/13]

Hamm And Continental Resources had a History of Unsafe Business Practices that Caused Detrimental Environmental Impacts

**Media Matters: “Hamm Is A Member Of Lobbying Group Behind Policy Allowing Fracking Companies To Pollute Drinking Water.”**According to Media Matters, Hamm is a member of the Interstate Oil And Gas Compact Commission (IOGCC), a ‘quasi-governmental’ organization created by Congress that essentially serves as an oil industry lobbying group and ‘has been quietly working for decades to restrict federal oversight of oil and gas,’ as InsideClimate News (ICN) reported. The IOGCC claimed credit for a measure within the 2005 Energy Policy Act that exempted hydraulic fracturing -- or fracking -- from regulation under the Safe Drinking Water Act. That provision, known as the ‘Halliburton loophole,’ has ‘helped enable the modern fracking boom that has created vast economic benefits, but also has been implicated in cases of drinking water contamination, air pollution and rising emissions of climate-changing methane,’ ICN reported.” [Media Matters, [7/22/16](http://mediamatters.org/research/2016/07/22/three-things-media-should-know-about-harold-hamm-trump-s-leading-pick-energy-secretary/211836)]

**Media Matters: “Hamm Exerted Pressure On Oklahoma Scientists To Keep Them Quiet About Link Between Fracking And Earthquakes.”** “Scientists have ‘known for decades that injecting waste fluid in deep disposal wells -- from oil and gas or other industrial activities -- can cause earthquakes in rare cases,’ according to E&E News, and in recent years scientists have discovered a connection between Oklahoma’s oil and gas activities and the state’s dramatic increase in earthquakes. Yet according to emails obtained by E&E News, Hamm and other Oklahoma officials worked to suppress the scientists’ findings.” [Media Matters, [7/22/16](http://mediamatters.org/research/2016/07/22/three-things-media-should-know-about-harold-hamm-trump-s-leading-pick-energy-secretary/211836)]

**Media Matters: “Hamm Tried To Have Scientists Conducting Earthquake Research Dismissed.” “**In response to the University of Oklahoma scientists’ earthquake research, Hamm told Larry Grillot, then-dean of the university’s Mewbourne College of Earth and Energy, that he was ‘upset at some of the earthquake reporting to the point that he would like to see select [Oklahoma Geological Survey (OGS)] staff dismissed,’ according to an email from Grillot obtained by Bloomberg News. Grillot also wrote that Hamm indicated that he would be ‘visiting with Governor [Mary] Fallin on the topic of moving the OGS out of the University of Oklahoma.’ Bloomberg added that ‘Hamm’s meeting with Grillot resulted in no apparent changes at the university.’” [Media Matters, [7/22/16](http://mediamatters.org/research/2016/07/22/three-things-media-should-know-about-harold-hamm-trump-s-leading-pick-energy-secretary/211836)]

**The Journal Record: “Ground Water Protection Council Associate Executive Director Dan Yates Said Continental Resources Inc. And Devon Energy Corp. Have Wastewater Reuse Projects That Could Be Used As A Model In Other Parts Of The State.”** [The Journal Record, 12/4/15]

**2014: Continental Resources Tied For Last In Report That Said Oil Companies Were “Doing A Poor Job Of Informing The Public About The Safety Of Their Hydraulic Fracturing Activities.”** According to Tulsa World, “Fracking report: Public not adequately informed Most major oil and gas producers, including those in Oklahoma, are doing a poor job of informing the public about the safety of their hydraulic fracturing activities, according to a new report released by environment-focused investment groups Thursday. Tulsa-based WPX Energy Inc. ranked 25th on a scoreboard of 30 companies. Oklahoma City-based Chesapeake Energy Corp. fared better in the new report, while Continental Resources tied for last place. The report, ‘Disclosing the Facts: Risk and Transparency in Hydraulic Fracturing,’ was a team effort by As You Sow, Boston Common Asset Management, Green Century Funds and the Investor Environmental Health Network. The effort rated companies as issues from disclosure of toxic chemicals used in fracking to well safety and the impact of air emissions.” [Tulsa World, 12/14/14]

**2012: It Was Unknown Who Dumped Oil And Gas Waste Near A Continental Resources Drilling Site In The Community Of Fay.** According to The Journal Record, “The search for a polluter near the small farming community of Fay continues on Friday, nearly a week after someone dumped about 10,000 gallons of contaminated water and oil waste on a county road. Meanwhile, Oklahoma City-based Continental Resources has offered to help with the cleanup effort. Brad Ice, supervisor with the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, is leading his team of field inspectors to track down the perpetrator, but he admits that finding the polluter is unlikely unless someone reports information to the agency. The pollution spanned nearly a mile of dirt road, near producing oil and gas wells and only four miles from a legal disposal well. What likely happened, Ice said, is that a trucker opened a valve on his truck, then drove down the road, spilling thousands of gallons of hot liquid and a number of still-undetermined chemicals. The toxic fluid, which on Tuesday tested more than three times the allowable level of salt, flowed off the dirt road, through a metal culvert and into a dry creek bed onto private property where cattle feed. Though it is impossible to tell what oil and gas well the pollution came from, the illegal dumping was a few feet away from a Continental Resources well site. The company contracts trucking firms to load what is known as formation water, a byproduct of oil and gas production, and take it to a legally permitted disposal well. But the problem is that some companies don’t actually dispose of the waste legally. In the case of the Fay incident, one trucker intentionally dumped thousands of gallons on county roads, but will likely still get paid for the legal disposal.” [The Journal Record, 8/16/12]

**2011: AP: “North Dakota Health Officials Have Cited [Continental Resources], Accusing It Of Polluting State Waters And Failing To Quickly Clean Up The Spills.”** According to The Associated Press State & Local Wire, “North Dakota health officials have cited an Oklahoma oil company, accusing it of polluting state waters and failing to quickly clean up the spills. The state Department of Health announced Tuesday that it issued violation notices to Continental Resources Inc. for two separate incidents in April. Continental is one the oldest and biggest operators in North Dakota’s booming oil patch in the western part of the state. Court documents show that about 10 barrels of drilling mud and oil overflowed from a waste pit at one of the company’s wells in Divide County and contaminated soil and water. In the second incident, about two barrels of oil spewed from a well in Williams County and spread to water, where one dead duck was discovered. A barrel is about 48 gallons.” [The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 11/1/11]

* **First Incident: “Court Documents Show That About 10 Barrels Of Drilling Mud And Oil Overflowed From A Waste Pit At One Of The Company’s Wells In Divide County And Contaminated Soil And Water.”** [The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 11/1/11]
* **Second Incident: “About Two Barrels Of Oil Spewed From A Well In Williams County And Spread To Water, Where One Dead Duck Was Discovered. A Barrel Is About 48 Gallons.”** [The Associated Press State & Local Wire, 11/1/11]
* **Editorial: Continental Resources Spilled Two Barrels Of Oil In North Dakota.** According to Editorial, The Oklahoman, “We ask the same question we did a year ago. Do Washington bureaucrats know anything about farm country? The same sage approach was taken by North Dakota bureaucrats in reacting to Continental Resources Inc. of Enid spilling a whopping two barrels of oil that killed one duck this spring. In an Associated Press account, an environmental geologist with that state’s health department water quality division said no drinking water sources were threatened and the site was clean. That didn’t stop the state Department of Health from issuing violation notices to Continental. Where common sense is called for, federal regulators instead offer dust in the wind. We trust these farm family rules will end up as dead as that duck in North Dakota.” [Editorial, The Oklahoman, 12/2/11]

**2011: Continental Resources Charged With Killing Migratory Birds In Oil Spill.** According to The Oklahoman, “Continental Resources Inc. has asked a federal judge to dismiss a criminal case charging the Enid-based company with killing migratory birds in North Dakota. ‘Continental violated no statute or regulation; nor has the government identified any illegal act or omission committed by Continental,’ attorneys for the company wrote in court papers filed Tuesday. Continental is one of seven oil companies charged in August with killing migratory birds that died after allegedly landing in oil waste pits in western North Dakota. The company, which has announced plans to move its headquarters to Oklahoma City next year, has been operating in North Dakota since shortly after modern oil and natural gas development began there in 1995. The misdemeanor charge against Continental stems from a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service agent’s discovery of one dead bird near a reserve pit in May, according to court papers. Continental contends the find occurred during a warrantless inspection at a well site in Williams County.” [The Oklahoman, 10/28/11]

* **The Oklahoman: “Continental Resources Inc. On Friday Denied That It Has Violated The Migratory Bird Treaty Act, As Alleged By Federal Prosecutors In North Dakota.”** According to The Oklahoman, “Continental Resources Inc. on Friday denied that it has violated the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as alleged by federal prosecutors in North Dakota. The company only learned of the allegation Thursday when authorities issued a news release accusing seven oil companies of killing migratory birds that allegedly landed in waste pits in the western part of the state, spokesman Brian Engel said. Engel said Continental complied fully with state regulations on the site where a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service agent allegedly found one dead bird on May 6. ‘We set our operating standards to do things right. We believe we are in full compliance with the law,’ he said. ‘Protecting the health, safety and environment where we work and operate is a core value and a high priority for Continental personnel.’” [The Oklahoman, 8/27/11]

**2006 – 2014: Continental Resources Experienced 11 Blowouts On Its North Dakota Wells.** “In early August 2013, Arlene Skurupey of Blacksburg, Va., got an animated call from the normally taciturn farmer who rents her family land in Billings County, N.D. There had been an accident at the Skurupey 1-9H oil well. ‘Oh, my gosh, the gold is blowing,’ she said he told her. ‘Bakken gold.’ It was the 11th blowout since 2006 at a North Dakota well operated by Continental Resources, the most prolific producer in the booming Bakken oil patch. Spewing some 173,250 gallons of potential pollutants, the eruption, undisclosed at the time, was serious enough to bring the Oklahoma-based company’s chairman and chief executive, Harold G. Hamm, to the remote scene.” [The New York Times, [11/22/14](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/11/23/us/north-dakota-oil-boom-downside.html)]

* **The New York Times: “115,000 Gallons Spilled In Those First 10 Blowouts.”** “Blowouts represent the riskiest failure in the oil business. Yet, despite these serious injuries and some 115,000 gallons spilled in those first 10 blowouts, the North Dakota Industrial Commission, which regulates the drilling and production of oil and gas, did not penalize Continental until the 11th.” [The New York Times, [11/22/14](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/11/23/us/north-dakota-oil-boom-downside.html)]
* **2013: The New York Times: “When The Skurupey Well Blew Out Last Summer, Continental Waited Some 10 Hours To Notify The Local Authorities.”** “When the Skurupey well blew out last summer, Continental waited some 10 hours to notify the local authorities. ‘They should have called us a lot sooner, but when these things happen, the oil companies pretty much take over, ‘ said Sheriff Dave Jurgens of Billings County. ‘They have their own security, and they don’t let anybody on location, unless you’re with Continental or the state Industrial Commission. And I totally understand why. It’s specialized-type stuff.’” [The New York Times, [11/22/14](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/11/23/us/north-dakota-oil-boom-downside.html)]
* **The New York Times: “Oil, Water And Chemicals Shot 40 Feet Into The Air From The Wellhead But Did Not Ignite. One Worker Was Injured With A Broken Finger And Bruises To His Head And Chest, The Sheriff Said.”** According to The New York Times, “The public never knew the blowout had occurred because the well, like many new wells, had been granted confidential status by the state for competitive reasons; almost everything except its existence was off the record for six months. Oil, water and chemicals shot 40 feet into the air from the wellhead but did not ignite. One worker was injured with a broken finger and bruises to his head and chest, the sheriff said. ‘They didn’t call an ambulance, just put him in a pickup and took him to the E.R.,’ he said. ‘That was not very wise on their part.’ The oil misted over hundreds of acres, contaminating hundreds of bales of hay and alfalfa fields. ‘They redid the land, washed all the tanks,’ Mrs. Skurupey said. ‘Continental was super-nice. They left no stones unturned, as far as I was concerned. They paid us all for damages, and we signed agreements that we wouldn’t sue.’ Defending itself against the commission’s enforcement action this year, Continental argued that its own investigation revealed that ‘an irresponsible supervisor’s callous disregard of’ its ‘well-established standard operating procedures’ caused the Skurupey blowout.” [The New York Times, [11/22/14](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/11/23/us/north-dakota-oil-boom-downside.html)]

American Petroleum Institute, EEI, ACCCE, and DTE Energy

On February 18, 2014, Hunton & Williams lobbyist Roderick Hastie emailed Oklahoma Deputy Solicitor General Clayton Eubanks asking him to publicly oppose an EPA regulation entitled *Geological Sequestration of Carbon Dioxide Draft Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program Guidance on Transitioning Class II Wells to Class VI Wells,* issued in December of 2013. Eubanks replied “[I]t sounds like a comment is in order.” The next day, the American Petroleum Institute donated $50,000 to RAGA. On February 21, Hastie sent Eubanks a prepared draft letter objecting to the proposed regulation addressed to EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy. On February 24, 2014, Hunton & Williams hosted a reception for at RAGA’s National Winter Meeting, making an in kind donation of roughly $5,000. On February 25, 2014, Hastie reached out to Eubanks to see if he had circulated the draft letter among other Attorneys General. Eubanks forwarded him the email and draft letter he sent to 15 states; the email made no mention of Hunton & Williams and stated that Pruitt’s office had prepared the letter. On February 28, 2014, the final letter was sent to the EPA from Pruitt and six other Attorneys General. That day, the, American Petroleum Institute, Edison Electric Institute, and American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity also submitted comments with their concerns over the EPA draft guidance. The Edison Electric Institute donated $25,000 on February 27, and Edison Electric Institute member DTE Energy donated $25,000 that day as well. The American Coalition for Clean Coal Energy donated $50,000 on March 5, 2014, bringing the total donated by interested parties to $150,000.

February 18, 2014: Hunton & Williams Lobbyist Roderick Hastie Emailed Oklahoma Deputy Solicitor General Clayton Eubanks About Intervening in New EPA Oil and Gas Well Regulation Related to Drinking Water. [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/12/07/us/politics/2-southern-and-hunton-williams-letters.html)]

February 18, 2014: Eubanks: “It Sounds Like A Comment Is In Order.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/12/07/us/politics/2-southern-and-hunton-williams-letters.html)]

February 19, 2014: American Petroleum Institute Donated $50,000 to RAGA. [Political MoneyLine, accessed 1/4/17]

February 21, 2014: Hastie Sent Draft Letter to Eubanks. [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/12/07/us/politics/2-southern-and-hunton-williams-letters.html)]

* Eubanks: “Thank You Rod!” [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/12/07/us/politics/2-southern-and-hunton-williams-letters.html)]

February 23-24, 2014: RAGA Held Winter National Meeting in Washington, D.C. [RAGA 2014 Calendar of Events, accessed 1/3/17]

February 24, 2014: Hunton & Williams Made an In Kind Donation of $4,298 to RAGA. [Political MoneyLine, accessed 1/3/17]

February 25, 2014: Hastie Emailed Eubanks to See If He Had Reached Out to Other States About the Draft. [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/12/07/us/politics/2-southern-and-hunton-williams-letters.html)]

February 25, 2014: Eubanks Sent Letter to 15 Attorneys General for Review; Email Stated Oklahoma Had Prepared Letter. [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/12/07/us/politics/2-southern-and-hunton-williams-letters.html)]

February 26, 2014: Eubanks Asked Hastie Where to Send Final Letter. [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/12/07/us/politics/2-southern-and-hunton-williams-letters.html)]

February 27, 2014: Edison Electric Institute Donated $25,000 to RAGA. [Political MoneyLine, accessed 1/4/17]

February 27, 2014: Edison Electric Institute Member DTE Energy Donated $25,000 to RAGA. [Political MoneyLine, accessed 1/4/17]

February 28, 2014: Oklahoma, Alabama, Michigan, Nebraska, South Carolina, Texas, and Wyoming Sent Letter to Environmental Protection Agency to Express Concern Over UIC Regulation. [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/12/07/us/politics/2-southern-and-hunton-williams-letters.html)]

February 28, 2014: Edison Electric Institute and American Coalition for Clean Coal Filed Comments Opposing EPA’s Draft UIC Regulation; Stated Guidance Could Have Unintended Negative Consequences. [Edison Electric Institute and American Coalition for Clean Coal Comments, [2/28/14](http://www.eei.org/issuesandpolicy/testimony-filings-briefs/Documents/140228ObenshainEpaUndergroundInjectionControl.pdf)]

February 28, 2014: API Did Not Want “Traditional [Enhanced Oil and Gas Recovery] Projects” to Be Affected by EPA Rule; API “Has A Strong Interest In The Development Of The Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program For Geologic Sequestration (GS) Wells.” [API Comments, [2/28/14]](https://environmentalnewsstand.com/sites/environmentalnewsstand.com/files/documents/apr2014/epa2014_0602c.pdf)

March 5, 2014: American Coalition for Clean Coal Donated $50,000 to RAGA. [Political MoneyLine, accessed 1/4/17]

# Pruitt Meeting Schedules

Under EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt’s leadership, the EPA has systematically weakened or repealed standards designed to protect clean air and water and provide basic public health protections. A review of Administrator Pruitt’s schedule found that he repeatedly held meetings with companies that would benefit from changing these standards prior to announcing a reversal in EPA policy. Pruitt continued to meet with those organizations after rules were finalized or proposed.

Key findings include are detailed below.

Clean Power Plan

In September 2017, the EPA announced a plan to replace the Clean Power Plan. In the months leading up to that announcement, Pruitt met with officials from the US Chamber of Commerce, utility executives, ACCCE, API, National Association of Manufactures, and Rosebud mining.

June 12: Meeting With U.S. Chamber Of Commerce At EPA.

June 19: Utility Executives Meeting At EPA.

June 29: Speaking Engagement: American Coalition For Clean Coal Electricity Board Meeting.

June 28: Meeting With American Petroleum Institute Directors At EPA.

June 23: Conference Call With Public Utility Group In Tulsa, Oklahoma.

June 20: Meeting With National Association Of Manufacturers.

Sept 27: Pruitt Held Meeting With Oklahoma Associations Of Electric Cooperatives.

October 10: Pruitt Held Meeting With Statoil.

October 25: Meeting With Rosebud Mining Company.

November 7: Meeting With Regulatory Improvement Council And Manufacturing Action Council.

November 6: Call With American Petroleum Institute.

October 30: Speaking Engagement: Interstate Mining Compact Commission.

WOTUS

In June 2017, the EPA moved to rescind the Waters of the United States Rule. Pruitt held more than a dozen meetings on WOTUS including site visits and roundtable discussions. Pruitt held WOTUS roundtable discussions in Alabama, Utah, Minnesota, Arkansas, South Carolina, Oklahoma, Indiana, Colorado, Iowa, North Dakota, Mississippi, and Nebraska.

June 27: Pruitt proposed rule to rescind Waters of the United States Rule.

July 7: Tour And WOTUS Event At Gully Branch Tree Farm In Cochran, Alabama.

July 13: WOTUS Call With State AGs.

July 18: Lunch And WOTUS Roundtable Discussion In Salt Lake City, Utah.

July 19: WOTUS Roundtable At Minnesota Agrigrowth Council In Minneapolis, Minnesota.

July 20: WOTUS Roundtable Hosted By Arkansas Poultry Federation In Little Rock, Arkansas.

July 24: WOTUS Roundtable, Tour And Press At Super-Sod Farm In Orangeburg, SC.

July 27: WOTUS Site Visit In Guymon, Oklahoma.

July 28: WOTUS Roundtable At OK Electric Cooperatives Association.

August 2: WOTUS Roundtable In Brownsburg, Indiana.

August 3: WOTUS Roundtable At Fraiser Ranch In Woodrow, Colorado.

August 8: WOTUS Roundtable In Des Moines, Iowa.

August 9: Pruitt Held WOTUS Roundtable In Fargo, North Dakota.

September 11: Pruitt Held WOTUS Briefing With Army Corps Of Engineers At EPA.

September 13: WOTUS Briefing With Army Corps Of Engineers At EPA.

October 12: Pruitt Held WOTUS Roundtable In Jackson Mississippi.

October 13: Pruitt Attended WOTUS Roundtable In Lincoln, Nebraska.

Phase 2 Fuel Efficiency Standards

On May 8, 2017, Pruitt met with Fitzgerald Truck Sales, which manufactures truck bodies without engines. Two months later, Pruitt announced the EPA would revisit Phase 2 Heavy-Duty regulations citing “significant issues raised” by the industry.

May 8: Meeting with Fitzgerald Truck Sales; EPA Headquarters.

June 14: Meeting With American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers Board.

June 28: Meeting With American Petroleum Institute Directors At EPA

July 17: Meeting With Valero

August 17: EPA Announced Intent To Revisit Provisions Of Phase 2 Heavy-Duty Rules.

Sept 20: Pruitt Held Meeting With Mack Trucks (Volvo Group) And Cummins.

Sept 20: Pruitt Held Meeting With Marathon Petroleum Corporation.

Sept 29: Pruitt Held Phone Call With American Petroleum Institute.

October 4: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement: Occidental Petroleum Board Of Directors Meeting.

October 10: Pruitt Held Meeting With Statoil.

October 19: Speaking Engagement: Texas Oil And Gas Association.

Mining

On May 1, 2017, Pruitt met with the CEO of Pebble Limited Partnership Tom Collier, a mining company looking to expand operations near Bristol Bay, Alaska. On the same day that Pruitt met with Collier, he directed the agency to withdraw protections so that Pebble could submit an application to mine in the area.

May 1: Pruitt met with Pebble Limited Partnership at EPA Headquarters.

May 1: Pruitt directed EPA to withdraw proposed protections for sensitive area in Bristol Bay so Pebble could submit application to mine in area.

August 3: Meeting And Tour With Cloud Peak Energy In Broomfield, Colorado.

Pesticide Applicators Rule

From May 4 to May 9, Pruitt met with the Southern Crop Production Association and the American Farm Bureau Federation. Within days, the EPA announced a 12 month delay in the implementation of the revised final Certification and Training of Pesticide Applicators (C&T) rule after Pruitt extended the rule, he participated in a string of meetings with agricultural interests. He met with Syngenta on May 15, the Western Growers on May 16, the North Dakota Agriculture Commissioner on May 18, the Kansas Farm Bureau on May 24, and spoke at the National Farm Bureau’s State Leadership meeting in Washington, DC on July 11. Pruitt continued meeting with the agricultural industry, including roundtables in Georgetown, Kentucky and Nashville, Tennessee. Pruitt took part in speaking engagements with the chemical industry, including the Louisiana Chemical Association and the American Chemistry Council.

May 4: Pruitt met with the Southern Crop Production Association.

May 9: Pruitt met with the American Farm Bureau Federation.

May 11: EPA extended the timeline for the implementation of the C&T Pesticide Applicators regulation.

July 12: Speaking Engagement: National Turkey Federation Annual Leadership Conference.

July 11: Speaking Engagement: National Farm Bureau's State Leadership Meeting.

October 9: Pruitt Held Agriculture Roundtable In Georgetown, Kentucky.

October 23: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement With Tennessee Farm Bureau In Nashville, Tennessee.

October 12: Pruitt Held Roundtable With Mississippi Farm Bureau At EPA Headquarters.

October 27: Speaking Engagement Louisiana Chemical Association.

November 9: Speaking Engagement: American Chemistry Council In Kiawah Island, SC.

Coal Power Plant Waste Water

From June 29 through August 3, Pruitt met with a number of mining interests, including the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity and Cloud Peak Energy. On August 14, the EPA announced that it would halt the implementation of current limits for wastewater from coal fired power plants, and reconsider the standard.

June 29:Pruitt spoke at the American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity Board Meeting.,

August 2: Pruitt attended an event at Liberty Mine in Boonville, Indiana.

August 3: Pruitt met with and toured Cloud Peak Energy.

August 14: The EPA announced that it would halt the implementation of current limits for wastewater from coal fired power plants, and reconsider the standard.

Methane Emissions

From April 3 to April 6, Pruitt met with Magellan Midstream Partners, which had an interest in rolling back EPA regulations limiting methane emissions at new oil and gas drilling sites. Less than two weeks later, the EPA halted implementation of that regulation. Pruitt continued to meet with interested parties including API, Texas Oil and Gas Association, and Phillips 66.

April 3:Pruitt met with Magellan Midstream Partners.

April 6: Pruitt met with First Energy.

April 19: Pruitt granted a reconsideration of the Oil and Gas New Source Performance Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources Rule.

April 21: Pruitt spoke at the National Association of Royalty Owners Convention in Norman, Oklahoma.

June 13: Pruitt met with Phillips 66.

August 25: Pruitt Held Meeting with Midstream Group In Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Sept 20: Pruitt Held Meeting With Marathon Petroleum Corporation.

Sept 29: Pruitt Held Phone Call With American Petroleum Institute.

October 10: Pruitt Held Meeting With Statoil.

October 19: Speaking Engagement: Texas Oil And Gas Association.

Toxic Discharge For Coal Fired Power Plants And Naaqs Compliance

From April 24 through May 22, Pruitt met with multiple mining interests and power companies, including the National Mining Association, Contura Energy, Duke Energy, and the Congressional Coal Caucus. On May 25, the EPA proposed to suspend the compliance dates for coal fired power plants to come into compliance with new limits on toxic discharge (fly ash, bottom ash, flue gas wastewater, and gasification wastewater) as required under the Clean Water Act. In addition, two weeks later, EPA announced that it would extend the deadline for the 2015 ozone NAAQS designations, giving states more time to develop air quality plans as required under NAAQS and providing them with “additional flexibilities” to comply with the ozone standard. In June 2017, Pruitt met with utility executives at EPA and spoke at the ACCCE board meeting.

April 24: Pruitt spoke at the National Mining Association’s Spring Board of Directors Meeting and attended the executive committee meeting.

May 18: Pruitt met with Tennessee based coal mining company Contura Energy.

May 19: Pruitt met with Kentucky’s Secretary of Energy and Environment at EPA Headquarters.

May 22: Pruitt called Duke Energy and White Stallion Energy.

May 22: Pruitt spoke to Congressional Coal Caucus.

May 25: The EPA proposed to suspend the compliance dates for coal fired power plants to come into compliance with new limits on toxic discharge as required under the Clean Water Act.

June 6: The EPA announced that it would extend the deadline for the 2015 ozone NAAQS designations.

June 19: Utility Executives Meeting At EPA.

June 29: Speaking Engagement: American Coalition For Clean Coal Electricity Board Meeting.

October 25: Meeting With Rosebud Mining Company.

Nitrogen Dioxide Standard

From April 26 through June 28, Pruitt met with multiple oil and gas interests, including the American Petroleum Institute, the American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, and the American Exploration and Production Council. All of these entities had an interest in ensuring that new limits on nitrogen dioxide emissions were not implemented. Nitrogen dioxide is a pollutant from burning fossil fuels and comes primarily from vehicles, power plants and industrial facilities. On July 14, the EPA proposed keeping the current standard for nitrogen dioxide emissions in place.

April 26: Pruitt met with the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission.

April 26: Pruitt met with Alabama Power and Power South.

May 2: Pruitt met with the American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers.

May 2: Pruitt met with the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers.

May 4: Pruitt met with the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

May 24: Pruitt spoke to the American Exploration and Production Council.

May 25: Pruitt met with the International Association of Drilling Contractors at EPA Headquarters

May 25: Pruitt spoke at the U.S. Oil & Gas Association Board of Directors and Executive Committee Annual Meeting.

June 14: Pruitt met with the American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers Board.

June 28: Pruitt met with the American Petroleum Institute.

July 14: The EPA announced that it would maintain the current standard for nitrogen dioxide emissions.

Waters of the United States

From April 26 through May 23, Pruitt met with a number of companies potentially impacted by the Waters of the United States rule (WOTUS), including Newtrient, a dairy waste management company; Frontier Water Systems and Reliable One Resources, both of which are wastewater treatment companies; and the Alliance to Restore our Waterways, a group representing parties potentially responsible for groundwater contamination. A month later, the EPA rescinded WOTUS.

April 26: Pruitt met with Newtrient.

April 27: Pruitt met with the Alliance to Restore our Waterways.

May 5: Pruitt met with the National Rural Water Association.

May 16: Pruitt met with Frontier Water Systems.

May 23: Pruitt met with Reliable One Resources.

June 27: EPA announced that it would rescind the Water of the United States rule.

Key meetings include:

**Business And Industry**. Pruitt held at least 45 meetings, calls, or speaking engagements with business or industry groups from May 25 to November 9, 2017. Meetings included: the US Chamber of Commerce, American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers Board, National Association Of Manufacturers, API, ACCCE, Valero, Marathon Petroleum, Delta Airlines, Occidental Petroleum Board of Directors, Statoil, Walmart, Texas Oil And Gas Association, Rosebud Mining Company, and the American Chemistry Council.

**Waters Of The United States**. Pruitt held more than a dozen meetings on WOTUS including site visits and roundtable discussions. Pruitt held WOTUS roundtable discussions in Alabama, Utah, Minnesota, Arkansas, South Carolina, Oklahoma, Indiana, Colorado, Iowa, North Dakota, Mississippi, and Nebraska.

**Political Meetings**. Pruitt held various political meetings, calls, and speaking engagements including: The Heritage Foundation, the Federalist Society, former Majority Leader Trent Lott, the Tea Party Patriots, Conservative Action Project, Americans For Tax Reform, Manhattan Institute, and Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke.

**Elected Representatives**. Pruitt has held at least 20 calls or meetings with various state governors; 13 meetings or calls with members of the Senate; and 8 meetings or calls with members of the House of Representatives.

**Notable Meetings**. Pruitt met with CIA Director Mike Pompeo at CIA Headquarters on July 12. Pruitt held only four meetings with community or tribal groups only one meetings with an environmental group (Chesapeake Bay Commission on August 1).

### Business and Industry Meetings

**November 9: Speaking Engagement: American Chemistry Council In Kiawah Island, SC**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**November 8: Speaking Engagement And Reception: SIGMA, Chicago Illinois**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**November 7: Meeting With Regulatory Improvement Council And Manufacturing Action Council**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**November 6: Call With American Petroleum Institute**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 30: Speaking Engagement: Interstate Mining Compact Commission**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 27: Pruitt Took Part In Business Roundtable**. According to the calendar for EPA Administrator, Pruitt took part in a business roundtable in New Orleans, Louisiana. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 27: Speaking Engagement Louisiana Chemical Association**. According to the calendar for EPA Administrator, Pruitt had a speaking engagement at the Louisiana Chemical Association/Louisiana Chemical Industry Alliance in New Orleans, Louisiana. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 25: Meeting With Rosebud Mining Company.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 24: Pruitt Met With Plains All American Pipelin**e. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 23: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement With BG Products In Nashville, Tennessee**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 20: Pruitt Met With Union Pacific**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 19: Speaking Engagement: Texas Oil And Gas Association**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 18: Pruitt Met With Walmart**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 18: Pruitt Met With Rubicon Global**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 16: Pruitt Met With Green Plains**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 10: Pruitt Held Meeting With Statoil**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 9: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement With Whayne Supply In Hazard, Kentucky**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 6: Pruitt Held Roundtable Discussion And Speaking Engagement With Arizona Manufacturers Council**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 5: Pruitt Held Roundtable Discussion And Speaking Engagement With National Association Of Home Builders In Colorado Springs, Colorado**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 4: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement: Occidental Petroleum Board Of Directors Meeting In Washington, DC**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 4: Pruitt Took Tour Of General Electric's Additive Technology Center In West Chester, Ohio**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 29: Pruitt Held Phone Call With American Petroleum Institute**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 29: Pruitt Held Meeting With Delta Airlines**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 27: Pruitt Held Meeting With Oklahoma Associations Of Electric Cooperatives**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 26: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement: AGC Leadership Conference**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 26: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement: Williams Board In Washington DC.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 25: Pruitt Held Meeting With Concordia**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 25: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement: National Stone, Sand And Gravel Association In DC**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 20: Pruitt Held Meeting With Mack Trucks (Volvo Group) And Cummins**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 20: Pruitt Held Meeting With Marathon Petroleum Corporation**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 17: Meeting With Valero**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 17: Meeting With Uranium Producers**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 13: Meeting With Boeing And GE**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 12: Roundtable With Commerce Lexington**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 11: Meeting With Smithfield's Foundation**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 29: Speaking Engagement: American Coalition For Clean Coal Electricity Board Meeting**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 28: Meeting With American Petroleum Institute Directors At EPA**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 23: Conference Call With Public Utility Group In Tulsa, Oklahoma**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 20: Meeting With National Association Of Manufacturers**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 20: Speaking Engagement: BCIU Roundtable Discussion**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 19: Meeting With Healthy Partners Group**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 19: Utility Executives Meeting At EPA**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 14: Meeting With American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers Board**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 13: Meeting With Phillips 66**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 12: Meeting With U.S. Chamber Of Commerce At EPA**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

### WOTUS Meetings

**October 20:** **Pruitt Attended WOTUS Roundtable In Lincoln, Nebraska**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 12:** **Pruitt Held WOTUS Roundtable In Jackson Mississippi**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 13:** **WOTUS Briefing With Army Corps Of Engineers At EPA**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 11:** **Pruitt Held WOTUS Briefing With Army Corps Of Engineers At EPA**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 9:** **Pruitt Held WOTUS Roundtable In Fargo, North Dakota**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 8:** **WOTUS Roundtable In Des Moines, Iowa**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 3:** **WOTUS Roundtable At Fraiser Ranch In Woodrow, Colorado**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 2:** **WOTUS Roundtable In Brownsburg, Indiana**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 28:** **WOTUS Roundtable At OK Electric Cooperatives Association**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 27:** **WOTUS Site Visit In Guymon, Oklahoma**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 24:** **WOTUS Roundtable, Tour And Press At Super-Sod Farm In Orangeburg, SC. [**EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 20:** **WOTUS Roundtable Hosted By Arkansas Poultry Federation In Little Rock, Arkansas**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 19:** **WOTUS Roundtable At Minnesota Agrigrowth Council In Minneapolis, Minnesota**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 18:** **Lunch And WOTUS Roundtable Discussion In Salt Lake City, Utah**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 13****: WOTUS Call With State AGs.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 7:** **Tour And WOTUS Event At Gully Branch Tree Farm In Cochran, Alabama**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 6: WOTUS Site Visit With Alabama Farm Federation In Morrisville, Alabama**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 27: WOTUS Withdrawal Signing**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June: EPA Moved To Rescind WOTUS**. According to a press release, “The Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Army, and Army Corps of Engineers (the agencies) are proposing a rule to rescind the Clean Water Rule and re-codify the regulatory text that existed prior to 2015 defining ‘waters of the United States’ or WOTUS. This action would, when finalized, provide certainty in the interim, pending a second rulemaking in which the agencies will engage in a substantive re-evaluation of the definition of ‘waters of the United States.’ The proposed rule would be implemented in accordance with Supreme Court decisions, agency guidance, and longstanding practice. ‘We are taking significant action to return power to the states and provide regulatory certainty to our nation’s farmers and businesses,’ said Administrator Scott Pruitt. ‘This is the first step in the two-step process to redefine ‘waters of the U.S.’ and we are committed to moving through this re-evaluation to quickly provide regulatory certainty, in a way that is thoughtful, transparent and collaborative with other agencies and the public.’” [EPA, [6/27/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-us-army-move-rescind-2015-waters-us)]

### Agriculture Meetings

**October 23: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement With Tennessee Farm Bureau In Nashville, Tennessee**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 12: Pruitt Held Roundtable With Mississippi Farm Bureau At EPA Headquarters**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 9: Pruitt Held Agriculture Roundtable In Georgetown, Kentucky**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

* **1990: Pruitt Earned A Bachelor’s Degree In Communications And Political Science At Georgetown College**. According to the Oklahoma Attorney General’s office, “He earned a bachelor’s degree in communications and political science at Georgetown College before being accepted to the University of Tulsa College of Law.” [Oklahoma Attorney General, about Scott Pruitt, accessed [3/15/17](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/profile.html); LinkedIn, accessed [3/15/17](https://www.linkedin.com/in/e-scott-pruitt-3b771653/)]

**July 12: Speaking Engagement: National Turkey Federation Annual Leadership Conference**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 11: Speaking Engagement: National Farm Bureau's State Leadership Meeting**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

### Political Meetings

**November 3: Meeting With Department Of Justice**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 31: Meeting With Inspector General Arthur Elkins**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 26: Pruitt Spoke At OECA Criminal Investigation Division SAC Planning Meeting**. According to the calendar for EPA Administrator, Pruitt had a Speaking Engagement: OECA Criminal Investigation Division SAC Planning Meeting at EPA headquarters. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 17: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement At The Heritage Foundation**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 13: Pruitt Was Part Of Principals Meeting At The White House**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 11: Call With Secretary Ross**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 10: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement: Combined Federal Campaign (CFC) Kick-Off Event.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 10: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement With Water Infrastructure Stakeholders At The White House**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 28: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement: The Federalist Society In New York, New York**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 28: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement: American Opportunity Alliance In New York, New York**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 27: Pruitt Held Meeting With Former Majority Leader Trent Lott At EPA**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 22: Pruitt Held Meeting With Tennessee Valley Authority**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 22: Pruitt Held Lunch With George Sifakis At The White House.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 22: Pruitt Attended Meeting With Tea Party Patriots At The White House**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 19: Pruitt Speaking Engagement: Concordia Summit In New York, New York.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 13: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement:** **Conservative Action Project In DC**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 13: Pruitt Held Meeting With** **Americans For Tax Reform In DC.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 13: Pruitt Held Meeting With Oklahoma State Chamber**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 13: Pruitt Attended ACYL Honors Event In DC**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 12: Breakfast With Secretary Ross At The White House** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 1: NEC Principals Meeting At The White House**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 17: Made In America Event At The White House**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 12: Meeting Director Pompeo At CIA Headquarters**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 12: NEC Infrastructure Principals Meeting At The White House.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 11: Speaking Engagement: Americans For Tax Reform In DC**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 10: Meeting With Americans For Tax Reform At EPA**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 30: Speaking Engagement: Manhattan Institute**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 29: POTUS Energy Dominance Summit**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 6: Meeting With Secretary Zinke.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 2: Meeting With Arkansas Attorney General**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 2: White House Press Event**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 1: White House Event**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

#### Governors

**October 24: Pruitt Met With Iowa Governor Reynolds**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 23: Pruitt Met with Governor Bill Haslam In Nashville, Tennessee**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 20: Pruitt Met With Governor Rickets Of Nebraska In Lincoln, Nebraska**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 19: Pruitt Held Call With Governor Herbert (UT).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 6: Meeting With Governor Ducey (AZ) In Phoenix, Arizona**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 8: Call With Governor Rossello (PR).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 22: Call With Governor Walker (WI).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 9: Lunch With Governor Burgum (ND), Senator Hoeven (ND), And Representative Cramer (ND). [**EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 8: Meeting With Governor Reynolds (IA).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 2: Meet With Governor Holcomb And Officials In Indianapolis, Indiana.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 31: Call To Governor Abbott (TX).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 28: Meeting With Governor Fallin In Oklahoma City, Oklahoma**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 21: Call With Governor Cooper (NC).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 28: Meeting With Governor Ricketts (NE).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 28: Meeting With Governor Reynolds (IA).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 20: Meeting With Governor Asa Hutchinson (AR) In Little Rock, Arkansas**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 19: Meeting With Governor Dayton (MN) And John Stein (President Of ECOS) In Minneapolis, Minnesota**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 18: Meeting With Governor Herbert (UT) And Staff In Salt Lake City**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 17: Superfund Calls With Governors**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 2: Call With Governor Hogan (MD).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

#### Senators

**October 26: Pruitt Had Breakfast With Senator Pat Toomey**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 24: Pruitt Held Separate Calls With Senators Manchin And Capito Of West Virginia**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 18: Breakfast With Senator Sullivan (AK).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 17: Meeting With Senator Grassley (IA).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 16: Lunch With Senator Grassley (IA), Senate Dining Room.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 11: Call With Senator Ernst (IA**). [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 11: Call With Senator Moran (KS).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 4: Call With Senator Barrasso (WY).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 4: Call With Senator Grassley (IA)**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 29: Phone Call With Senator Sullivan (AK).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 7: Call With Senator Nelson (FL).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 11: Meeting With Senator Fischer (NE).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 26: Phone Calls With Senator Gardner (CO), Senator Udall (CO), Governor Hickenlooper (CO), Representative Tipton (CO).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

#### Representatives

**November 7: Call With Representative LaHood (IL).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 13: Lunch With Representative Shimkus (IL).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 4: Call With Representative Walden (OR).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**November 7: Call With Representative LaHood (IL).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 1: Call With Representative Neal (MA).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 11: Call With Representative Calvert (CA).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 29: Call With Representative Young (AK).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 13: Call With Representative McCarthy (CA).** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

#### Ambassadors and Foreign Dignitaries

**October 25: Pruitt Met With Moroccan Ambassador**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 20: Pruitt Held Meeting With Taiwan Minister Of The Environment**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 19: Meeting With South Korean Ambassador**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

### State Visits and Travel

**October 9: Pruitt Held Energy Dominance Roundtable In Hazard, Kentucky**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 25: Pruitt Held Meeting With Noble Research Institute In Oklahoma City, Oklahoma**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 25: Pruitt Held Meeting with Midstream Group In Oklahoma City, Oklahoma**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 25: Pruitt Held Meeting with Oklahoma Legislatures In Oklahoma City, Oklahoma**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 10: Pruitt Attended Northern Texas Water District Board Meeting Om Wylie, Texas**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 10: Pruitt Tour Of Toyota Headquarters In Plano, Texas.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 10: Pruitt Held Meeting With Dallas Chapter Of The Association Of Homebuilders**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 9: Pruitt Lunch With Governor Burgum (ND), Senator Hoeven (ND), And Representative Cramer (ND) In Fargo, ND.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 9: Farm Stops With Commodity Groups In Grand Forks, ND**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 9: Tour And Roundtable At North Dakota's Energy And Environment Research Center**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 8: Meeting With Governor Reynolds (IA) In Des Moines, Iowa. [**EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 4: Tour Of Gold King Mine In Silverton, Colorado**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 3: Meeting And Tour With Cloud Peak Energy In Broomfield, Colorado**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 2: Tour Of Mike Starkey Farms And Media Interviews In Brownsburg, Indiana**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 2: Event At Liberty Mine In Boonville, Indiana**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 26: Phillips 66 Tour In Bartlesville, Oklahoma**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 26 Tulsa Roundtable Hosted By Chamber Of Commerce In Tulsa, Oklahoma**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**July 18: Ranch Tour & Conservatory In Park City, Utah**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 23: Tour And Meeting With Ardagh In Sapulpa, Oklahoma**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**May 26: Tour Bird Creek Site In Osage County, Oklahoma**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

### International Travel

**June 11: Bilateral Meeting With Japanese Minister Of Environment In Bologna, Italy**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 11: G7 Environmental Summit General Session in Bologna, Italy**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 11: G7 Environmental Ministers Group Photo In Bologna, Italy**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 11: Bilateral Meeting With German Minister Of Environment In Bologna, Italy**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 10: Meeting With U.S. Embassy Staff in Bologna, Italy**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 10: Food Loss And Waste Event With Italian Minister Of Environment In Bologna, Italy.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 10: Bilateral Meetings With Italian, British, And Canadian Minister Of Environment In Bologna, Italy.** [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 10: Meet And Greet With U.S. Private Sector And University Delegation In Bologna, Italy**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 10: G7 Welcome Reception In Bologna, Italy**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 9: Meeting With Archbishop Gallagher In Rome, Italy**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 9: Judicial Roundtable With Italian Court Of Appeals In Rome, Italy**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 9: Meeting With Cardinal Tomassi In Rome, Italy**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 7: Meeting With US Embassy In Rome**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 7: Round Table With Business Leaders On Environmental Innovation In Rome, Italy**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

### Community Groups

**November 6: Meeting With Franciscan Action Network**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 19: Roundtable With San Jacinto Community Groups**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**October 11: Pruitt Held Speaking Engagement With National Tribal Operational Meeting At EPA**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 12: Pruitt Held Meeting With National Geographic**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 1: Chesapeake Bay Commission Leadership Meeting**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**June 28: Tribal & State Energy Presentation Roundtable Discussion At The White House**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

### Hurricanes

**September 15: Pruitt Held Briefing And Tour Of Superfund Sites In Houston, Texas**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**September 14: Pruitt Held WOTUS Briefing With Army Corps Of Engineers**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 30: Pruitt Held Meeting With Corpus Christi Mayor And City/County Officials In Corpus Christie, Texas**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**August 30: Pruitt Held Tour Of The Debris At J.C. Elliott Transfer Station, Port Of Corpus Christi EOC, And Joint Command Center In Corpus Christie, Texas**. [EPA, Calendar for Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/17/17](https://www.epa.gov/senior-leaders-calendars/calendar-scott-pruitt-administrator)]

**Pruitt as Attorney General**

**2010: Scott Pruitt Was Elected Attorney General Of Oklahoma.** According to Scott Pruitt’s website, “Scott Pruitt was elected the Attorney General of Oklahoma in November 2010. As attorney general, he is dedicated to fighting corruption, safeguarding Oklahoma’s vulnerable citizens, championing public safety measures to reduce violent crime and protecting the interests of the State of Oklahoma and its citizens. Pruitt established Oklahoma’s first federalism unit to combat unwarranted regulation and overreach by the federal government.” [Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/28/16](https://www.ok.gov/oag/Media/About_the_AG/)]

* **“Pruitt Filed The First Lawsuit Challenging The Implementation Of The Affordable Care Act, And Is A Leading Advocate Against The EPA’s Activist Agenda.”** According to Scott Pruitt’s website, “He is a national leader in the cause to restore the proper balance of power between the states and federal government, having served two terms as president of the Republican Attorneys General Association. Pruitt filed the first lawsuit challenging the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, and is a leading advocate against the EPA’s activist agenda.” [Scott Pruitt, accessed [11/28/16](https://www.ok.gov/oag/Media/About_the_AG/)]

## Background

### Environmental Positions

**Pruitt Said Wind Power Could Use Federal Eminent Domain Laws To Build Power Lines**. According to The Journal Record, “In the fight to build power lines from the Oklahoma Panhandle to Tennessee, Clean Line Energy Partners has a new foe. Attorney General Scott Pruitt claimed the wind power developer could use federal eminent domain laws to acquire land in Oklahoma, and his office fired a salvo at the plan by pushing legislation in the opening weeks of the session.” [The Journal Record, 3/3/15]

**2013: Pruitt Opposed Regional Water Pact In Oklahoma**. According to The Journal Record, “Pruitt’s brief is the third filed in the Supreme Court case this year. In January, the TRWD filed its argument. A short time later, the U.S. Office of the Solicitor General filed its argument. Both of those documents urge the high court to return the case to the 10th Circuit for another hearing. In Oklahoma’s brief, Pruitt said arguments from the TRWD and the United States were flawed. ‘Tarrant should not get a new opportunity to change positions, not least because the United States’ theory shares many of the same flaws as Tarrant’s,’ Pruitt said in the brief. Pruitt also seeks to shoot down the argument that the Red River Compact allows states to claim water from within the borders of another state.” [The Journal Record, 3/22/13]

**2013: Pruitt Sought Delay For Public Hearing On Electric Utility Environmental Plan**. According to The Journal Record, “A public hearing over a Tulsa electric utility’s environmental plan is still on, despite a request by Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt to delay it. Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality officials said no to Pruitt’s request on Friday. In a letter to Steven A. Thompson, DEQ executive director, Pruitt asked for a delay in a hearing regarding Public Service Company of Oklahoma’s proposed environmental compliance plan with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. ‘The public hearing scheduled for Monday is still on,’ said Skylar McElhaney, DEQ spokeswoman, in an email to The Journal Record.” [The Journal Record, 5/17/13]

* **Pruitt: “It Seems Unlikely That Any Economic Impact Or Environmental Benefit Statement Compiled By DEQ Would Be Accurate.”** According to The Journal Record, “Pruitt, citing Title 27 of state statutes regarding ‘Economic Impact- Environmental Benefit Statement,’ said a state environmental agency has to determine the economic effects and environmental benefit of a permanent rule. Pruitt said his office did not have updated cost information from PSO’s revised rate plan. ‘It seems unlikely that any economic impact or environmental benefit statement compiled by DEQ would be accurate,’ Pruitt wrote. ‘Based on the above, I respectfully request that DEQ delay the public meeting scheduled cost information from PSO’s revised rate plan.’” [The Journal Record, 5/17/13]
* **“Tulsa-Based PSO, A Unit Of Ohio-Based AEP, Sought To Move Forward With The Hearing On Its Tentative Settlement With The EPA And The Sierra Club.”** According to The Journal Record, “Tulsa-based PSO, a unit of Ohio-based AEP, sought to move forward with the hearing on its tentative settlement with the EPA and the Sierra Club. Last fall, PSO filed an application with the Corporation Commission asking for approval of a plan to meet the requirements of that settlement.” [The Journal Record, 5/17/13]
* **“The PSO Will Reduce Sulfur Dioxide Emissions By 75 Percent Along With Other Pollutants That Cause Health Problems.”** According to The Journal Record, “The PSO will reduce sulfur dioxide emissions by 75 percent along with other pollutants that cause health problems, said Whitney Pearson, an associate field organizer for the Oklahoma chapter of the Sierra Club. The PSO has also asked the commission for preapproval to recover $350 million in costs associated with the proposed settlement. The OCC must review the compliance actions and later rule on proposed rate changes stemming from that settlement once it is approved by regulators.” [The Journal Record, 5/17/13]

**2010: Pruitt Campaigned Against CO2 Regulations While Candidate For Attorney General**. According to an article in the Journal Record, “And the race, he said, is all about freedom. ‘Fundamentally, this race is all about freedom,’ Pruitt said. ‘The steps being taken on the national level over health care, the EPA aggressively indicating they will regulate CO2 without cap and trade law being passed and the laws proposed that would affect community banks are all threats to our freedom. With the command and control approach coming out of Washington, the most potent and relevant place to do something is the AG’s office.’” [Journal Record, 9/20/10]

**2010: Pruitt Pledged To Protect Water As AG**. According to an article in the Journal Record, “Additionally, Pruitt said he would work to protect the state’s natural resources. ‘Water is going to be a huge issue. Look at the water study being conducted across the state. Over the next 50 to 75 years, that study is going to be very, very important. Water ownership, we see from a tribal perspective, is going to be very important in protecting our state’s interests. ‘The AG’s office, he said, requires a conservative.” [Journal Record, 9/20/10]

### Philosophy

**Pruitt Said He Was Will Challenge What He Calls The Federal Government’s Aggressive Challenges To The Constitution**. According to the Lawton Constitution, “Scott Pruitt said that as Oklahoma ‘s attorney general, he will challenge what he calls the federal government’s aggressive challenges to the Constitution. Pruitt, a constitutional attorney by training, is a Republican candidate for the seat being vacated by longtime Attorney General Drew Edmondson, who is running for governor.” [The Lawton Constitution, 5/7/10]

**Pruitt Said Fighting For State’s Rights Was Most Important Role As Oklahoma AG**. According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt says fighting to make sure federal officials don’t exceed their constitutional authority may be the most important role he plays as Ok-lahoma’s attorney general. Elected as just the second Republican attorney general in state history in No-vember 2010, Pruitt has quickly gained a national reputation for his Don Quixote-like advocacy of federal-ism and relentless efforts to challenge any federal law or action that he sees as an infringement on individu-al liberties or states’ rights.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 10/7/12]

### Transparency

**“Pruitt Tried Three Times To Push Passage Of A Sunshine Law That Would Have Opened To Public Scrutiny The Attorney General's Process Of Contracting With Private Attorneys.”** According to the Lawton Constitution, “He has other interests as well, explaining he believes in governmental transparency. As a state senator, Pruitt tried three times to push passage of a Sunshine law that would have opened to public scrutiny the attorney general's process of contracting with private attorneys. While his efforts were unsuccessful, Pruitt said his years in the Senate do help him understand the dynamics between the Legislature and state offices.” [The Lawton Constitution, 5/7/10]

**Pruitt Wanted “An Open And Transparent Process” At Office As AG Candidate**. According to the Oklahoman, “Pruitt said increasing transparency in state government is important and he would institute a policy to re-quire disclosure of private attorneys being retained by the state. Currently, there is no requirement that agencies seek competitive bids when hiring outside counsel. ‘It needs to be an open and transparent process,’ Pruitt said. ‘Oklahomans need to know who they are retaining and how much they are paying them.’” [The Oklahoman, 7/18/10]

### Sue and Settle at EPA

**Pruitt Sued EPA To Gain Records In Sue And Settle FOIA**. According to Journal Record Legislative Report, “Attorneys general for a dozen states, including Oklahoma, filed a federal lawsuit Tuesday seeking access to records related to cases in which they allege quick settlements indicate collaboration between the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and environmental groups. ‘It’s regulation through litigation, which is an abuse of the judicial process,’ Attorney General Scott Pruitt said. Pruitt referred to the situation as the EPA’s ‘sue and settle’ strategy.” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 7/16/13]

**Pruitt Said EPA Consent Decrees Affect Due Process**. According to Journal Record Legislative Report, “Pruitt said that when a consent decree is approved that binds the EPA to take actions not authorized by Congress, ‘that affects our due process. ‘He said it also damages the cooperative federalism that has historically marked the relationship between the federal government and the states in such matters since the EPA was established. It seems suspect, the attorney general said, when a lawsuit over a complex environmental issue is settled the day it is filed.” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 7/16/13]

**Pruitt Sought Documents On EPA ‘Sue And Settle’ Strategy As Oklahoma AG**. According to The Edmond Sun, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt and 12 other attorneys general are seeking documents related to the EPA’s purported ‘sue and settle’ strategy with environmental groups. The request, sent under the Freedom of Information Act, is in response to multiple lawsuits filed by environmen-tal organizations against the federal government during the past three years, according to the attorneys general.” [The Edmond Sun, 8/11/12]

* **Pruitt Filed FOIA Request For Greenpeace, Defenders Of Wildlife, Wildearth Guardians, Sierra Club And The AFL-CIO And EPA**. According to The Edmond Sun, “The FOIA letter requests electronic and print documents involving organiza-tions that include Greenpeace, Defenders of Wildlife, WildEarth Guardians, Sierra Club and the AFL-CIO. In some instances, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency entered a consent decree the same day the lawsuit was filed, demonstrating prior knowledge, Pruitt said.” [The Edmond Sun, 8/11/12]
* **Pruitt: “The EPA Is Making Backdoor Deals With Environ-Mental Groups To Push Their Agenda On The American People While Bypassing The States And Congress We Need To Know.”** According to The Edmond Sun, “Pruitt said his office is investigating the pervasiveness of the purported tactic and requested documents to help in that effort. ‘If the EPA is making backdoor deals with environ-mental groups to push their agenda on the American people while bypassing the states and Congress we need to know,’ Pruitt said. ‘This appears to be a blatant strategy by the EPA to go around the process and bend the rules to create environmental regulations that have failed in Congress.’” [The Edmond Sun, 8/11/12]
* **Pruitt: “This Appears To Be A Blatant Strategy By The EPA To Go Around The Process And Bend The Rules To Create Environmental Regulations That Have Failed In Congress.”** According to The Edmond Sun, “Pruitt said his office is investigating the pervasiveness of the purported tactic and requested documents to help in that effort. ‘If the EPA is making backdoor deals with environ-mental groups to push their agenda on the American people while bypassing the states and Congress we need to know,’ Pruitt said. ‘This appears to be a blatant strategy by the EPA to go around the process and bend the rules to create environmental regulations that have failed in Congress.’” [The Edmond Sun, 8/11/12]

**Pruitt: “This Apparent Practice By The EPA To Engage In Friendly Lawsuits In Order To Circumvent The Law Is Disturbing.”** According to Tulsa World, “‘This apparent practice by the EPA to engage in friendly lawsuits in order to circumvent the law is disturbing,’ Pruitt said. ‘The outcomes of these settlements have a very real effect on families, businesses, communities and state economies.’ EPA spokeswoman Enesta Jones would not comment directly on the Pruitt letter nor a notice of intent to sue filed by the northeastern states.” [Tulsa World, 5/7/13]

### Other Issues of Note as Oklahoma AG

**Pruitt Defended Ten Commandment Statue At Oklahoma State Capital.** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Pruitt’s office also defended the Ten Commandments monument on the grounds of the state Capitol. The Oklahoma Supreme Court ruled 7-2 last week that the monument violated Article II, Section 5 of the state constitution.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 7/5/15]

**Pruitt Was Happy To See Works Comp Reform In 2013**. According to The Daily Ardmoreite, “The significant change to the system is that it will change from a judicial system to an administrative system, similar to 48 other states. Pruitt said under the judicial system, workers’ comp had become an industry, and with new changes, it would place power with the stakeholders, business owners and employees. ‘I authored workers’ comp legislation in 2000 and 2001 geared toward this reform,’ he said. ‘I’m glad to see we have crossed the finish line.’” [The Daily Ardmoreite, 7/31/13]

**Pruitt And Oklahoma Only State To Opt Out Of Mortgage Settlement**. According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Oklahoma was the only state to opt out of the $25 billion settlement that attorneys general in 49 states negotiated with the five mortgage servicers after Pruitt voiced concerns that the settlement talks had strayed too far from compensating wronged consumers and more into the realm of housing policy. In March 2011, Pruitt joined with the attorneys general of Alabama and Nebraska to object to some of settlement negotiations, including loan reductions for underwater borrowers.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 5/12/13]

**Pruitt Wanted Separate Settlement For Oklahoma In In Nationwide Foreclosure Settlement**. According to The Journal Record, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt is actively seeking a separate settlement agreement for the state with some of the nation’s largest banks in connection with the foreclosure practices probe that attorneys general from all 50 states launched last year. ‘Attorney General Pruitt has in-structed his public protection team to craft a settlement that is specific to Oklahoma’s concerns of punish-ing bad actors while respecting the appropriate role of attorneys general,’ Pruitt’s office said in a written statement. ‘This alternative to the current proposed term sheet could provide other states with a model to consider. ‘“ [The Journal Record, 4/27/11]

**Pruitt Said He Was Elected AG To “Push Back Against Obamacare.”** According to The Oklahoman, “‘The people of Oklahoma, I think, have sent a very strong and clear message that they want an advocate in the attorney general’s office, an advocate that’s willing to give meaning to the Constitution and to push back against Obamacare,’ Pruitt said.” [Associated Press, 11/3/10]

**Pruitt Sued Federal Government Over Affordable Care Act As AG**. According to The Associated Press, “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt on Friday made good on his campaign promise to join the fight against the federal health care law. Pruitt, a Republican, filed a lawsuit against the federal government de-signed to work in concert with a slew of lawsuits by other states also challenging the constitutionality of the nation’s overhauled health care laws. Oklahoma’s law-suit seeks to have parts of the health care law ruled unconstitutional in order to prevent the entire law from being enforced. Pruitt said it includes strengthened arguments based on the federal government’s responses to the other lawsuits.” [Associated Press, 11/3/10]

**Pruitt Opposed Lead Ammunition Ban While Candidate For Oklahoma AG**. According to an article in the Lawton Constitution, “Attorney General candidate Scott Pruitt said a lead ban under consideration by the Environmental Protection Agency is alarming and a perfect example of why he would create an office to respond to the federal government aggressive challenges to the Constitution. Pruitt was at Lawton ‘s Republican headquarters Friday to discuss a petition filed in early August by five environmental groups that want the EPA to ban lead from ammunition and fishing tackle. Pruitt said he had met with Lawton business leaders earlier in the day to discuss the business climate and this proposed ban would definitely affect business in Oklahoma, while being a gross infringement on constitutional rights.” [The Lawton Constitution, 8/28/10]

RAGA Chairman

**Pruitt Served As Chairmen Of Republican Attorneys General Association (RAGA) For Two Terms.** According to Scott Pruitt’s LinkedIn, Pruitt has served as chairmen of Republican Attorneys General Association (RAGA) for two terms. According to his LinkedIn, “Under his leadership, attorneys general have come together to advance policies and legal strategies that protect the interests of their states from an overly intrusive federal government, with a particular focus on domestic energy security and production. Pruitt has led the charge with repeated notices and subsequent lawsuits against the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for their leadership’s activist agenda and refusal to follow the law.” [Scott Pruitt LinkedIn, accessed [11/28/16](https://www.linkedin.com/in/e-scott-pruitt-3b771653)]

**2012-2014: Scott Pruitt Elected Twice As Chairman of the Republican Attorneys General Association.**  [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [2/25/13](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/3E67F1CEE13BC090862572B2005AD559/D7D0CEB8FCE468C886257B1D007738BE)]

**2014-2015: Scott Pruitt Was on the Executive Committee of RAGA.** [RAGA, accessed [12/20/16](http://www.republicanags.com/raga_announces_leadership)]

**Pruitt Refused To Answer Question On RAGA Donations**. Senator Cardin asked, “What assurances can you provide the public, particularly vulnerable communities at greatest risk from pollution, that you will represent their interests fairly as administrator when your personal political campaigns, as well as organizations that you have held leadership positions within - like the Republican Attorneys General Association, has received hundreds of thousands of dollars in contributions from the fossil fuel industry because of your working championing their interests by challenging laws regulating these industries?” According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I explained in my testimony to the Committee, I am a firm believer in the EPA’s mission to protect the environment and look forward to the opportunity lead the agency to help provide our future generations with a better and healthier environment for all Americans.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Unaware Of Who Donated To RAGA**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “Records of fundraising for that organization are kept with the staff of the Republican Attorneys General Association, and are also disclosed on campaign finance reports filed by that entity. I am not aware how much money has been donated to RAGA or from whom.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Served As Chairman Of The Republican Attorney Generals Association From November 2011 To November 2013**. Pruitt wrote, “I served as Chairman of the Republican Attorney Generals Association from November 2011 to November 2013. These dates represent "two terms" of serving as Chairman. Thereafter, I was a member of the Executive Committee from November 2013 to November 2015. I made all required disclosures to OGE and EPA ethics counsel, including disclosures about my relationship to RAGA.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Made Fundraising Calls For RAGA**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “I did receive call sheets to solicit funds and/or event sponsorships for RAGA and I did make contact with the listed people/entities. The exact dates, the purpose, and who was called are records that are kept by RAGA, and those requests would need to be made to RAGA. Similarly, I do not have records of how much money or sponsorships were raised as a result - those records are kept by the Republican Attorneys General Association.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “No One Else Working On My Behalf Has Solicited Funds For RAGA.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “No one else working on my behalf has solicited funds for RAGA. In addition to call sheet efforts, I have asked for funds from individuals/entities in person for RAGA. Records of exact dates, names of individuals and entities and how much money was solicited are kept by the staff of RAGA.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Did Not Remember Attending Meetings At 2015 RAGA Summit**. When asked, “In 2015, you were on the agenda to speak on a panel entitled, “The Dangerous Consequences of the Clean Power Plan and other EPA Rules” during RAGA's National Summer meeting that included several fundraisers. The agenda for that meeting included private meetings with attorneys general and Murray Energy, Southern Company, and American Fuel Petrochemical Manufacturers. According to RAGA’s 2015 and 2016 member benefits descriptions, donors that contribute $50,000 or more have an “annual opportunity to lead private briefings with Republican attorneys general during RAGA events” and attend other private events, including private dinners and retreats, at which Republican attorneys general are present. Did you or any person working on your behalf attend any of the private meetings with Murray Energy, Southern Company, and/or the American Fuel Petrochemical Manufacturers during the 2015 Summer National RAGA meeting? If yes, please provide a list of meeting attendees, any minutes/notes taken, and describe any conversations about EPA matters.” Scott Pruitt wrote, “I do not recall which meetings I attended at the event you reference.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Did Not Recall Meeting With Any Co-Plaintiffs Or Amici During RAGA Meetings**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “I do not recall private meetings or functions with a co-plaintiff or amici while at a RAGA event, and do not know of any instance where a person working on my behalf attended such a meeting. In instances where a case is being litigated, counsel for each plaintiff or amici will routinely speak about matters related to the litigation, as court rules and other procedural matters often require such communications.”

[Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Did Not Track Free Flights Paid For By RAGA**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “Yes, I recall I was a passenger on a chartered flight to and from Las Vegas, Nevada in the fall timeframe of 2014. RAGA has covered the cost of flights and accommodations for me when I have attended RAGA meetings. I do not keep itemized records of these expenses, flights and accommodations are booked directly by RAGA staff.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

RAGA Campaign Finance

Pruitt has raised roughly $3.5 million more from fossil fuel interests while serving in the leadership of the Republican Attorney Generals Association. In addition, Pruitt created the Rule of Law Defense Fund, which, as a 501(c)(4), allows corporations to make unlimited contributions that will be hidden from public disclosure. In 2014, *The New York Times* noted that the Fund was targeting major companies in the energy sector. A review of campaign finance documents indicate that the Rule of Law Defense Fund made regular cash transfers to RAGA’s 527.

* **RAGA Raised $3,443,491 from Fossil Fuel Interests While Pruitt Was In Leadership, Between 2013 and 2016.** [CQ MoneyLine, Republican Attorneys General, accessed 12/20/16]
	+ **2012-2014: Scott Pruitt Elected Twice As Chairman of the Republican Attorneys General Association.**  [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [2/25/13](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/3E67F1CEE13BC090862572B2005AD559/D7D0CEB8FCE468C886257B1D007738BE)]
	+ **2014-2015: Scott Pruitt Was on the Executive Committee of RAGA.** [RAGA, accessed [12/20/16](http://www.republicanags.com/raga_announces_leadership)]
	+ **Pruitt Was Rule Of Law Defense Fund Chairman From November 2015 Until November 2016**. According to the Executive Branch Personnel Public Financial Disclosure Report, Scott Pruitt was a member of the Board of Directors of the Rule of Law Defense Fund from November 2016 to December 2016 and Chairman from November 2015 until November 2016. Pruitt was also a board member from April 2014 until November 2015. [Executive Branch Personnel Public Financial Disclosure Report, OGE Form 278e, [12/16/16](https://extapps2.oge.gov/201/Presiden.nsf/PAS%2BIndex/AF6B16678D423328852580A1002C747F/%24FILE/Pruitt%2C%20Edward%20Scott%20%20%20final278.pdf)]

Rule of Law Defense Fund

**Pruitt Was Rule Of Law Defense Fund Chairman From November 2015 Until November 2016**. According to the Executive Branch Personnel Public Financial Disclosure Report, Scott Pruitt was a member of the Board of Directors of the Rule of Law Defense Fund from November 2016 to December 2016 and Chairman from November 2015 until November 2016. Pruitt was also a board member from April 2014 until November 2015. [Executive Branch Personnel Public Financial Disclosure Report, OGE Form 278e, [12/16/16](https://extapps2.oge.gov/201/Presiden.nsf/PAS%2BIndex/AF6B16678D423328852580A1002C747F/%24FILE/Pruitt%2C%20Edward%20Scott%20%20%20final278.pdf)]

**Pruitt Served On Rule Of Law Defense Fund Board From April 2014 To November 2016**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “I served on the Board of Directors of the Rule of Law Defense Fund from April 2014 until November 2016. I served as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Rule of Law Defense Fund from November 2015 to November 2016.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Was Rule Of Law Defense Fund Chairman Of The Board From November 2015 Until November 2016**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “I served on the Board of Directors of the Rule of Law Defense Fund from April 2014 until November 2016. I served as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Rule of Law Defense Fund from November 2015 to November 2016.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Have No Knowledge Of Whether The Freedom Partners’ Donation Was The Largest Contributor To Rule Of Law Defense Fund.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I have no knowledge of whether the Freedom Partners’ donation was the largest contributor to Rule of Law Defense Fund. I have resigned as Chairman and as a board member, and those records are kept by the staff of Rule of Law Defense Fund. RLDF’s policies at the time I was a board member were that donors did not have any say with respect to the fund’s activities.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Denied Any Role In Founding Or Forming The Rule Of Law Defense Fund**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “I did not play a role in founding or forming the Rule of Law Defense Fund, and no one on my staff played such a role.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Claimed No Knowledge Of RLDF Donors**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “My understanding from the time I was a member of that entity’s board is that its staff operates the fund. A list of contributors to the Fund since its inception is in the custody of RLDF and I do not personally have records of or have knowledge of that information. Expenditures by the fund are in the custody of RLDF, and I do not personally have records of or have knowledge of that information. Any records relating to requests for funding to individuals or to corporate entities would be in the possession of RLDF. RLDF has paid for flights and accommodations when I attended RLDF events or panel discussions.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Am Not Aware Of What Steps May Have Been Taken By The Rule Of Law Defense Fund In Preparing Or Coordinating Letters.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am not aware of what steps may have been taken by the Rule of Law Defense Fund in preparing or coordinating letters. Day to day operations of the Rule of Law Defense Fund are delegated to staff of the organization. I am unaware of any role by RAGA in preparing or coordinating release of letters. My understanding is that such letters are typically released by the office who took the lead on preparing the letter. I am unaware of any corporate funder of either RAGA or RLDF having any role in preparing or coordinating the release of letters signed by my office.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “During My Time As Chairman Of Rule Of Law Defense Fund, I Cannot Ever Recall A Time When ‘Corporate Donors’ Participated In A Meeting Of The Executive Committee.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “During my time as Chairman of Rule of Law Defense Fund, I cannot ever recall a time when ‘corporate donors’ participated in a meeting of the executive committee, including board meetings, phone calls or retreats during which EPA matters were discussed. However, members and funders of the Rule of Law Defense Fund were invited to attend large group panel discussions hosted by RLDF where several EPA matters were discussed. Any records of attendees at those meetings would be in the possession of the Rule of Law Defense Fund staff.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Do Not Recall Receiving Gifts With A Value Of More Than $100 From RAGA And/Or RLDF.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I do not recall receiving gifts with a value of more than $100 from RAGA and/or RLDF. I have, as stated before, had travel and accommodations provided for me when I traveled to and from RAGA or RLDF meetings.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

Illinois River Cleanup

**Pruitt Said Oklahoma Did Not Revise Phosphorous Standards As Part Of Illinois River Deal**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “The ‘Statement of Joint Principles and Actions’ did not require Oklahoma to ‘revise’ its criterion, but rather stated that ‘Oklahoma will reevaluate Oklahoma’s .037 mg/l criterion for total phosphorus in Oklahoma’s Scenic Rivers by 2012, based on the best scientific information available at that time, and with the full, timely inclusion of officials from the State of Arkansas representing both point and non point source dischargers.’ As of 2012, which was the final date for the reevaluation to occur, Arkansas maintained its objection that Oklahoma’s .037 mg/l criterion was inappropriate, and not based on the best scientific information available at that time. Rather than protract a now decades long dispute that appeared to again be headed towards litigation once again, I instead negotiated an agreement whereby Arkansas agreed to be finally bound to the results of a new study that would use the best scientific information available at the time to determine the appropriate criterion. This agreement avoided the prospect of more litigation, and ultimately resolved the dispute (with Oklahoma getting the stringent standard that it wanted).” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Refused Comment On Actions In The Tyson Food Case.** According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “It would not be appropriate for me as an attorney to comment on the acceptableness or reasonableness of the actions of a judge before whom the Office of the Attorney General has a pending case.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Refused To Provide Records On Arkansas-Oklahoma Water Quality Litigation**. Pruitt was asked by Senator Cardin, “Please provide all communications you had had with representatives of agricultural and other companies regarding water quality litigation between Arkansas and Oklahoma. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “Such communications can be requested from the Oklahoma Office of the Attorney General through a request made to that office pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Records Act.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

Oklahoma Environmental Enforcement

**Pruitt Said It Was Misleading To Claim He Defunded Environmental Protection Unit**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “With regard to the environmental protection unit, it is misleading to say that it was “defunded.” Consistent with the practice of every Attorney General save one, I determined that a standalone unit was operationally inefficient. I opted to combine the Environmental Protection Unit and the Consumer Protection Unit into a single unit called the “Public Protection Unit.” The Public Protection Unit continued the work of the Environmental Protection Unit, and that work continues to this day, headed by the very same attorney who worked in the Environmental Protection Unit under the prior Attorney General.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Claimed No Knowledge Of Consent Orders From AG Office To Oklahoma Department Of Environmental Quality**. Senator Cardin asked, “Please provide a list of water treatment plants under consent order from the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality during your tenure as Attorney General. Please identity funding sources other than federal funding that are available to bring these treatment plants into compliance with the Clean Water Act.” According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “This question should be directed to the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, as I have no personal knowledge of such matters.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said There Were No Changes To Responsibilities Of Attorneys Who Were Reorganized When Environmental Investigative Unit Was Shuttered**. Scott Pruitt wrote, “My office continues to employ attorneys vested with responsibilities related to environmental protection, including the attorney who served as the lead attorney on the previous attorney general’s ‘environmental protection unit.’ That attorney’s responsibilities remain unchanged (he has been promoted, in fact), and he pursues exactly the kind of cases that he pursued under the previous attorney general. The only thing that changed was the internal organization of those vested with those responsibilities, because I concluded (consistent with the practices of every attorney general in the State’s history but for my immediate predecessor) that it was not operationally efficient to have a separate unit for such work. Thus, I chose to house that work in the Office’s Public Protection Unit and then later in the Solicitor General’s Unit.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

Key Environmental Lawsuits

Since taking office in 2010, Pruitt has sued the EPA and the Department of the Interior repeatedly. A brief summary of key cases is below.

**Oklahoma Sued EPA Often, Succeeded Rarely.** “Of course, this is far from the first time Pruitt is crying foul about federal overreach, or maybe he’s crying wolf. ‘Off the top of my head, I can’t think of a time, recently, when Oklahoma has been successful in taking the EPA to court,’ Whitney Pearson with the Sierra Club’s Beyond Coal Campaign in Oklahoma says. She tries to remember all the times Pruitt has sued the EPA since taking office in 2011. ‘Like, the cross-state air pollution rule, which they were not successful on, the mercury and air toxics protections that they were also not successful on, and then regional haze,’ Pearson says. The U.S. Supreme Court in May decided not to hear Oklahoma’s challenge to the regional haze rule. The state has also joined other states’ lawsuits against the EPA, like in the yet-to-be-decided Texas vs. EPA case over the federal agency’s authority to regulate greenhouse gasses. Pruitt has also sued EPA for being sued — by environmental groups like the Sierra Club.” [State Impact, [6/12/14](https://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2014/06/12/court-losses-wont-deter-attorney-general-scott-pruitt-in-his-fight-with-the-epa/)]

**Courts Often Deferred to EPA on Matters of Science, But Pruitt Believed Suits Were Worth Investment.** “Some cases are pending. Some Pruitt lost. But notice there are, so far, no wins in that list of cases. University of Texas environmental law professor Thomas McGarity explains why: ‘How the courts tend to come out — though not always — is to defer to EPA on these matters of scientific judgment,’ McGarity says. But Pruitt says fighting these court battles is worth the effort even if he doesn’t win. Take the regional haze case: ‘The court put a stay in place, preventing our utility companies from having to spend two-plus billion dollars,’ Pruitt says. ‘That saved us three years of costs, and oh by the way I think led to some alternative plans that were perhaps more accommodating.’” [State Impact, [6/12/14](https://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2014/06/12/court-losses-wont-deter-attorney-general-scott-pruitt-in-his-fight-with-the-epa/)]

**Scott Pruitt’s Lawsuits Against the EPA Rarely Succeeded.** “As Oklahoma attorney general, Scott Pruitt, President-elect Donald Trump’s pick to lead U.S. EPA, built a record of filing politically charged lawsuits against the agency. Almost all of those lawsuits failed. Since Pruitt became attorney general in 2011, the Republican has used the office to launch an offensive against EPA as well as other major Obama administration policies, including the Affordable Care Act. But a review of those lawsuits by E&E News shows Pruitt lost the majority of those cases, some of which were quickly tossed by federal judges. Pruitt’s most significant win was the Supreme Court’s decision to put President Obama’s landmark greenhouse gas emissions program on hold. But legal experts say his primary argument — that EPA was overstepping constitutional limits and trampling states’ rights — is unlikely to prevail.” [E&E News, [12/8/16](http://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2016/12/08/stories/1060046900)]

* **Case Western University Law Professor Jonathan Adler: “The Fact That A Lot Of His Suits Have Been Unsuccessful Indicates Nothing More Than It's Hard To Challenge Environmental Regulations In Court. If The EPA Is Doing Its Job, It Should Win The Vast Majority Of Cases.”** [E&E News, [12/8/16](http://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2016/12/08/stories/1060046900)]

Pruitt Statements on Lawsuits

**Pruitt: “I Do Not Expect Any Previous Lawsuits To Adversely Affect My Performance As EPA Administrator.”** According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “Because I will follow the guidance of ethics officials and my own professional responsibilities in determining whether and how to participate in a particular matter, I do not expect any previous lawsuits to adversely affect my performance as EPA Administrator if confirmed.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Claimed To Have “Participated Personally And Substantially” In Ten Lawsuits Against EPA**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “As Attorney General of Oklahoma, I have participated personally and substantially in the following suits against the EPA:

• EME Homer City Generation v. EPA, No. 12-1182 (U.S.S.C.)

• Michigan v. EPA, No. 14-46 (U.S.S.C.)

• Murray Energy Corp. v. EPA, Nos. 14-1112, 14-1151 (D.C. Cir.)

• Murray Energy Corp. v. EPA, Nos. 15-1385, 15-1392, 15-1490, 15-1491 & 15-1494 (D.C. Cir.)

• Oklahoma v. EPA, Nos.12–9526, 12–9527 (10th Cir.)

• Oklahoma ex rel. Pruitt v. EPA, No. 16-5038 (10th Cir.).

• Oklahoma ex rel. Pruitt v. McCarthy, No. 15-cv-369 (N.D. Okla.).

• Oklahoma v EPA, No, 13-cv-00726 (W.D. Okla.)

• West Virginia v. EPA, No. 14-1146 (D.C. Cir.)

• West Virginia v. EPA, No. 16-1264 (D.C. Cir.)”

[Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would Not Say If He Personally Believed Everything Filed In EPA Briefs As AG**. When asked, “When filing briefs for Oklahoma in the Mercury and Air Toxics Standard litigation, Clean Power Plan litigation, and other litigation against EPA that you joined as Attorney General, were you just advocating for a client? Or do you continue to believe all the positions argued in your briefs are correct?” Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I stated in my testimony to the committee, all legal positions that I took in my capacity as Attorney General for the State of Oklahoma were in an advocacy capacity. If confirmed as Administrator, I will consider all matters presented to me with an open mind and will work to reach conclusions that are reflected in the administrative record of each matter and that comport with Congress's intent in enacting the Act.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Refused To Answer Question About David Rivkin Contributions And Clean Power Lawsuit**. When asked by Senator Markey in questions submitted for the record about relationship between David Rivken Jr. and the Clean Power Plan lawsuit Scott Pruitt wrote, “Information relating to the contract can be requested from the Office of Attorney General through a request made pursuant to Oklahoma's Open Records Act. A full list of contributors to my campaigns for the state senate and attorney general may be found at the Oklahoma Ethics Commission's websites.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Said David Rivkin Did Not Receive Outside Funds For Representing State In CPP Lawsuit**. According to questions submitted for the record in the Scott Pruitt confirmation hearing, Pruitt said David Rivkin represented the state of Oklahoma in their Clean Power Plan lawsuit. Pruitt denied that Rivkin received any funds from outside sources. [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, pg. 111, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “Mr. Rivkin Received No Compensation From The Office For The Legal Services He Provided.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am not aware of any such requirements. In any event, Mr. Rivkin received no compensation from the Office for the legal services he provided.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Am Unaware Of Any Payments Made To Mr. Rivkin From Any Other Parties.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I am unaware of any payments made to Mr. Rivkin from any other parties in return for his representation.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “I Cannot Recall The Exact Circumstances Leading To Mr. Rivkin’s Representation, Or Who Initiated The Contact.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “I cannot recall the exact circumstances leading to Mr. Rivkin’s representation, or who initiated the contact. Mr. Rivkin has represented over half of our Nation’s states on various matters, and is a well-recognized expert on constitutional questions, particularly those relating to States and their federalism interests.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

*Recusal*

**Pruitt Recused Himself From Clean Power Plan And WOTUS Suits.**According to E&E News, “U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt has recused himself from several cases that he pursued against the agency as Oklahoma attorney general. Pruitt has signed a recusal statement, dated yesterday, which was obtained by E&E News under the Freedom of Information Act. The four-page document lays out several lawsuits pending before the agency that Pruitt has agreed to step away from during his tenure as EPA chief. ‘This recusal statement addresses all of my ethics obligations,’ Pruitt said in the statement. Pruitt said he would not participate for one year after his Senate confirmation in matters involving certain parties, including the state of Oklahoma and the Rule of Law Defense Fund, a public policy group involving Republican attorneys general that targeted environmental rules. In addition, Pruitt has recused himself from a dozen pending cases involving EPA, including high-profile litigation over the Clean Power Plan and cases in both federal appeals and district courts over the controversial Clean Water Rule.” [E&E News, [5/8/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/05/05/stories/1060054153)]

* **Scott Pruitt “Waited Until The Last Second” To Recuse Self From Hearings.**According to The Last Word With Lawrence O’Donnell (MSNBC), “Tonight E&E News, which covers an environmental policy signed by Scott Pruitt, it is dated yesterday. And it says, quote, it addresses all of my ethics obligations. E&E indicates that Scott Pruitt t will now recuse himself from a dozen pending cases involving especially parks including the clean power plan, in cases both federal appeals and district courts over the clean water rule. So if this is what it appears to be, that means we know what those ethics officials told administrator Scott Pruitt he had to do. But it appears he waited until the very last second to let anybody know that he is actually doing it.” [The Last Word With Lawrence O’Donnell (MSNBC), 5/5/17]

**Pruitt Previously Said He Would Not Recuse Himself From Litigation Pending Before The EPA**. According to questions submitted to the record Scott Pruitt wrote, “As a lawyer, I am bound by the rules of professional conduct not to “switch sides” in any litigation in which I represented the State of Oklahoma, unless my former client gives its informed consent.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt Would “Follow The Advice Of EPA Ethics Counsel In All Recusal Matters.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “As I stated in my testimony to the Committee, I will follow the advice of EPA Ethics Counsel in all recusal matters.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “EPA Administrator I Will Recuse From Participation In Litigation In Matters In Which I Represented The State Of Oklahoma, Unless I Receive Informed Consent From The State Of Oklahoma.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “As EPA Administrator I will recuse from participation in litigation in matters in which I represented the State of Oklahoma, unless I receive informed consent from the State of Oklahoma and the permission of relevant federal ethics officials. It is my understanding that recusal obligations do not extend to regulatory rulemaking of general applicability, which does not create a conflict under applicable rules.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

**Pruitt: “It Is My Understanding That Recusal Obligations Do Not Extend To Regulatory Rulemaking Of General Applicability.”** Scott Pruitt wrote, “It is my understanding that recusal obligations do not extend to regulatory rulemaking of general applicability, which does not create a conflict under applicable rules. In any matters involving specific parties where I believe that my impartiality may be questioned, I will consult with relevant federal ethics officials to determine whether to participate in a particular matter, provide them with all relevant facts, and follow their guidance. Following these procedures, along with all the other commitments I have made to comply with applicable ethics rules, will ensure that I discharge my duties impartially.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, Questions for the Record, 1/18/17]

2011: Cross-State Air Pollution Rule

**EME Homer City Generation, L.P., et al., v. United States Environmental Protection Agency, et al. (11-1302; 11-1182).** On April 29, 2014, the Supreme Court reversed and remanded the opinion of the lower court, ruling in favor of the EPA. On July 28, 2015, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit reconsidered the rule 6-2, upholding most of the regulation while rejecting arguments by several of the petitioners. [11-1302; 11-1182, accessed 12/6/16]

Coverage

**2011: Oklahoma Joined States to Sue EPA Over Cross-State Pollution Rule.** “September 2011: Oklahoma joins other states in challenging an EPA regulation of power-plant air pollution that crosses state lines. In 2014, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the cross-state air pollution rule, which is scheduled to take effect in May 2017.” [Tulsa World, [12/8/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/courts/pruitt-lawsuits-other-actions-taken-against-epa/article_c2b975d2-0df0-5e6c-aa8b-ce6d1758ea9e.html)]

**2014: Supreme Court Ruling on Cross-State Air Could Impact Oklahoma Power Plants.** “A U.S. Supreme Court ruling on emissions from power plants reaching other states could affect several electric generating plants in Oklahoma for part of the year. In a 6-2 ruling, the Supreme Court on Tuesday upheld the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule. Oklahoma is covered by a supplemental part of the rule on nitrogen oxides that can cause ozone in the summer months. The rule covers upwind emissions from power plants and their downwind effects on other states. Twenty-eight states, mostly in the eastern and central parts of the country, are affected in some way by the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule. The Supreme Court decision reversed an earlier ruling from an appellate court in the District of Columbia. The ruling sends the case back to the lower court for further action.” [Oklahoman, [4/29/14](http://newsok.com/u.s.-supreme-court-ruling-on-emissions-could-affect-oklahoma-coal-plants/article/4744359/?page=1)]

* **Pruitt: “Congress Passed Environmental Laws Giving States Primacy In This Instance And Others, But Over The Years Has Deferred Its Authority To Federal Agencies Like The EPA, Which Have Rushed In To Fill The Vacuum And Expand Their Authority. Until Congress Reclaims Its Oversight And Authority, It Makes It Even More Important For States Like Oklahoma And My Office To Continue Our Efforts To Fight The Attempts Of Federal Agencies To Ignore The Law And Encroach Upon State Sovereignty.”** [Oklahoman, [4/29/14](http://newsok.com/u.s.-supreme-court-ruling-on-emissions-could-affect-oklahoma-coal-plants/article/4744359/?page=1)]

**D.C. Appeals Court Found Errors With Parts of Cross-State Air Regulation; Did Not Toss Out Entire Rule.** “A federal court today sent part of U.S. EPA’s landmark rule meant to curb air pollution drifting across state lines back to the agency but upheld the rule against broader challenges by state and industry petitioners. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit found that EPA had erred in its 2014 budgets for sulfur dioxide and ozone pollution in several states. While it did not vacate the budgets, the court sent them back to EPA for reconsideration. Circuit Judge Brett Kavanaugh wrote the ruling. EPA’s budgets ‘have required states to reduce pollutants beyond the point necessary’ to achieve air quality improvements in downwind areas, Kavanaugh wrote. The court rejected other arguments by states and local petitioners that the agency did not have the authority to put in place federal plans for 22 states. The court also rejected challenges to the models used by EPA to create the rule.” [E&E News, [7/28/15](http://www.eenews.net/stories/1060022546/)]

2011, 2012: Regional Haze Rule

**State of Oklahoma ex rel. Scott Pruitt v. Lisa P. Jackson. (5:11-cv-00605-F).** On May 31, 2011, the State of Oklahoma filed a lawsuit for injunctive and declaratory relief against Lisa Jackson, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency. Plaintiffs alleged that the EPA had illegally promulgated a Regional Haze Federal Implementation Policy before considering Oklahoma’s State Implementation Policy. On January 5, 2012, the court dismissed the claims without prejudice “for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.” [5:11-cv-00605-F, accessed 12/7/16]

**State of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers v. United States Environmental Protection Agency and Lisa Jackson (Appellate Case: 12-9526).** On February 24, 2012, the State of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers filed a petition to review the final EPA’s final Regional Haze Rule. On May 27, 2014, the Supreme Court of the United States denied a request to consider an appeal of the case. [Appellate Case: 12-9526, accessed 12/7/16]

Coverage

**Pruitt Said Regional Haze Rule Was About Aesthetics**. According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Among the rules Pruitt is fighting is regional haze, which governs power plant emissions that affect visibility at national parks and wilderness areas. Pruitt said regional haze is about aesthetics, not safety and health. Because of that, it is unique among environmental laws in that it allows states to do cost-benefit analyses for compliance. Pruitt said the state’s plan for regional haze, which was rejected by EPA, reached compliance 15 years earlier than the 2064 deadline.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 8/23/13]

**Pruitt: “According To The Clean Air Act, It Is The Responsibility Of The State To Create A Plan To Improve Visibility And Reduce Regional Haze In Wildlife Areas, And We Are Intent On Preserving That Right.”** According to Journal Record Legislative Report, “‘According to the Clean Air Act, it is the responsibility of the state to create a plan to improve visibility and reduce regional haze in wildlife areas, and we are intent on preserving that right,’ said Pruitt. ‘By ignoring Oklahoma’s plan, the EPA not only usurped the right of Oklahoma to set its own energy policy, but violated the process required by the Regional Haze Rule.’” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 5/31/11]

**2011 Regional Haze Lawsuit: Pruitt Acknowledged That The Cost Estimate Came From Data Developed By Utility Companies And Other Groups.** According to Journal Record Legislative Report, “Pruitt acknowledged that the cost estimate came from data developed by utility companies and other groups. He said industry officials have said the federal plan could require adding costly scrubbers to every coal-fired power plant in the state.” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 5/31/11]

**Pruitt Said Federal Requirements For Regional Haze Plans, Which He Said Are Aesthetic In Nature, Allow Consideration Of Cost-Benefit Analyses**. According to Journal Record Legislative Report, “The attorney general said federal requirements for regional haze plans, which he said are aesthetic in nature, allow consideration of cost-benefit analyses.” [Journal Record Legislative Report, 5/31/11]

**2011: Pruitt: “Let The EPA Be Put On Notice, As Attorney General, I Plan To Do All That I Can To Protect And Preserve The State’s Authority And Responsibility Under The Clean Air Act To Craft And Implement Solutions For Our State.”** “Attorney General E. Scott Pruitt, while at a National Attorneys General Summit in Washington D.C., today responded to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s announcement they will reject Oklahoma’s State Implementation Plan, crafted to address the EPA rules on Regional Haze. ‘The State Implementation Plan was a thoughtful and well-crafted plan that will achieve greater visibility within the timeline than was mandated by the Regional Haze rule,’ said Pruitt. ‘The action taken today by the EPA inappropriately usurps the state’s authority to dictate our own energy and environmental policies. The appropriate stakeholders to address Oklahoma’s energy and environmental needs are Oklahoma’s citizens, energy producers, industry consumers and policymakers. ‘Let the EPA be put on notice, as Attorney General, I plan to do all that I can to protect and preserve the state’s authority and responsibility under the Clean Air Act to craft and implement solutions for our state,’ said Pruitt.” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [3/7/11](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=15179)]

**2011: Pruitt Sued EPA Over Regional Haze Rule that Would Impact Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. and American Electric Power-Public Service Company of Oklahoma.** “May 2011: As Oklahoma Attorney General, Scott Pruitt sues the EPA, alleging that the federal agency violated its own procedures in rejecting a state plan to reduce regional haze at three coal plants. In May 2014, the U.S. Supreme Court declined to review Pruitt’s challenge of the EPA’s plan for reducing haze. The EPA’s plan is designed to reduce pollution from coal-fired power plants and industrial sources to improve visibility at federally managed wilderness areas such as the 59,000-acre Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge near Lawton. It would target coal-fired power plants operated by Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. at Red Rock and Muskogee and another operated by American Electric Power-Public Service Company of Oklahoma at Oologah.” [Tulsa World, [12/8/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/courts/pruitt-lawsuits-other-actions-taken-against-epa/article_c2b975d2-0df0-5e6c-aa8b-ce6d1758ea9e.html)]

**2011: Pruitt Announced Lawsuit Against EPA Over Regional Haze Rule.** “Attorney General Scott Pruitt today filed a lawsuit against the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, challenging the agency’s denial of Oklahoma’s proposed implementation of a plan to reduce regional haze in the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge. ‘According to The Clean Air Act, it is the responsibility of the state to create a plan to improve visibility and reduce regional haze in wildlife areas, and we are intent on preserving that right,’ Pruitt said. ‘By ignoring Oklahoma’s plan, the EPA not only usurped the right of Oklahoma to set its own energy policy, but violated the process required by the Regional Haze Rule.’…In March, EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson informed the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality that the federal government planned to implement their own regional haze plan. Based on the latest estimates, the federal plan may increase Oklahoma utility rates 13 percent to 20 percent over three years.” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [6/1/11](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=15166)]

**2011: Pruitt Sued The EPA Over Air Pollution Cleanup Plan, Oklahoma Gas & Electric Joined The Lawsuit.** According to the Journal Record, “Oklahoma’s cleanup plan has been contentious. The EPA rejected the state’s plan in March 2011, and the federal agency began developing one for Oklahoma to follow. Public Service Company of Oklahoma began to work with the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality and the office of the secretary of energy and the environment, upgrade one of its coal-fired power plants and add more wind power to the grid. In the meantime, Attorney General Scott Pruitt sued the federal agency, and Oklahoma Gas & Electric joined the lawsuit. Pruitt eventually lost the lawsuit. The U.S. Supreme Court denied Pruitt’s appeal, declining on May 27 to hear the case. OG&E is creating a plan to meet federal guidelines. That ruling shows the high court is willing to uphold EPA rules, Vaught said. She said there is a good chance Texas will also fight the EPA’s plan to clean up the Lone Star State’s air pollution.” [Journal Record, 11/24/14]

* **Oklahoma Gas And Electric Lawsuit Failed In Court, The Company Faced Compliance Under Federal Plan For Regional Haze.** According to the Daily Oklahoman, “Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. faces compliance under the federal plan for regional haze after unsuccessfully fighting it in the courts along with Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt. DEQ spokeswoman Erin Hatfield said the agency is reviewing Costello's letter.” [Daily Oklahoman, 7/16/14]

**2011: Pruitt Planned to Appeal EPA’s Decision to Institute Federal Regional Haze Plan in Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge.** “Attorney General Scott Pruitt said he will appeal today’s decision by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to institute a federal regional haze plan in the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge. The decision goes against Oklahoma’s right to implement a state plan that will allow a more gradual transition that meets the standards of the rule, and spares Oklahoma utility consumers substantial rate increases. ‘As Attorney General, it is my job to preserve Oklahoma’s right to formulate a state plan that meets the standards of the Regional Haze Rule. The Clean Air Act clearly recognizes that Oklahomans, and not federal bureaucrats, are best situated to determine energy and environmental policies,’ Pruitt said. ‘This action by the Obama Administration once again ignores the state’s ability to craft an Oklahoma solution. We will continue to fight this intrusion by appealing today’s decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit.’” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [12/14/11](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=15118)]

**2013: Pruitt Disappointed on U.S. Tenth Circuit Panel Decision to Uphold Regional Haze Rule.** “‘We disagree and are disappointed with the panel’s 2-1 decision. We will continue to fight to preserve the ability of Oklahoma stakeholders to create an Oklahoma solution and to protect Oklahoma consumers from excessive and unnecessary utility costs,’ Attorney General Scott Pruitt said. ‘We are reviewing the decision and considering our options.’” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [7/19/13](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=13144)]

**2013: A Divided Appeals Court Upheld A Costly Federal Plan Opposed By Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt And Oklahoma Gas And Electric Co. To Reduce Pollutants From Two Oklahoma Power Plants.** According to the Daily Oklahoman, “A divided appeals court Friday upheld a costly federal plan opposed by Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt and Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. to reduce pollutants from two Oklahoma power plants. The 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled 2-1 that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency was within its authority to reject a state pollution-control plan for the plants and instead impose a more stringent plan. The coal-burning plants near Pawnee and Muskogee emit large amounts of pollutants that cause haze and damage air quality in a multistate region. The emissions are subject to EPA regulations for haze and other types of pollution under the federal Clean Air Act.” [Daily Oklahoman, 7/20/13]

* **“Pruitt And OG&E Had Asked The Denver-Based Court To Overturn The EPA Plan, Contending The Agency Usurped The State’s Authority And That The Plan Will Require Unnecessary, Sizable Expenditures On Scrubber Technology.”** According to the Daily Oklahoman, “Pruitt and OG&E had asked the Denver-based court to overturn the EPA plan, contending the agency usurped the state’s authority and that the plan will require unnecessary, sizable expenditures on scrubber technology. The EPA plan would cost the utility, and ultimately its customers, much more than the state plan. Pruitt and OG&E contend the EPA plan would cost more than $1 billion in the next five years. EPA contends that figure is grossly exaggerated. At issue in the case are parts of the federal Clean Air Act meant to protect visibility at certain national parks and wildlife areas.” [Daily Oklahoman, 7/20/13]

**2013: Pruitt Planned to Ask for Rehearing Before Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals Over Regional Haze Case.** “Attorney General Scott Pruitt Wednesday announced the state’s plan to ask for a rehearing before the full Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals in Oklahoma’s Regional Haze case against the EPA. In July, a three-judge panel voted 2-1 in favor of the federal agency. ‘We strongly disagree with the judges’ decision and the basis for their findings. As Judge Kelly said in his dissenting opinion, the EPA misrepresented the facts, made assumptions and provided no factual support for its conclusions,’ General Pruitt said. ‘Regional Haze is about aesthetics, not health, and states have a say in how the regulations are implemented. Part of that role is considering the cost to our consumers.’” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [8/22/13](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=13035)]

* **Pruitt: “We Want Our Wildlife Areas To Continue To Be Places Where Oklahomans Can Enjoy The Outdoors With Their Families And Friends. Oklahoma Stakeholders Created A Common Sense Plan That Would Accomplish That Goal And Improve Our Environment Without Forcing Oklahomans To Pay Unnecessary Costs. The EPA Exceeded Its Authority Under The Law By Imposing Their Federal Plan In Oklahoma.”** [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [8/22/13](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=13035)]

**2013: Oklahoma Gas And Electric And Pruitt Requested In A Filing That All The Active Judges On The 10th Circuit Court Of Appeals Revisit A Lawsuit Against The Federal Environmental Protection Agency And The Sierra Club.** According to the Journal Record, “The state’s top lawyer and a major utility have asked an appellate court for a rehearing in an air pollution case. On Tuesday, Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. and Attorney General Scott Pruitt requested in a filing that all the active judges on the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals revisit a lawsuit against the federal Environmental Protection Agency and the Sierra Club. But it's unlikely the 10th Circuit Court will grant the hearing, said legal scholar and professor Gary Allison.” [Journal Record, 9/4/13]

**2013: Oklahoma Gas and Electric and Pruitt Vowed to Continue Regional Haze Despite Uphill Battle. “**Oklahoma’s attorney general and Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co. are continuing their legal fight against a federal plan for regional haze, asking for a full review of an appellate decision that went against them in July. In separate requests Tuesday, Attorney General Scott Pruitt and OG&E asked the 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Denver to convene its full panel of judges and reconsider an earlier 2-1 decision in favor of the Environmental Protection Agency…In remarks before the Rotary Club of Oklahoma City on Tuesday, Pete Delaney, OGE Energy Corp.’s chairman, president and CEO, said OG&E remains committed to a diverse fuel supply, including coal, natural gas and wind. He said the EPA has been doing everything it can to shut down coal plants across the country. ‘On appeal, you’re working a little bit uphill,’ Delaney said. ‘We know there’s a lot at stake for our ratepayers because there’s potential investment of $1 billion for scrubbers, so we take that very seriously.’” [Oklahoman, [9/4/13](http://newsok.com/oklahoma-attorney-general-scott-pruitt-oge-continue-legal-fight-against-federal-plan-for-haze/article/3879077?custom_click=rss)]

* **Pruitt: “Regional Haze Is About Improving Visibility, Not About Health. The Clean Air Act Clearly Gives States A Primary Role In Implementing Regulations To Address Regional Haze. Oklahoma Leaders Crafted A Commonsense Plan To Meet The Goals Of The Clean Air Act Without Imposing Unnecessary Rate Hikes On Oklahomans. The EPA Was Wrong To Ignore The Oklahoma Plan And Impose A Federal Plan.”** [Oklahoman, [9/4/13](http://newsok.com/oklahoma-attorney-general-scott-pruitt-oge-continue-legal-fight-against-federal-plan-for-haze/article/3879077?custom_click=rss)]

**2013: Oklahoma Gas And Electric Joined Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt In Requesting A Rehearing To Determine If The Environmental Protection Agency Acted Appropriately In Rejecting The State’s Plan To Address Visibility At National Parks And Wildlife Areas.** According to Electrical Apparatus, “Oklahoma Gas and Electric recently joined Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt in requesting a rehearing to determine if the Environmental Protection Agency acted appropriately in rejecting the state’s plan to address visibility at national parks and wildlife areas. A panel ruled in July that the EPA lawfully exercised its authority to impose a federally mandated plan on the state. If upheld, the panel’s ruling is expected to result in large rate increases for Oklahoma electric consumers, according to OGE Energy Corp.” [Electrical Apparatus, October 2013]

* **OG&E: “The Majority Opinion Gives EPA The Ability To Replace The State Of Oklahoma’s Decision With Its Own. This Is Especially Egregious Considering The Errors Made By The EPA When It Conducted Its Own Analysis.”** According to Electrical Apparatus “‘This is among the first decisions in the country to address EPA’s review under the Clean Air Act’s regional haze provisions,’ said OG&E spokesman Brian Alford. ‘The majority opinion gives EPA the ability to replace the State of Oklahoma’s decision with its own. This is especially egregious considering the errors made by the EPA when it conducted its own analysis.’ The utility, along with the state attorney general, the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, and others, has argued that a plan developed by the State of Oklahoma ‘would be more effective than costly pollution control technology, or scrubbers, and cost far less’ than the federal mandate.” [Electrical Apparatus, October 2013]

**2013: Pruitt Disappointed in Tenth Circuit of Appeals’ Decision Not to Rehear Regional Haze Lawsuit.** “Following a decision by the 10th Circuit Court of Appeals to reject the state’s request for a rehearing before the entire court of the state’s regional haze lawsuit, Attorney General Scott Pruitt said he is considering the next steps to take, including asking the U.S. Supreme Court to review the state’s lawsuit against the EPA. ‘We are disappointed with the court’s decision to not rehear this lawsuit. We are considering our next steps in the fight to protect Oklahoma’s right to pursue its own solutions to address regional haze,’ General Pruitt said. ‘At stake is the ability of Oklahoma and other states to develop and implement state-based solutions. The EPA exceeded its authority when it denied the state’s plan to address regional haze. Oklahomans need to understand the regional haze rule is not about health, it is about visibility in a state wildlife area that Oklahoma leaders want to protect. We developed a commonsense plan to address regional haze, but as part of its anti-fossil fuel agenda, the EPA rejected the state’s plan in favor of a federal plan that will significantly raise utility rates for Oklahomans.’” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [10/31/13](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=12993)]

**2013: Pruitt Asked the Supreme Court to Review Regional Haze Lawsuit.** “Attorney General Scott Pruitt Thursday announced his intention to seek U.S. Supreme Court review of Oklahoma’s regional haze lawsuit against the EPA. Thursday morning, Attorney General Pruitt testified before a House subcommittee on energy and power about the importance of Oklahoma’s regional haze challenge. ‘At stake is the ability of Oklahoma and other states to develop and implement state-based solutions. The EPA exceeded its authority when it denied the state’s plan to address regional haze. Oklahomans need to understand the regional haze rule is not about health, it is about visibility in a state wildlife area that Oklahoma leaders want to protect,’ Attorney General Pruitt said.” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [11/14/13](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=13188)]

* **Pruitt: “We Developed A Commonsense Plan To Address Regional Haze, But As Part Of Its Anti-Fossil Fuel Agenda, The EPA Rejected The State’s Plan In Favor Of A Federal Plan That Will Significantly Raise Utility Rates For Oklahomans.”** [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [11/14/13](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=13188)]

**2013: Pruitt Fought Against An EPA Haze Rule That Would Have Cut Haze In National Parks And Wilderness Areas.** According to Clean Air Report, “The decision leaves in place a first-time ruling backing EPA's authority to reject state implementation plans (SIPs) that fail to properly use the agency's guidelines for estimating the costs of controlling pollutants that contribute to regional haze air pollution. EPA's haze program requires cuts in haze at national parks and wilderness areas. Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt said the state is considering ‘next steps,’ which could include appealing the case to the Supreme Court, but a spokeswoman says a decision on that has not yet been made.” [Clean Air Report, 11/7/13]

**2013: Pruitt And Oklahoma Gas & Electric Planned To Seek Supreme Court Review Of A Precedent-Setting Appellate Court Ruling That Backed EPA’s Power To Reject State’s Regional Haze Air Quality Plans If They Do Not Follow Agency Guidelines.** According to Energy Washington Week, “Oklahoma and utilities plan to seek Supreme Court review of a precedent-setting appellate court ruling that backed EPA’s power to reject state’s regional haze air quality plans if they do not follow agency guidelines, with the groups saying the ruling’s ‘substantial’ implications for federalism in part warrant the high court taking the case. The groups, in a Nov. 6 motion, ask the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit to stay its mandate that finalizes the ruling pending a bid for the Supreme Court to review the case and its precedent -- which the 8th Circuit adopted in a recent ruling, and the 9th Circuit could consider in a pending lawsuit over Arizona’s regional haze plan. Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt (R), Oklahoma Gas & Electric (OG&E) and manufacturers say in the motion that the 10th Circuit’s ruling in State of Oklahoma, et al. v. EPA, et al. deferring to the agency is contrary to the ‘unprecedented State-Federal partnership role established by Congress for regional haze,’ adding that the federalism issues raised in the case will provide ‘substantial incentive for the Supreme Court to take this case.’” [Energy Washington Week, 12/4/13]

* **Pruitt And OG&E: “The Court’s Decision, Including The Lifting Of The Stay, Is Not Final, And The Court Retains Jurisdiction To Take Further Action.”** According to Energy Washington Week, “But Pruitt and OG&E, in the Nov. 6 motion, say that until the mandate is issued, ‘the Court’s decision, including the lifting of the stay, is not final, and the Court retains jurisdiction to take further action.’ The motion says if the stay on the FIP was lifted immediately with the ruling, OG&E would have to start work to install the sulfur scrubbers immediately, even while the court considered the petitions for rehearing, which ‘makes no practical sense and is contrary to the legal significance attached to the issuance of the mandate.” [Energy Washington Week, 12/4/13]

**Supreme Court Declined to Hear Challenge to Tenth Circuit’s Regional Haze Ruling to the Ire of Scott Pruitt.** “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt and Oklahoma Gas and Electric — the state’s largest utility — have fought the Regional Haze Rule since the EPA rejected the state’s implementation plan in 2012, but it looks like this is the end of the line. The U.S. Supreme Court on Tuesday declined to hear Pruitt and OG&E’s challenge to a lower court’s ruling in favor of the EPA’s decision to reject the Oklahoma plan. ‘The Supreme Court’s decision not to hear Oklahoma’s regional haze lawsuit lets stand a bad legal precedent that places the states in an inferior position to EPA’s ‘command and control’ approach to regional haze regulation,’ Pruitt tells StateImpact in an email. ‘Now, Oklahoma ratepayers will bear billions of dollars in costs for an onerous federal regional haze plan that even the EPA concedes barely provides a discernible difference in the visual quality of air.’” [State Impact, [5/27/14](https://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2014/05/27/u-s-supreme-court-wont-hear-attorney-generals-challenge-to-federal-haze-rule/)]

2013: Regional Haze Rule

**2013: State of Oklahoma ex re. Scott Pruitt, et al. v.** **United States Environmental Protections Agency** **(5:13-cv-00726-M**).  On July 16, 2013, the State of Oklahoma, et al. filed a lawsuit for injunctive and declaratory relief against the Environmental Protection Agency.  Plaintiffs brought the action to compel compliance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).  Plaintiffs sought records of negotiations between the EPA and non-governmental organizations over Regional Haze state implementation plans (SIPs).  On December 18, 2013, Chief U.S. District Judge Vicki Miles-LaGrange granted Defendant’s motion to dismiss the lawsuit. [5:13-cv-00726-M, accessed 12/7/16]

**State of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers v. United States Environmental Protection Agency and Lisa Jackson (Appellate Case: 12-9526).** On February 24, 2012, the State of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers filed a petition to review the final EPA’s final Regional Haze Rule.  On July 19, 2013, the U.S. Court of Appeals denied the petition for review. On January 29, 2014, the Petitioners filed a petition for certiorari. On May 27, 2014, the Supreme Court of the United States denied a request to consider an appeal of the case. [Appellate Case: 12-9526, accessed 12/7/16]

**2013: State of Oklahoma ex re. Scott Pruitt, et al. v.** **United States Environmental Protections Agency** **(5:13-cv-00726-M**). On July 16, 2013, the State of Oklahoma, et al. filed a lawsuit for injunctive and declaratory relief against the Environmental Protection Agency. Plaintiffs brought the action to compel compliance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Plaintiffs sought records of negotiations between the EPA and non-governmental organizations over Regional Haze state implementation plans (SIPs). On December 18, 2013, Chief U.S. District Judge Vicki Miles-LaGrange granted Defendant’s motion to dismiss the lawsuit. [5:13-cv-00726-M, accessed 12/7/16]

**2014: State of Oklahoma, Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers, Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company v. US Environmental Protection Agency.** On May 5, 2014, The State of Oklahoma, Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers, and Oklahoma Gas and Electric field a reply brief of petitioners on Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. The brief argued that “The Government's opposition brief is largely premised on the same error that plagued the Tenth Circuit's decision: the failure to recognize that there are two distinct decision points at issue in these unique regional haze cases… If the Court denies certiorari, it will effectively read the Regional Haze Program's unique delegation of authority to the States right out of the Clean Air Act. The impact will be widespread and will cost tens of millions of citizens tens of billions of dollars, as those citizens see their utility bills spike in the eight other states where EPA has rejected Best Available Retrofit Technology determinations for electric generating units.” [No. 13-921, May 5, 2014, accessed 1/6/17]

Coverage

**Pruitt and Other Attorneys General Sued EPA Over “Sue and Settle” Freedom of Information Act Request.** “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt joined Republican colleagues from 11 other states Tuesday in filing a lawsuit against the Environmental Protection Agency related to what they call the agency’s ‘sue and settle’ strategy for regulation. Pruitt and the other attorneys general sent an information request in August asking the EPA for records that could show whether the agency was encouraging environmental groups to sue it for missing regulatory and statutory deadlines. The practice, dubbed ‘sue and settle’ by Pruitt and other critics of the Obama administration, contends the EPA settled lawsuits brought over missed deadlines with consent decrees that are stricter than the original regulations.” [Oklahoman, [7/17/13](http://newsok.com/article/3862959)]

* **Pruitt: “It's A Regulation-Through-Litigation Type Of Initiative. Friendly Lawsuits Apparently Are Being Encouraged. We Were Concerned Because Our Due Process, As A State And Citizens Of Oklahoma, Were Potentially Being Affected Adversely. And Not Just Oklahoma, But 11 Other States.”** [Oklahoman, [7/17/13](http://newsok.com/article/3862959)]
* **Pruitt: “We Were Very Specific, And Very Narrow, On Clean Air Act And Regional Haze Specifically. The EPA Rejected That In May. We Have Been Patiently Working With The EPA Since Last August On A Very Important Matter Of Transparency And A Very Important Matter Of Due Process.”** [Oklahoman, [7/17/13](http://newsok.com/article/3862959)]

**Pruitt: “The EPA Is Picking Winners And Losers, Exhibiting Favoritism, At The Expense Of Due Process And Transparency.”** “‘The EPA is picking winners and losers, exhibiting favoritism, at the expense of due process and transparency,’ Pruitt said in a statement. ‘They are manipulating our legal system to achieve what they cannot through our representative democracy. The outcomes of their actions affect every one of us by sticking states with the bill and unnecessarily raising utility rates by as much as 20 percent.’” [Fox News, [7/17/13](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/07/17/oklahoma-11-other-states-sue-epa-over-sue-and-settle-strategy.html)]

* **Pruitt: “I Would Look At That Very Suspect And Say: ‘What’s Going On? The EPA Is Picking Winners And Losers. These Cases Affect Oklahoma's Ability To Do Its Job.”** [Fox News, [7/17/13](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/07/17/oklahoma-11-other-states-sue-epa-over-sue-and-settle-strategy.html)]
* **Pruitt: “We Are Deserving Of Information From The EPA. They've Routinely Said No, Period.”** [Fox News, [7/17/13](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/07/17/oklahoma-11-other-states-sue-epa-over-sue-and-settle-strategy.html)]

2012: Endangerment Finding

**Pruitt Maintained Fight Against EPA’s Endangerment Finding Regarding the Danger Greenhouse Gases Pose to Public Health; Suit Was Ultimately Rejected by Supreme Court.**  [09-1322, accessed [12/12/16](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-08/documents/09-1322-1380690.pdf)]

2014: Lesser-Prairie Chicken

**State of Oklahoma and Domestic Energy Producers Alliance vs. the Department of Interior, et al.** **(4:14-cv-00123-JHP-PJC).** On March 17, 2014, the State of Oklahoma and the Domestic Energy Producers Alliance filed a lawsuit for injunctive and declaratory relief against the Department of the Interior, et al. The Plaintiffs alleged that the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service was violating the Endangered Species Act, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the U.S. Constitution in regards to using “sue and settle” tactics to list species like the Lesser Prairie-Chicken as Endangered. On February 5, 2015, the case was transferred to the District of Columbia. On July 29, 2016, the Defendants requested that the claims in the case be voluntarily dismissed since the Parties were unlikely to reach a settlement and the Lesser Prairie-Chicken was no longer on the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife. On August 17, 2016, the Parties stipulated the Plaintiffs’ dismissal without prejudice of the actions in their entirety. [4:14-cv-00123-JHP-PJC; 1:15-cv-00252-EGS, accessed 12/7/16]

Coverage

**Pruitt: “Oklahoma Has Spent Millions To Develop A Conservation Plan That Offers Adequate Protections For The Lesser Prairie Chicken, Yet Those Efforts Could Be Undone Without Input From The State Because Of A Consent Decree Between The FWS And A National Environmental Group.”** [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [3/17/14](https://www.oag.ok.gov/oagweb.nsf/0/A648FA4F8D20203386257C9E0076CBC4%21OpenDocument)]

**Pruitt: “The Sue-And-Settle Timelines Force The FWS To Make Determinations Without A Thorough Review Of The Science. This Violates The Original Statute Requiring Sound Science Before Listing Species As Endangered.”** “In an interview, Pruitt told IBD that ‘the sue-and-settle timelines force the FWS to make determinations without a thorough review of the science. This violates the original statute requiring sound science before listing species’ as endangered. Pruitt also claims the Fish and Wildlife has broken federal law by ‘ignoring state and local conservation measures’ in the affected states with millions of private and tax dollars invested.” [Investor’s Business Daily, 3/18/14]

**Pruitt: “For The Fish And Wildlife Service To Come Out And Say, ‘Yes, We’re Going To Classify The Lesser Prairie Chicken As A Threatened Species, But We’re Not Going To Change Anything,’ Seems To Beg The Question, Then Why Did You Take The Step?”** [NPR, [4/9/14](http://www.npr.org/2014/04/09/301008237/federal-plan-to-save-prairie-chickens-ruffles-state-feathers)]

**Priutt: “We Expended Roughly $26 Million Dollars To Try To Avert The Listing Of The Lesser Prairie Chicken.”** “Oklahoma joined Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico and Texas in a conservation plan by which oil, wind and other companies, as well as farmers, could pay a fee to offset the habitat destruction. Janus and other ODWC researchers also built a sophisticated interactive map to help steer developers away from prime Prairie Chicken habitats. Attorney General Scott Pruitt says the cross-state collaboration was unprecedented. ‘We expended roughly $26 million dollars to try to avert the listing of the Lesser Prairie Chicken.’ But it didn’t work. In March, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service finalized its plans to list the bird as a threatened species, which goes into effect on May 12. Pruitt is now suing the federal agency, which he says settled with environmental groups and circumvented state involvement in federal rule making.” [State Impact, [5/1/14](https://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2014/05/01/lesser-prairie-chicken-peep-show-in-the-field-with-oklahomas-threatened-bird/)]

**Scott Pruitt: “It's Not A Coincidence The Bird Has Been A Target For Environmental Groups Because Its Habitat Spreads Across Five States That Are Home To Some Of The Most Promising Land For Oil And Natural Gas Development.”** “The FWS listed the lesser prairie chicken as ‘threatened’ under the Endangered Species Act, greatly restricting land use in the five-state habitat of the bird. It’s not a coincidence the bird has been a target for environmental groups because its habitat spreads across five states that are home to some of the most promising land for oil and natural gas development. It’s also not a coincidence the listing categories considered by the FWS were the only two that would have required land use restrictions. It’s becoming increasingly clear this issue isn’t about sound science or saving endangered species. It’s instead about using the courts to impose a political agenda. The three branches of government each serve as a check upon the other.” [Washington Examiner, [5/5/14](http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/sue-and-settle-deals-are-regulation-by-consent-decree/article/2548465)]

**Pruitt Filed A Lawsuit Against The Interior Department And The U.S. Fish And Wildlife Service Over “Sue And Settle” Tactics… That Sought To Restrict Land Use For Agriculture, Oil And Gas Drilling, Wind Farms.**, “In March, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt filed a lawsuit against the Interior Department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service over such ‘sue and settle’ tactics following an ESA lawsuit by a group called Wild Earth Guardians that sought to restrict land use for agriculture, oil and gas drilling, wind farms, and other activities in a five-state area-Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Kansas-inhabited by the lesser prairie chicken.” [USA Today, 7/1/14]

**Pruitt: “Oklahoma Has Indicated Its Willingness To Protect The Lesser Prairie Chicken, But It Seems Increasingly Clear This Issue Isn’t About Sound Science Or Saving Endangered Species.”** “‘These settlements,’ Pruitt said in a statement, ‘impose tougher regulations and shorter timelines than those imposed by Congress,’ and thus violate the rule of law. ‘Oklahoma has indicated its willingness to protect the lesser prairie chicken,’ he added, ‘but it seems increasingly clear this issue isn’t about sound science or saving endangered species.’” [USA Today, 7/1/14]

**Pruitt: Even Threatened Or Endangered Species Designations Are Dictated By Attempts To Discourage Oil And Gas Production.** “Even threatened or endangered species designations are dictated by attempts to discourage oil and gas production, Pruitt said, and cited the case of the lesser prairie chicken. In May, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service designated the bird as a threatened species, prompting lawsuits from environmental groups that wanted it listed as endangered, and agriculture and energy interests averse to the regulations that go with protected status. Several Pruitt challenges to federal environmental rules and decisions are pending. As in the past, Pruitt said they are not prompted by ideology or policy but by ‘rule of law.’” [Tulsa World, [9/20/14](http://www.tulsaworld.com/business/energy/pruitt-says-regulators-targeting-fossil-fuel-industry/article_f8e95ebe-7a28-5089-b5f3-752d518c7bd7.html)]

**Pruitt Joined Harold Hamm In Suing The DOI Over Adding Lesser Prairie Chicken To Endangered Species List, A Move That Would Knock Out “Some Of The Most Promising Land For Oil And Gas Leases In The Country.”** “This year, Mr. Pruitt joined with a group aligned with Mr. Hamm to sue the Interior Department over its plan to consider adding animals such as the lesser prairie chicken to the endangered species list, a move that Mr. Hamm has said could knock out ‘some of the most promising land for oil and gas leases in the country.’ The suit was filed after Mr. Hamm announced that he would serve as the chairman of Mr. Pruitt’s re-election campaign.” [New York Times, [12/6/14](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/12/07/us/politics/energy-firms-in-secretive-alliance-with-attorneys-general.html)]

**Pruitt: “The Obama Administrations Unlawful Attempt To List The Lesser Prairie Chicken As An Endangered Species Was Not Based On Sound Science But A Hastily Put Together Effort By Federal Agencies, Colluding With Environmental Groups, To Engage In Sue-And-Settle Tactics Designed To Stifle Oil And Gas Exploration In Oklahoma And Other States.”** “Attorney General Scott Pruitt on Friday released the following statement in response to the Obama administrations recent decision to abandon its efforts to list the lesser prairie chicken as an endangered species. The Obama administrations unlawful attempt to list the lesser prairie chicken as an endangered species was not based on sound science but a hastily put together effort by federal agencies, colluding with environmental groups, to engage in sue-and-settle tactics designed to stifle oil and gas exploration in Oklahoma and other states, Attorney General Pruitt said.” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, 5/20/16]

* **Pruitt: “That Is Why I Brought Suit Challenging The Listing, And Arguing That Science And Facts-On-The-Ground Unequivocally Prove The Chicken Is Not Endangered, And That The State’s Conservation Efforts Are Working.”** “That is why I brought suit challenging the listing, and arguing that science and facts-on-the-ground unequivocally prove the chicken is not endangered, and that the State’s conservation efforts are working. I’m pleased to report that the federal government has finally realized the error of its ways and has ended its efforts to list the bird as endangered. [Scott Pruitt Press Release, 5/20/16]

2015: Waters of the United States

**2015: State of Oklahoma ex. rel. E. Scott Pruitt v. United States Environmental Protections Agency, et al. (4:15-cv-00381-CVE-FHM).** On July 8, 2015, the State of Oklahoma filed a lawsuit for injunctive and declaratory relief against the Environmental Protection Agency, et al. Oklahoma alleged that the “Waters of the United States” regulation usurped State’s authority, conflicted with the Clean Water Act, exceeded the government’s authority under the Commerce Clause and violated the Administrative Procedure Act. On February 24, 2016, U.S. District Judge Claire Eagan dismissed the Plaintiff’s case for “lack of subject matter jurisdiction.” On April 19, 2016, Oklahoma appealed the judgment to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. [4:15-cv-00381-CVE-FHM, accessed 12/7/16]

**2016: State of Oklahoma v. US Environmental Protection Agency**. On July 1, 2016, the State of Oklahoma filed an appellate brief from 15-CV-00381. The brief argued that “The State of Oklahoma challenged the validity of a rule issued by the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers that drastically expands federal jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act (‘the WOTUS Rule’). However, before the State could litigate the merits of those claims the Northern District of Oklahoma dismissed the State's complaint, relying on a splintered Sixth Circuit decision holding that subject matter jurisdiction to review the Rule was proper before that circuit court.” [No. 16-5039, July 1, 2016, Accessed 1/9/17]

Coverage

**Pruitt Suit Over Waters of the United States Rule Dismissed, Appeal Pending.** “Pruitt files a lawsuit in Tulsa federal court challenging the EPA’s new rules governing pollution controls on waters governed by the Clean Water Act. A judge later dismissed the lawsuit on jurisdictional grounds. An appeal is pending.” [Tulsa World, [12/8/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/courts/pruitt-lawsuits-other-actions-taken-against-epa/article_c2b975d2-0df0-5e6c-aa8b-ce6d1758ea9e.html)]

**2016: Pruitt On WOTUS: “We Got A Stay Of Enforcement. The Sixth Circuit Has Taken Jurisdiction And Every State In The Country Is Now Able To Live Without Any Kind Of Fear Against The WOTUS Rule Being Enforced Against Private Property Owners.”** [OK AG Policy Youtube, [3/14/16](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P7-PnsHeHJw)]

**Pruitt Explained That The EPA Did Not Have The Right To Regulate Waters In Oklahoma.**Pruitt: “It’s all about land use, Pat. When you look at the decision that land owners are making across the state of Oklahoma presently … guess where they go to get authority … [to drill, ranch etc] … They get authority from the local municipalities … But what the EPA is seeking to do is to replace all that and them become primary in getting permission to use your own land. If you’ve got a pond on your land right now that’s self-contained, the EPA’s definition is going to be changed so much so that it will require you to get a permit to use water out of your own pond … This administration does not blush, we know that … [The WOTUS rule is something people aren’t really paying attention to but this hearing] is going to bring a great deal of awareness because the president is doing that which he always seeks to do. If you can’t get it done through Congress, he’s going to use his pen and phone and bypass Congress and do it through agency power … that’s not how our system works.” [KFAQ, Accessed [1/6/17](https://www.ok.gov/oag/Media/Radio_Interviews/)]

**Pruitt Explained That The EPA Did Not Have The Right To Regulate Waters In Oklahoma.**Pruitt: “It’s all about land use, Pat. When you look at the decision that land owners are making across the state of Oklahoma presently … guess where they go to get authority … [to drill, ranch etc] … They get authority from the local municipalities … But what the EPA is seeking to do is to replace all that and them become primary in getting permission to use your own land. If you’ve got a pond on your land right now that’s self-contained, the EPA’s definition is going to be changed so much so that it will require you to get a permit to use water out of your own pond … This administration does not blush, we know that … [The WOTUS rule is something people aren’t really paying attention to but this hearing] is going to bring a great deal of awareness because the president is doing that which he always seeks to do. If you can’t get it done through Congress, he’s going to use his pen and phone and bypass Congress and do it through agency power … that’s not how our system works.” [KFAQ, Accessed [1/6/17](https://www.ok.gov/oag/Media/Radio_Interviews/)]

**Pruitt: WOTUS Rule a Threat to Private Property Rights.** “If we fail, we will all live in a regulatory state where farmers must go before the EPA to seek permission to build a farm pond to keep their livestock alive, where homebuilders must seek EPA approval before beginning construction on a housing development that contains a dry creek bed, and where energy producers are left waiting for months or even years to get permits from the EPA, costing the producers tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of dollars that inevitably will be passed on to consumers. That is why failure is not an option. The EPA’s rule is unlawful and must be withdrawn. We urge the EPA to meet with state-level officials who can help the agency understand the careful measures that states already have in place to protect and develop the lands and waters within their borders. We urge the EPA to listen to Congress regarding the intent of the law to limit the regulation of non-navigable waters. But most of all, we urge the EPA to take note of the harm that its rule will do to the property rights of the average American.” [The Hill, [3/4/15](http://thehill.com/opinion/op-ed/234685-epa-water-rule-is-blow-to-americans-private-property-rights)]

**Pruitt Believed Waters Rule Was a Power Grab.** “More likely is that the rule ends up mired in legal battles for years, like so much of the rest of the Obama agenda, where the president has blamed Congress for inaction, has tested the limits of executive power and has had to rely on the courts to sort things out. Republican attorneys general said they’ll test the legality of the new rules. ‘This is an egregious power grab by the EPA and an attempt to reach beyond the scope granted to it by Congress,’ said Oklahoma Attorney General E. Scott Pruitt. ‘This rule renders the smallest of streams and farm ponds subject to EPA jurisdiction. This means that the first stop for property owners is the EPA.’ EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy denied the rule was a power grab, saying it was intended to sort out a legal morass left by court decisions over the last few decades that had left in doubt what waters are affected by the Clean Water Act.” [Washington Times, [5/27/15](http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2015/may/27/epa-expands-powers-over-land-use-bid-control-water/)]

**Pruitt: “When You Think About Something That Is Fundamental To Agency Power. Agencies Can’t Act In Access Or Outside Of What Congress Says That They Can Do. And Here A Congress Has Been Very Clear Under The Clean Water Act That Land Use Decisions Water Management Is Vested In The States.”**[KFAQ, Accessed [1/6/17](https://www.ok.gov/oag/Media/Radio_Interviews/)]

**Pruitt Believed EPA Waters of the U.S. Rule Was Overreach, Would Stifle Property Rights.** “Attorney General Scott Pruitt has filed a lawsuit against the Environmental Protection Agency alleging that the redefinition of the ‘Waters of the United States’ is executive overreach, flatly contrary to the will of Congress. The lawsuit alleges that the EPA’s broad redefinition of long-standing regulatory jurisdiction places virtually all land and water under an untenable regulatory burden. The EPA’s regulatory jurisdiction has historically been limited to the ‘navigable waters’ – a term that has always been understood to include only large bodies of water capable of serving as pathways for interstate commerce. ‘Respect for private property rights have allowed our nation to thrive, but with the recently finalized rule, farmers, ranchers, developers, industry, and individual property owners will now be subject to the unpredictable, unsound, and often byzantine regulatory regime of the EPA,’ Attorney General Pruitt said. ‘I, and many other local, state and national leaders across the country, made clear to the EPA our concerns and opposition to redefining the ‘Waters of the U.S.’ However, the EPA’s brazen effort to stifle private property rights has left Oklahoma with few options to deter the harm that its rule will do.’” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [7/8/15](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=16121)]

**Pruitt Called Temporary Block of Waters of the U.S. Rule a “Win for Oklahoma.”** “Critics, including lawmakers and business and farming groups, say the new regulation amounts to federal intrusion upon states’ rights. Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt, one of the challengers, said the court order ‘is certainly a win for Oklahoma, but the legal fight moves forward as we work diligently to roll back this unlawful rule.’ He said the regulation ‘is a devastating blow to private property rights and is an unlawful power grab by the EPA.’ Environmentalists expressed disappointment. ‘The Clean Water

 Rule is key to ensuring clean drinking water for one-in-three Americans and protecting essential buffers against flooding,’ said Jon Devine, an attorney at the Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental group that joined the case to defend the regulation.” [Wall Street Journal, [10/9/15](http://www.wsj.com/articles/u-s-appeals-court-blocks-epa-water-rule-nationwide-1444400506)]

2015: Ozone Rule

**State of Arizona, et al. v. United States Environmental Protection Agency (15-1392).** On October 27, 2015, the State of Arizona, et al. filed a petition for Review of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s “National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone.” [15-1392, accessed [12/12/16](https://www.uschamber.com/sites/default/files/documents/files/arizona_v._epa.pdf)]

Coverage

**Pruitt Called on EPA to Withdraw Ozone Rule.** “Attorney General Scott Pruitt, along with 13 other state attorneys general, called on the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to withdraw its proposed ozone rule, saying the rule was unlawful, failed to achieve the goals to protect air quality standards and would substantially harm Oklahoma’s economy. ‘The ozone rule would lead to the loss of thousands of jobs and could increase residential electricity prices by 15 percent in Oklahoma, yet the EPA has not articulated how the rule will further improve public health. It’s increasingly clear the ozone rule, which could prove to be the most expensive regulation ever, is just another attempt by the administration to use executive agencies like the EPA to bypass Congress and the people in order to impose the president’s anti-fossil fuels agenda. As Oklahoma’s attorney general, I will continue to advocate on behalf of Oklahomans and challenge the EPA’s misguided and unlawful overreach.’” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [3/20/15](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=15602)]

**Pruitt Filed Petition for Review With Five Other States Against New Ozone Regulations.** “Oklahoma has joined a five-state effort to fight new ozone regulations issued by the Environmental Protection Agency. Attorney General Scott Pruitt's office said Tuesday that Oklahoma joined Arizona, Arkansas, New Mexico's Environmental Department and North Dakota in a petition for review filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The rules were published Monday in the Federal Register. They establish a limit of 70 parts per billion for ozone, which is formed at the ground level when the sun heats nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds. Automobiles, power plants and industrial facilities account for most of those emissions.” [Oklahoman, [10/27/15](http://newsok.com/oklahoma-joins-five-states-in-suit-against-new-epa-ozone-limits/article/5456440?custom_click=rss)]

2014, 2015, 2016: Clean Air Act

**2014: State of West Virginia, et al. vs. the United States Environmental Protection Agency (14-1146).** On August 1, 2014, the State of West Virginia, et al. filed a petition for review to invalidate a settlement in which the EPA agreed to regulated existing coal-fired power plants. On June 9, 2015, the U.S. Court of Appeals for District of Columbia Circuit the denied the review because the proposed EPA actions had not been finalized. [14-1146, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.ago.wv.gov/publicresources/epa/Pages/West-Virginia-No-14-1146.aspx)]

* **2014: Oklahoma Joined Suit with Eleven Other States Over Proposed Clean Power Plan.** “The EPA promised in a 2011 settlement agreement to expand its authority to regulate greenhouse gas emissions of existing power plants even though the Clean Air Act prohibits the agency from doing so. Now, the EPA has issued a proposed rule based upon the promises made in that 2011 settlement agreement. The lawsuit from the collection of states contends the 2011 settlement agreement is illegal because the law prohibits existing power plants from being regulated under section 111(d) since such power plants already are regulated under section 112(d) of the CAA. The lawsuit was filed in the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. The states that are a part of this lawsuit are Oklahoma, Alabama, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nebraska, Ohio, South Carolina, South Dakota, Wyoming and West Virginia.” [Oklahoma Attorney General, [8/5/14](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=14535)]

**2014: State of Michigan et, al. v. Environmental Protection Agency (14-46).**  On July 14, 2014, Michigan, et al. filed a lawsuit against the Environmental Protection Agency over the agency’s interpretation of the Clean Air Act in regards to considering costs of regulations. On June 29, 2015, the Supreme Court reversed and remanded the lower courts judgment, ruling against the EPA. [14-46, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/michigan-v-environmental-protection-agency/)]

**2015: State of Oklahoma ex rel. E. Scott Pruitt and Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality v. Gina McCarthy and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (4:15-cv-00369-CVE-FHM).** On July 1, 2015, the State of Oklahoma filed a lawsuit for injunctive and declaratory relief against the Environmental Protection Agency. Plaintiffs alleged that the “Clean Power Plan” illegally coerced states to detrimentally reorganize their “energy economies” and do so at a “breakneck” pace to avoid judicial review. On July 17, 2015, U.S. District Judge Claire Eagan dismissed the Plaintiff’s case for “lack of subject matter jurisdiction.” On July 20, 2015, Oklahoma appealed the judgment to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. On September 21, 2015, the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit granted Appellants’ Consent Motion for Voluntary Dismissal of Appeal. [4:15-cv-00369-CVE-FHM, accessed 12/7/16]

**2015:** **State of West Virginia, et al. vs. the United States Environmental Protection Agency (15-1277).** On August 13, 2015, the State of West Virginia, et al. filed a petition for Extraordinary Writ to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to stay the Clean Power Plan regulations. On September 9, 2015, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit denied the petition. [15-1277, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.ago.wv.gov/publicresources/epa/Pages/West-Virginia-No-15-1277.aspx)]

**2015: State of Oklahoma ex rel. E. Scott Pruitt and the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality vs. the U.S. Protection Agency (15-1364).** On October 23, 2015, the State of Oklahoma filed a petition for review of the final Clean Power Plan. [15-1364, accessed [12/6/16](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/OK%20Petition.pdf)]

**2015:** **State of West Virginia, et al. vs. the United States Environmental Protection Agency (15A773).** On January 26, 2016, the State of West Virginia, et al. filed a lawsuit against the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in order to stay the Clean Power Plan regulations. On February 9, 2016, the Supreme Court granted the stay. [15A773, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.ago.wv.gov/publicresources/epa/Pages/No-15A773-.aspx)]

**2016:** **State of West Virginia, et al. vs. the United States Environmental Protection Agency (16-1264).** On August 2, 2016, the State of West Virginia, et al. filed a petition for review for the EPA’s Clean Air Act Section 111(b) rule regulating new oil and gas sources. [16-1624, accessed [12/6/16](http://www.ago.wv.gov/publicresources/epa/Documents/16-1264%20date%20stamped%20Petition%20for%20Review%20Methane%20Rule%20%28M0132075xCECC6%29.pdf)]

**2016: State of North Dakota, et al. v. United States Environmental Protection Agency, et al. (15-1381).** On October 13, 2016, the State of North Dakota, et al. filed a petition of review for the EPA Clean Air Act rule entitled, “Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units.” [15-1381, accessed [12/12/16](https://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/content/2016.10.13_state_petitioners_opening_brief.pdf)]
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**Scott Pruitt Created His Own State-Focused Clean Air Act Section 111(d) in Response to the Clean Power Plan.** “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt on Tuesday unveiled his proposal to give states flexibility to address carbon dioxide emissions standards from existing power plants. The plan titled, ‘The Oklahoma Attorney General’s Plan: The Clean Air Act Section 111(d) Framework that Preserves States’ Rights,’ was the focus of Tuesday’s event in Washington, D.C., hosted by the Federalist Society. ‘The Environmental Protection Agency has played an important role historically in protecting the environment. But the Clean Air Act and other environmental laws envision a cooperative federalism where the states and federal government work together to protect our air and water,’ Attorney General Pruitt said. ‘Unfortunately, the EPA has grown increasingly unwilling to properly defer to state authority and instead is attempting to usurp the role of the states through initiatives like proposing new regulations on emissions from existing power plants.’” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [5/20/14](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=14211)]

**Pruitt: “The EPA Emissions Rule Is Central To The President’s Climate Action Plan – A Plan That Has No Legal Basis Or The Force Of Law. It Will Undoubtedly Lead To Higher Electricity Rates, Job Losses And Increased Manufacturing Costs As Coal-Fired Power Plants, Which Provide 40 Percent Of Our Baseload Power, Are Taken Offline.”** [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [6/2/14](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=14259)]

**Pruitt: “The EPA Can’t Force Utility Companies To Actually Incorporate Emission Control Measures Unless They’re Achievable Through Technology. And Here, There Really Isn’t Any Demonstrated Technology That Will See A Reduction Of 30 Percent.”** [State Impact, [6/12/14](https://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2014/06/12/court-losses-wont-deter-attorney-general-scott-pruitt-in-his-fight-with-the-epa/)]

**Pruitt Sued EPA Over Federal Clean Power Plan**. According to a radio segment in NPR, “When StateImpact reported on President Barack Obama’s proposal to cut carbon emissions 30 percent nationally by 2030, mainly through less reliance on coal-fired power plants, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt’s reaction made it clear a lawsuit was coming. On Tuesday, it became official. Oklahoma joined West Virginia — which is leading the case — and 10 other states to sue the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.” [NPR Oklahoma, [8/6/14](http://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2014/08/06/oklahoma-attorney-general-scott-pruitt-sues-epa-over-federal-clean-power-plan/)]

**Pruitt Argued The Clean Power Plan Should Be Withdrawn, Stating, “In The Existing Source Rule, EPA Omitted For The Docket 84 Percent Of The Modeling Runs On Which It Relied In Crafting The Proposed Rule, Without Which The States And The Public Cannot Comment Meaningfully On The Proposal.”** According to a letter written by Attorney General Pruitt concerning the Clean Power Plan, “In The Existing Source Rule and the Modified Sources Rule, EPA has repeated violated Section 307’s unambiguous requirements: In the Existing Source Rule, EPA omitted for the docket 84 percent of the modeling runs on which it relied in crafting the proposed Rule, without which the States and the public cannot comment meaningfully on the proposal. Specifically, the docket does not include 21 out of 25 of the Integrated Planning Model modeling runs cover projections for 2016, 2018, 2020, 2025, and 2030. This information is critical to assessing EPA’s claims that States and industry will be able to comply with the four “building blocks” in the Proposed Existing Source Rule. The states need the modeling run data for sufficient analysis of what that data shows on a unit by unit and state by state basis.” [Letter to Gina McCarthy, [8/25/14](http://energyfairness.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/AGs-Letter.pdf)]

**Pruitt: “EPA’s Proposal Attempts To Use The Clean Air Act To Override States’ Energy Policies And Impose A National Energy And Resource-Planning Policy That Picks Winners And Losers Based Solely On EPA’s Policy Choices, Forcing States To Favor Renewable Energy Sources And Demand-Reduction Measures Over Fossil Fuel-Fired Electric Production.”** “On June 18, 2014, EPA proposed emission guidelines for carbon dioxide emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired power plants, invoking its authority under Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (‘CAA’), 42 U.S.C. § 7411(d). Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units, 79 Fed. Reg. 34,830 (June 18, 2014) (hereinafter ‘Proposal’). EPA’s proposal attempts to use the Clean Air Act to override states’ energy policies and impose a national energy and resource-planning policy that picks winners and losers based solely on EPA’s policy choices, forcing states to favor renewable energy sources and demand-reduction measures over fossil fuel-fired electric production. But the Clean Air Act generally and Section 111(d) specifically do not give EPA that breathtakingly broad authority to reorganize states’ economies. ‘Congress . . . does not, one might say, hide elephants in mouseholes.’ Whitman v. Am. Trucking Ass’ns, Inc., 531 U.S. 457, 468 (2001). Congress did not hide the authority to impose a national energy policy in the ‘mousehole’ of this obscure, little-used provision of the Clean Air Act, which EPA has only invoked five times in 40 years. The proposed rule has numerous legal defects, each of which provides an independent basis to invalidate the rule in its entirety.” [Comment by Attorneys General Submitted to the EPA on the Clean Power Plan, [11/24/14](http://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/EPA%20Comment%20Letter%20111d%2011-24-2014.pdf)]

**Pruitt: “My Office Will Continue Its Aggressive Challenge Of The EPA’s Unlawful And Overreaching Clean Power Plan To Protect The Interests Of Oklahoma.”** “In a statement, Attorney General Scott Pruitt said he was disappointed with Fallin’s veto. Pruitt’s office requested the bill. ‘Senate Bill 676 would not have been a great expense to the state,’ Pruitt said. ‘Rather, it ensured Oklahoma would not be forced to submit a compliance plan to the EPA that violated state or federal law. Nevertheless, my office will continue its aggressive challenge of the EPA’s unlawful and overreaching Clean Power Plan to protect the interests of Oklahoma.’” [Bartlesville Examiner Enterprise, [5/3/15](http://m.newsok.com/oklahoma-gov.-mary-fallin-vetoes-bill-expanding-attorney-generals-input-on-federal-carbon-rules/article/5415510/?page=2)]

**Pruitt, On The Clean Power Plan: “The EPA Does Not Possess The Authority Under The Clean Air Act To Do What It Is Seeking To Accomplish In The So-Called Clean Power Plan.”** “This is an issue of major importance to states like Oklahoma. Quite simply, Madam Chairwoman, the EPA does not possess the authority under the Clean Air Act to do what it is seeking to accomplish in the so-called Clean Power Plan. The EPA, under this administration, treats states like a vessel of federal will. The EPA believes the states exist to implement the policies the Administration sees fit, regardless of whether laws like the Clean Air Act permit such action. In their wisdom, Congress gave states a primary role in emissions regulation, noting in the statement of policy of the Clean Air Act that “air pollution control at its source is the primary responsibility of states and local governments.” That statement respects the constitutional limits on federal regulation of air quality, and the reality that states are best suited to develop and implement such policies.” [Testimony to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, [5/5/15]](http://www.epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.View&FileStore_id=60e46f76-2eb8-4761-bd88-b89b31f7d0ad)

**Oklahoma Filed Separate Lawsuit Against EPA, Argued Rule Raised Constitutional Concerns.** “Attorney General Scott Pruitt (R) filed a suit in federal court in Tulsa that reiterates an argument that appeared in the previous challenge: that a long-standing discrepancy in the Clean Air Act prohibits EPA from regulating the same source category for different pollutants under two different sections of the law. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit rejected the combined suit by Murray Energy, West Virginia and 14 states including Oklahoma last month on the grounds that the rule is still in draft form. It will be final this summer, and similar challenges are likely to be filed at that time (Greenwire, June 9). But Pruitt’s filing goes beyond the legislative ‘glitch’ argument put forward by West Virginia and Murray Energy to argue that EPA’s rule also errs in demanding emissions reductions beyond the fence line at a power plant that can only be achieved through changes in dispatch and demand-side efficiency. It also raises constitutional concerns, contending that the rule constitutes ‘commandeering and coercion’ of states in violation of the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and would cause ‘irreparable harm’ to Oklahoma’s economy.” [E&E News, [7/2/15](http://www.eenews.net/greenwire/stories/1060021226)]

**U.S. District Judge Tanked Oklahoma Lawsuit for Lack of Jurisdiction.** “A Tulsa federal judge on Friday dismissed one of two lawsuits challenging the EPA that Attorney General Scott Pruitt filed earlier this month. U.S. District Judge Claire Eagan issued the opinion and order terminating the lawsuit, which dealt with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s proposed pollution rules for coal-fired power plants. Eagan torpedoed the lawsuit dealing with EPA’s Clean Power Plan after questioning whether the district court had jurisdiction over the matter. ‘Plaintiffs have not shown that this court has subject matter jurisdiction to hear their claims concerning the proposed emission standards for coal-fired power plants,’ Eagan wrote in the 10-page opinion.” [Tulsa World, [7/18/15](http://www.tulsaworld.com/news/courts/judge-tosses-ag-scott-pruitt-s-challenge-of-epa-s/article_037d086f-324e-5e5d-8e23-0b568b0da666.html)]

**Pruitt: “The President Could Announce The Most ‘State Friendly’ Plan Possible, But It Would Not Change The Fact That The Administration Doesn’t Have The Legal Authority Under The Clean Air Act To Regulate Carbon Emissions.”** “Attorney General Scott Pruitt on Monday said the final version of the Clean Power Plan announced by the Administration is unlawful because the EPA does not have the legal authority under the Clean Air to regulate carbon emissions from the electricity generating plants covered by the final rule. ‘The president could announce the most ‘state friendly’ plan possible, but it would not change the fact that the administration doesn’t have the legal authority under the Clean Air Act to regulate carbon emissions from these sources because these sources are already being regulated and the Act prohibits this sort of double regulation. The most important detail left out today, however, is the fact the Clean Power Plan threatens the reliability and affordability of power for consumers and business across this country. Oklahoma is suing the EPA over the Clean Power Plan because we are asking the federal government to comply with the Clean Air Act, not because we need more time and flexibility to implement this unlawful plan. My office will continue to challenge the EPA as long as the administration continues to pursue this unlawful rule,’ Attorney General Pruitt said.” [Scripps Media, [8/3/15](http://www.scrippsmedia.com/kfaq/news/Attorney-General-Scott-Pruitt-Says-Final-Clean-Power-Plan-Still-Unlawful--320517142.html)]

**Pruitt Quickly Filed Challenge To Clean Power Plan.**“Oklahoma's attorney general filed another legal challenge Friday to the Obama administration's Clean Power Plan to reduce greenhouse gases from power plants. The Environmental Protection Agency published the final rule in the Federal Register on Friday, and Attorney General Scott Pruitt said his office immediately filed a lawsuit in the federal appeals court for the District of Columbia. Pruitt called the plan unlawful and said it threatens the reliability and affordability of power generation across the nation.” [Oklahoman, [10/24/15](http://www.oklahoman.com/article/5455659?access=1827ceda39b2b458772560722b29995f)]

**Pruitt: Clean Power Plan Would Force “Oklahoma Into Fundamentally Restructuring The Generation, Transmission And Regulation Of Electricity In Such A Manner That Would Threaten The Reliability And Affordability Of Power.”** “It was not the first time Attorney General Scott Pruitt (R) pursued litigation over the plan; he joined a group of other attorneys general in August in asking a federal court to delay the rule's timelines. Pruitt's office previously said a lawsuit was filed because the plan would force ‘Oklahoma into fundamentally restructuring the generation, transmission and regulation of electricity in such a manner that would threaten the reliability and affordability of power in the state.’” [E&E News, [1/7/16](http://www.eenews.net/interactive/clean_power_plan/states/oklahoma)]

**Pruitt: “I Think At The End Of The Day, The Supreme Court Has Indicated That We're Going To Win On The Merits.”** “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt said granting the stay gives states some clarity. His office joined in the stay appeal on behalf of Oklahoma and the Department of Environmental Quality. ‘They can sit back, take a breath and let the legal process work,’ Pruitt said Tuesday. ‘I think at the end of the day, the Supreme Court has indicated that we're going to win on the merits, as well. It's a huge step, and something that illustrates how seriously the Supreme Court is taking these types of issues.’” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [2/10/16](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=18424)]

**Pruitt: “That Is Why We Are Part Of A Very Different Kind Of Coalition, A Coalition Of 29 States Seeking To Vindicate The Rule Of Law By Challenging The Legality Of The Clean Power Plan In Our Courts.”** “That is why we are part of a very different kind of coalition, a coalition of 29 states seeking to vindicate the rule of law by challenging the legality of the Clean Power Plan in our courts. The 29 states and state Attorneys General who are part of this effort respect our proper role, which is neither to pick winners and losers in the energy sector nor to silence those with whom we disagree. Rather, our job is to hold the EPA accountable to the laws that created it and to fulfill our statutory duties to ensure that consumers in our states have access to reliable, affordable energy. We will continue to pursue those goals and to present our arguments in the courts and in the public square, treating our opponents with the respect they deserve.” [Tulsa World, [5/21/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/opinion/othervoices/scott-pruitt-and-luther-strange-an-un-american-prosecution-of/article_eff77ff4-8f6c-5646-84da-1f3204b89f54.html)]

2016: Methane Rule

**2016:** **State of West Virginia, et al. vs. the United States Environmental Protection Agency (16-1264).** On August 2, 2016, the State of West Virginia, et al. filed a petition for review for the EPA’s Clean Air Act Section 111(b) rule regulating new oil and gas sources. [16-1624, accessed [12/6/16](http://www.ago.wv.gov/publicresources/epa/Documents/16-1264%20date%20stamped%20Petition%20for%20Review%20Methane%20Rule%20%28M0132075xCECC6%29.pdf)]
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**Scott Pruitt Joined Lawsuit Challenging Federal Regulations For Methane Emissions From New Equipment At Oil And Natural Gas Sites.** “Oklahoma has joined a dozen other states in a lawsuit challenging federal regulations for methane emissions from new equipment at oil and natural gas sites. Attorney General Scott Pruitt joined the effort Tuesday led by West Virginia Attorney General Patrick Morrisey. The rules are part of the Obama administration’s goal to cut methane emissions from the oil and gas industry more than 40 percent from 2012 levels by 2025.” [Tulsa World, [8/4/16](http://www.tulsaworld.com/business/energy/ag-scott-pruitt-joins-other-states-in-suit-against-epa/article_f218afbf-3a39-531b-9acc-84f34dd43516.html)]

**Pruitt Believed EPA Acted Outside Its Statutory Framework In Designating Methane Rules.**, “Pruitt spokesman Will Gattenby said Pruitt and his fellow attorneys general believe the EPA is acting outside its statutory framework. The rules apply to new and modified oil-field equipment. ‘The industry has been steadily lowering methane emissions levels for years, and had the Obama administration conducted a proper cost-benefit analysis, which they are required to do, we are confident they would have found that the cost of this new rule outweighs the benefit,’ Gattenby said in an email.” [News Oklahoma, [8/4/16](http://newsok.com/article/5512380)]

2015, 2016: Mercury and Air Toxic Rule

**2015: State of Michigan et, al. v. Environmental Protection Agency (14-46).** On July 14, 2015, Michigan, et al. filed a lawsuit against the Environmental Protection Agency over the agency’s interpretation of the Clean Air Act in regards to considering costs of regulations. On June 29, 2015, the Supreme Court reversed and remanded the lower courts judgment, ruling against the EPA. [14-46, accessed [12/7/16](http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/michigan-v-environmental-protection-agency/)]

**2016: Murray Energy v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, et al. (16-1127).**  On November 11, 2016, Murray Energy, et al. filed a Petition of Final Agency review to challenge EPA’s finding that it is “appropriate and necessary” to regulate emissions of hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) from power plants. [16-1127, accessed [12/12/16](http://blogs.edf.org/climate411/files/2016/11/Murray-Energy-v-EPA-Petitioners-combined-opening-brief-11-18-16.pdf?_ga=1.181245607.183035146.1439322551)]

Coverage

**Pruitt Cheered Michigan v. EPA Decision.** “Attorney General Scott Pruitt hailed the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision Monday in Michigan v. EPA, a case in which Oklahoma was a plaintiff. ‘The U.S. Supreme Court’s opinion in Michigan v. EPA is a substantial victory for Oklahoma industry and consumers. Thanks to our victory, the EPA can no longer ignore the substantial costs its rulemaking can heap on industry, and eventually ratepayers. The EPA routinely ignores statutes and congressional directive in order to pick winners and losers in the energy arena. This ruling will support Oklahoma’s continued challenges of the EPA’s attempts to act outside the authority granted to it by Congress and the law.’ The state of Oklahoma was a party to the litigation, joining Michigan and 20 other states. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled 5-4 the EPA unreasonably interpreted the Clean Air Act when it decided to set limits on the emissions of mercury and other pollutants from power plants without first considering the costs to utilities and others before doing so.” [Scott Pruitt Press Release, [6/29/15](https://www.ok.gov/triton/modules/newsroom/newsroom_article.php?id=258&article_id=16080)]

**Pruitt Sued To Stop Mercury Rule**. According to an article in the Atlantic, “In 2014, for instance, Pruitt sued to block the EPA’s Regional Haze Rule. The rule is built on a 15-year-old program meant to ensure that air around national parks is especially clear. Pruitt lost his case. Last year, he sued to block a rule restricting how much mercury could be emitted into the air by coal plants. He lost that, too.” [Atlantic, [12/8/16](https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2016/12/trumps-epa-pick-is-skeptical-of-more-than-just-climate-change/509960/)]

2016: Clean Water

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers v. Hawkes Co., Inc, et al. (15-290)**. On March 15, 2016, the State of Oklahoma, et al. filed an Amicus Curiae in support of Hawkes Co, Inc., et al. in a lawsuit over Clean Water Act regulations.  [15-290, accessed [12/12/16](http://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/15-290-bsac-West-Virginia.pdf)]

Amicus Curiae / Motions to Intervene

**Coalition for Responsible Regulation, et al. v. United States Environmental Protection Agency (09-1322).** On December 23, 2009, Coalition for Responsible Regulation, et al. filed a petition for review of the U.S. EPA’s endangerment finding of greenhouse gas emissions. On March 18, 2010, the State of Oklahoma, et al. filed a motion for leave to intervene on behalf of the petitioners. On April 10, 2015, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit denied the petition for review. On August 7, 2015, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit denied the petitioners’ petition for panel rehearing. [09-1322, accessed 1/4/17]

* **Coalition For Responsible Regulation Was A Front Group Linked To Chemical Company Solvay**. According to an article in the Guardian, “The previously unknown Coalition for Responsible Regulation Inc (CRR) is at the forefront of a strategy to strip the Obama administration of its powers to regulate greenhouse gas emissions should Congress fail to act on climate change… Court documents filed in Texas identify Richard Hogan, chief executive of Solvay's wholly owned US subsidiary, as one of three directors of the CRR, the lead petitioner on the legal challenge to the EPA's authority to act on greenhouse gas emissions. The filings give Solvay's Houston office as Hogan's address. The coalition was apparently created to block Obama's efforts to deal with climate change.” [Guardian, 4/21/10]

**Hillsdale Environmental Loss Prevention, et al. v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (10-2008;11-3210).**  On June 7, 2010, Hillsdale Environmental Loss Prevention, et al, sued the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, et al. Plaintiffs challenged a permit issued by the Corps’ that allowed the BNSF Railway Company to fill in a stream and wetlands. Plaintiffs also claimed that the Corps’ failed to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for the BNSF development. Plaintiffs believed the Defendants were in violation of the Clean Water Act, National Environmental Policy Act, and Administrative Procedure Act. On November 23, 2011, the States of Kansas and Oklahoma filed Amici Curiae in support of the Defendants. On November 28, 2012, the U.S. Court of the Appeals for the Tenth Circuit upheld the Corps’ issuance of the permit. [10-2008; 11-3210, accessed 12/12/16]

**Grocer Manufacturers Association et, al. v. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (10-1380).**  On November 9, 2010, the Grocer Manufacturers Association et, al. filed a petition for review against the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. The groups called on the Court to review a partial grant and partial denial of the EPA’s decision to increase the allowable ethanol content of gasoline to 15 percent. On July 21, 2011, the states of Alabama, Alaska, Oklahoma, and Virginia filed Amici Curiae in support of the petitioners. On June 24, 2013, the petition for a writ of certiorari was denied by the U.S. Supreme Court. [10-1380, accessed 12/12/16]

* **Pruitt Believed Ethanol Increases Would Negatively Impact Cars and Increases Food Prices.** “Pruitt has also been a critic of the Renewable Fuel Standard, the law put in place by Congress a decade ago that requires oil refiners to blend corn ethanol and other biofuels into the nation’s fuel supply. EPA implements the rule. He argued in a 2013 Supreme Court brief that EPA ignored the risks that gasoline with more than 10 percent ethanol pose to cars' fuel systems, as well as the mandate's effect on food prices. The high court declined to take up that case.” [Politico, [12/7/16](http://www.politico.com/blogs/donald-trump-administration/2016/12/oklahoma-ag-pruitt-epa-chief-232319)]

**National Mining Association v. Lisa Jackson, et al. (10-01220; 12-5310).**  On July 20, 2010, National Mining Association sued Lisa Jackson, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, et al. seeking declaratory and injunctive relief. Plaintiffs alleged that the EPA and Army Corps of Engineers had “unlawfully obstructed Clean Water Act permitting processes for coal mining.” Plaintiff further alleged that Defendants had superseded regulatory authority to create a “de facto moratorium” on coal mining permitting. On July 23, 2013, the State of Oklahoma, among others, filed an Amici Curiae in support of the Plaintiffs in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. On July 11, 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit concluded that the EPA and Corps did not exceed the authority they were given under the Clean Water Act and remanded the case to the District Court. [10-01220; 12-5310, accessed 12/12/16]

**American Farm Bureau Federation, et al. v. United States Environmental Protection Agency (11-00067, 13-4079).** On January 10, 2011, the American Farm Bureau Federation sued the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency seeking declaratory and injunctive relief. The Plaintiffs challenged the EPA’s final Total Maximum Daily Load for Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Sediment (TMDL) regulation as exceeding Clean Water Act authority. On February 3, 2014, the State of Oklahoma, among others, filed an Amici Curiae in support of the Plaintiffs in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. On September 13, 2013, the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania entered judgment against Plaintiffs in favor of the Defendants on all claims. On September 17, 2013, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit affirmed the judgment of the District Court. [11-00067, 13-4079, accessed 12/12/16]

Environmental Legal Briefs

2011: American Electric Power Company, Inc v. Connecticut.

**2011: American Electric Power Company, Inc. et al v. State of Connecticut, et al**. On February 7, 2011, the States of Indiana, Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Utah, West Virginia, and Wyoming filed an Amicus Brief in support of American Electric Power. The brief addresses “Whether claims seeking to cap defendants' carbon dioxide emissions at ‘reasonable’ levels, based on a court's weighing of the potential risks of climate change against the socioeconomic utility of defendants' conduct, would be governed by ‘judicially discoverable and manageable standards’ or could be resolved without ‘initial policy determination[s] of a kind clearly for nonjudicial discretion.’” [No. 10-174. February 7, 2011. Accessed 1/9/17]

2012: White Stallion Energy Center LLC v. US EPA

**August 2012: White Stallion Energy Center, LLC et al, v. United States Environmental Protection Agency**. On August 6, 2012, the State of Oklahoma joined the brief of Intevenor-petitioners on petition for review of final agency action. The case concerned two issues: 1. Whether the new source standards for electric utility steam generating units (“EGUs”) reflect the level of emissions “achieved in practice” by the “best controlled similar source” for hazardous air pollutants (“HAPs”) identified for regulation (emphasis added)? 2 2. Whether EPA erred in setting new source standards on a “pollutant-by-pollutant” basis, such that the emission standards for new sources were not “achieved in practice” by a single “best controlled similar source” as required by Clean Air Act (“CAA” or “Act”)…” The case questioned “whether it is even ‘appropriate and necessary’ to regulate [hazardous air pollutants from electric utility stream generating units] under the Clean Air Act. [No. 12-1272, accessed 1/6/17]

**October 2012: State of Oklahoma joined Joint Brief of State, Industry, and Labor Petitioners.** The parties argued that “In 1990, Congress directed that, when it comes to regulating HAPs, EGUs should be treated differently than all other sources. For most sources, Congress provided a rote formula: §112 regulation begins with categorizing sources, followed by rulemakings to set technology-based standards, and then follow-up rulemakings to address residual risks. For EGUs, §112 regulation is not rote. Regulation depends on whether additional reductions in HAP emissions are warranted given the substantial HAPs reductions resulting from other CAA requirements.” [No. 12-1100 (and consolidated cases) filed October 23, 2012, accessed 1/6/17]

2012: Farrell-Cooper Mining Company v. US Department of the Interior

**2012: Farrell-Cooper Mining Company v. US Department of the Interior.** On November 13, 2012, The Oklahoma Department of Mines filed a opening brief in Farrell-Cooper Mining Company v. US Department of the Interior. According to the brief, “Co-Appellant Farrell Cooper Mining Company (“Farrell-Cooper”) sought declaratory judgment and injunctive relief against Appellees U.S. Department of the Interior and Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, et al… Farrell-Cooper named ODM as a party defendant on January 6, 2012… On January 31, 2012, ODM filed an Answer and a Cross Claim against OSM… ODM's Cross Claim asserted that OSM violated SMCRA by exercising jurisdiction in a primacy state without following the express requirements set forth in SMCRA, OSM violated SMCRA by improperly issuing TDNs and OSM unlawfully issued the TDNs by relying on an internal policy guidance document in violation of the Administrative Procedures Act.” [No. 12-7048. November 13, 2012. Accessed 1/9/17]

2013: National Mining Association v. Bob Perciasepe

**National Mining Association, et al., v Bob Perciasepe, Acting Administrator of the US EPA**. On July 22, 2013, the States of Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Kansas, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Virginia filed a brief in support of the National Mining Association, Commonwealth of Kentucky, and City of Pikeville, Kentucky. The brief argued that “The amici curiae are States that have the primary regulatory authority under a variety of cooperative state-federal environmental programs. And they share a concern over the Environmental Protection Agency's (‘EPA’) recent inclination to usurp state programs under federal environmental laws… The EPA's actions conflict with traditional principles of cooperative federalism. This conflict is evidenced by the way the guidance memorandum came about, how it treats some States differently than others, and how it so dramatically diverges from the EPA's statutory authority.” [Nos. 12-5310(L), 12-5311. July 22, 2013. Accessed 1/9/17]

2013: Luminant Generation Co, LLC v. US EPA

**2013: Luminant Generation Co, LLC v. US Environmental Protection Agency.** On July 24, 2013, the States of Texas, Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, West Virginia, and Wyoming as Amici Curiae in Support of Petitioners petition for Write of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. The brief addressed two questions: “1. Whether, despite the Clean Air Act's explicit commands, and this Court's jurisprudence, EPA is correct that it has discretion to insist on its preferred substantive requirements when reviewing a state implementation plan. 2. Whether, when EPA was vague, indecisive, and conclusory in explaining its bases for its action, the panel below departed from this Court's precedents by guessing at what the agency meant and substituting its own rationale for that of the agency.” [No. 12-1484, July 24, 2013, accessed July 24, 2013]

2013: Utility Air Regulatory Group v. US EPA

**2013: Utility Air Regulatory Group, et al v. US Environmental Protection Agency, et al.** On December 9, 2013, the States of Texas, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and South Dakota, and the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality filed the Brief for the State Petitioners. The brief addressed “Whether EPA permissibly determined that its regulation of greenhouse gas emissions from new motor vehicles triggered permitting requirements under the Clean Air Act for stationary sources that emit greenhouse gases.” The State Petitioners filed a reply brief on Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit on February 13, 2014. [No. 12-1146, December 9, 2013, accessed 1/6/17]

2013: Mingo Logan Coal Company v. US EPA

**2013: Mingo Logan Coal Company v. US Environmental Protection Agency.** On December 16, 2013, the state of Oklahoma and 26 other states joined an Amicus Brief in Mingo Logan Coal Company v. US Environmental Protection Agency. The brief argued that “The Clean Water Act … vests full authority in the Army Corps of Engineers … to issue permits for discharge of fill material into the waters of the United States…. The Act unambiguously grants the Corps - not the Environmental Protection Agency … - the authority to lead the permitting process… The question presented is whether, under section 404(c) of the Clean Water Act, EPA has the uncabined authority to withdraw disposal site specifications years after the Corps has issued a permit, thereby effectively nullifying a permit properly issued by the Corps.” [No. 13-599 field December 16, 2013, accessed 1/9/17.]

2014: North Dakota v. US EPA

**2014: State of North Dakota v. US Environmental Protection Agency**. On March 7, 2014, Oklahoma joined the brief of amicus Curiae States of Arizona, Nebraska and Fourteen Other States and State Agencies in support of North Dakota. The brief argued that “Like the State of North Dakota, Amici States Arizona, Louisiana, the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Utah and Wyoming have submitted regional haze plans to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that contain determinations of Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) or similar determinations for certain large industrial facilities. As was the case with Oklahoma's plan, EPA disapproved the BART and other determinations that these Amici States made. These Amici States have filed Petitions for Review of EPA's disapprovals.” [No. 13-940, March 7, 2014, accessed 1/6/17]

2015: State of Wyoming v. US EPA

**2015: State of Wyoming v. US EPA and The Northern Arapaho Tribe, Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation v. US EPA and Northern Arapaho Tribe, Devon Energy Production Company, v. US EPA and Northern Arapaho Tribe**. On January 5, 2015, Idaho, Alabama, Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Utah filed a brief in support of the petitioner State of Wyoming as to Standard of Review. According to the brief, “States view territorial integrity as an essential component of their entry into the Union. The significance of this interest perhaps finds its clearest expression in the Equal Footing Doctrine developed to protect, upon admission to statehood, their ownership in the bed and banks of navigable waters… Such is the case now. The amicus curiae States take no position on the substantive issue raised by the Environmental Protection Agency's conclusion that the Wind River Reservation was not diminished by the Act of March 3, 1905…They seek only to make plain that an administrative agency is owed no deference with respect to its application of federal common law principles to historical facts.” [Nos. 14-9514, 14-9512, 14-9515. January 5, 2015. Accessed 1/9/17]

2015: Aurora Energy Services, LLC v. Alaska Community Action on Toxics.

**2015: Aurora Energy Services, LLC v. Alaska Community Action on Toxics.** The the National Mining Association, Association of American Railroads, Domestic Energy Producers Alliance, State of Alaska, State of Oklahoma, and West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection filed and Amicus Brief in support of petitioners on April 2, 2015. The brief states that “Congress structured the CWA to ensure regulatory certainty and permit enforceability. CWA Section 402(k) - known as the ‘permit shield’ - protects compliant permit holders from liability when operating pursuant to a CWA permit. Section 509 further mandates that challenges to agency permitting decisions be brought in the court of appeals within 120 days. Taken together, CWA Sections 402(k) and 509 evidence the intent of Congress to provide finality to the decisions made by regulatory agencies and allow permittees to then rely on those decisions.” [No. 14-1060. April 2, 2015. Accessed 1/9/17]

2015: Sierra Club v. Regina McCarthy

**2015: Sierra Club et al. v Regina McCarthy in her Official Capacity as Administrator of the US Environmental Protection Agency.** On August 17, 2015, the States of Nebraska, Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming filed and amicus brief in support of Appellant state of North Dakota. According to the brief, “The undersigned amici states are independent of the parties to this action and possess substantial interest in the consequences that will stem from Appellant States' appeal of the District Court's approval and entry of the Consent Decree… The District Court abused its discretion by approving and ordering the entry of a consent decree, over State Appellants' objections, which clearly violates the plain language of the CAA and which imposes additional substantive obligations upon states who were never parties to the consent decree. Accordingly, the District Court's order approving and entering the Consent Decree should be vacated and the matter remanded for further proceedings.” [No. 15-15894. August 17, 2015. Accessed 1/9/17]

2015: Federal Energy Regulatory Commission v. Electric Power Supply Association, et al.

**2015. Federal Energy Regulatory Commission v. Electric Power Supply Association, Eneroc, Inc v. Electric Power Supply Association.** On September 8, 2015, Indiana, Oklahoma, and ten other states field a brief in support of Electric Power Supply Association and Eneroc, Inc. According to the Brief, “This case is fundamentally about whether a federal administrative agency can, in contravention of explicit federal statutory language and nearly a century of precedent, enact and enforce a regulation that regulates retail transactions and effectively pushes retail customers into the federally regulated wholesale market.” [Nos. 14-840, 14-841, September 8, 2015. Accessed 1/9/17]

2015: In re: Murray Energy Corporation v. US EPA

**2015: In re: Murray Energy Corporation v. US Environmental Protection Agency**. On March 9, 2015, the States of West Virginia, Alabama, Alaska, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Nebraska, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wyoming filed a final brief in support of Murray Energy. The brief argued that “EPA has issued a proposed rule even though it admits that the ‘literal terms’ of the Clean Air Act prohibit the rule. And as described below, EPA's attempted justification for avoiding and rewriting that language is not remotely plausible… The ‘specific prohibition’ against EPA's proposed rule is in the very statutory provision the agency cites as its authority: Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 7411(d). That provision grants EPA certain authority to require States to regulate existing-source emissions, but it specifically excludes the regulation of any air pollutant emitted from a source category that EPA already regulates under Section 112 of the Act…” [Nos. 14-1112, 14-1151, March 9, 2015, accessed 1/9/17]

2016: Murray Energy Corporation v. US EPA

**2016: Murray Energy Corporation v. United States Environmental Protection Agency.** On September 14, 2016, the state of Oklahoma along with Wisconsin, Arizona, Kentucky, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, North Dakota, Utah, and Texas filed the state petitioners reply brief in Murray Energy v. US EPA. The States argued that “The Clean Air Act tasks EPA with promulgating a national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) for ozone that is ‘requisite’ to protect ‘public health.’ … It likewise charges States with the ‘responsibility’ to ensure that the standards are “achieved and maintained,” through SIPs, *id.* §§ 7407(a), 7410. These complementary obligations have historically coexisted. Now, however, by failing to adequately consider sources of ozone that States cannot control, EPA has created a false conflict between the Agency's obligation to adopt a health-protective standard and States' obligation to achieve that standard. More than a poor reading of the statute, the clash EPA has created between what States can ‘achieve’ and what is ‘requisite’ for the ‘public health’ invites a cascade of resulting harms, including a constitutional infirmity in the Clean Air Act itself. This Court should insist that the Agency reasonably address the problem of uncontrollable ozone and thereby reconcile the respective obligations of EPA and the States under [Sections 7407(a)](https://1.next.westlaw.com/Link/Document/FullText?findType=L&pubNum=1000546&cite=42USCAS7407&originatingDoc=Ifdb983737c8011e6b86bd602cb8781fa&refType=RB&originationContext=document&transitionType=DocumentItem&contextData=(sc.Search)#co_pp_8b3b0000958a4) and [7409(b)](https://1.next.westlaw.com/Link/Document/FullText?findType=L&pubNum=1000546&cite=42USCAS7409&originatingDoc=Ifdb983737c8011e6b86bd602cb8781fa&refType=RB&originationContext=document&transitionType=DocumentItem&contextData=(sc.Search)#co_pp_a83b000018c76).” [No. 15-1385 (consolidated with 15-1392, 15-1490, 15-1491 & 15-1494), September 14, 2016, accessed 1/9/17]

Other Environmental Lawsuits of Note

In 2012, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt sued BP for “‘double-dipping’ and profiting from pollution by billing state environmental cleanup funds for costs of cleaning up underground storage tank leaks that already had been paid by insurance companies.” In August 2016, Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt sued the Citizen Potawatomi Nation (CPN) over water rights. Pruitt argued that the tribe had illegally set up a water district by creating it without the consent of the State of Oklahoma. Pruitt first sued CPN in July 2016, but the suit was dismissed. CPN believed the suit was political retribution for a fight over state sales tax. Oklahoma also reached a 2016 settlement with the Chickasaw and Choctaw Nations over water rights in a case that had begun five years earlier. The complex agreement would allow Oklahoma to draw from the Sardis Lake while preserving water level and flows for the tribes.

**2013: State of Oklahoma, et al. v. Phillips 66, et al. (13-5246).**  On September 20, 2013, the State of Oklahoma, et al. filed a petition against Phillips 66, et al. seeking redress in excess of $10,000 for violations of Oklahoma statutory law.  Plaintiffs alleged that Defendants had illegally received money from the Oklahoma Petroleum Storage Tank Division Indemnity Fund by falsely claiming they did not have insurance.  On September 20, 2016, the charges were dismissed with prejudice after a settlement was reached between the two parties. [Oklahoma State Court Network, accessed [12/13/16]](http://www.oscn.net/dockets/GetCaseInformation.aspx?db=appellate&number=DF-112808&cmid=114334)

* **Oklahoma and ConocoPhillips Reached $3.7 Million in Lawsuit.**“Accused in lawsuits of profiting from pollution, ConocoPhillips has agreed to a $3.7 million settlement with the State of Oklahoma. The agreement was signed this week and in it, ConocoPhillips admitted to no wrongdoing nor liability, according to documents obtained by OK Energy Today…But as the 6-page settlement stated, ‘Phillips 66 and the Oklahoma Fund desire to avoid the additional cost and uncertainty of continued litigation, to bring about a just and amicable resolution of the Act and issues—to resolve fully and finally their dispute and all potential claims.’ An attempt by OK Energy Today to obtain a comment from the Attorney General’s office was not answered on Friday. But the agreement showed that the total settlement would be $3,770,000.” [OK Energy Today, [6/24/16](http://okenergytoday.com/2016/06/19302/)]

**Oklahoma Attorney General Sued Pottawatomie County Rural Water District No. 3 Over Water Pipes.** “The state is hassling a tribe about the rural water district it operates because of other legal issues between the two, an attorney for the water district said Friday. Oklahoma’s attorney general sued Pottawatomie County Rural Water District No. 3 this year, alleging it encroached on state rights of way without permission. Attorneys have also argued that the Citizen Potawatomi Nation is barred by law from operating the district. According to its request for declaratory judgment, the state wants CPN to get approval before expanding water district assets on state land. Water district attorney Steven Harris told District Judge Don Andrews that he will bring up other state-versus-tribe issues as part of his defense.” [Journal Record, 8/19/16]

* **Attorney General Pruitt Believed Tribe Was Not Allowed to Operate Water District; First Suit Was Dismissed.** “Attorney general spokesman Will Gattenby wrote in an email to The Journal Record that Attorney General Scott Pruitt filed the lawsuit because the tribe is unlawfully operating a rural water district. The office, he wrote, defends the state's interests regardless of who is involved. The state’s attorneys did not respond to Harris' allegation in court. Friday’s hearing on a temporary injunction was expected to run late into the day. Andrews declined to rule on the water district’s motion to dismiss, saying that he wanted to hear more testimony first. This is Pruitt’s second attempt to corral the tribe’s water district. The judge dismissed Pruitt’s first case in July, but allowed him to file again. At its heart, the attorney general’s complaint is that the rural water district ceased to exist in 2005 when CPN bought it, and the legal rights of a water district disappeared with that transfer.” [Journal Record, 8/19/16]
* **Citizen Potawatomi Nation Believed Suit Was Political Payback for Sales Tax Fight.** “Barrett and other sources close to the Citizen Potawatomi Nation suspect the pipe fight is petty political payback for a much bigger battle over sales taxes. District No. 3 requested the U.S. 177 pipe permit a few months after state tax officials in May 2014 challenged $27 million in tribal sales tax exemptions and moved to revoke the tribe’s alcoholic beverage permits. A federal arbitrator ruled in favor of the tribe in April 2016, and now the two sides are squaring off over highway rights-of-way. ‘It really wasn’t about water and it wasn’t about compliance, it was really all about another way to bring pressure to bear on the tribe,’ Barrett says.” [State Impact, [6/23/16](https://stateimpact.npr.org/oklahoma/2016/06/23/tribe-says-showdown-over-rural-permits-rooted-in-politics-not-water-pipes/)]

**Tarrant Regional Water District v. Rudolf John Herrmann, et al. (07:00045).** On January 11, 2007, Tarrant Regional Water District sued Rudolf John Herrman, et al. in their official capacities as members of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board and the Oklahoma Water Conservation Storage Commission seeking declaratory and injunctive relief against an embargo which forbid Texans from acquiring Oklahoma water.  On July 16, 2010, the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma entered a judgment in favor of the Defendants and against the Plaintiff on all claims.  On June 13, 2013, the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed the judgment. [07:00045, accessed 12/13/16]

* **Supreme Court Ruled in Favor of Oklahoma on Water Rights.** “The unanimous United States Supreme Court decision favoring Oklahoma in the water rights case, ‘Tarrant Regional Water District v. Herrmann,’ sets the stage for the next big development in Oklahoma water policy. That will be either a negotiated settlement over apportionment of water rights among interested parties — including the state of Oklahoma and the Chickasaw and Choctaw Nations — or new intensity in a case, filed in August 2011, that pits the state against the tribes. Last week’s 9-0 ruling, crafted by Associate Justice Sonia Sotomayor, ended a six-year water war between the Sooner State and Tarrant County (Fort Worth and surrounding towns in the greater Dallas-Forth Worth area). The North Texas agency had asserted a right for Texas – under provisions of the Red River Compact, approved in 1980 – to get its asserted share of water, even if that meant reaching into Oklahoma to secure the asset.” [Oklahoma Watchdog, [6/17/13](http://watchdog.org/90734/ok-water-rights-victory-historic-setting-stage-for-state-tribal-case/)]

**State of Oklahoma Reached Settlement with Choctaw and Chickasaw Nation Over Water Rights.** [Settlement Agreement, accessed [12/13/16](http://s3.amazonaws.com/content.newsok.com/documents/wateragreement.pdf?embeddedLinkType=document)]

* **Oklahoma Reached Settlement Over Water Rights With Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations.** “The agreement calls for Oklahoma City and the two tribes to contribute money into a new $10 million fund that will be used for projects around Sardis and Atoka lakes. The projects will be designed to improve conservation efforts and enhance the recreational use of the lakes and improve their habitats for fish and wildlife. Oklahoma City will be required to pay $5 million into the fund, the Choctaw Nation will contribute $3,750,000 and the Chickasaw Nation will contribute $1,250,000…While five years might seem like a long time to resolve a lawsuit, Indian water rights litigation typically takes decades to resolve, Pruitt said. Forty years is the average time to resolve such disputes, he said. While such litigation is pending, city governments, tribes, businesses and individuals are hindered in their ability to make plans and commit to economic development projects.” [Oklahoman, [8/11/16](http://newsok.com/article/5513458)]

**Valero Refinery Company – Oklahoma v. State of Oklahoma (Carter County District Court: 11-0067).**

**2014, 2015: EME Homer City Generation, L.P., et al., v. United States Environmental Protection Agency, et al. (11-1302; 11-1182).** On April 29, 2014, the Supreme Court reversed and remanded the opinion of the lower court, ruling in favor of the EPA. On July 28, 2015, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit reconsidered the rule 6-2, upholding most of the regulation while rejecting arguments by several of the petitioners. [11-1302; 11-1182, accessed 12/6/16]

**2016: Save the Illinois River, Inc., et al. v. the State of Oklahoma, et al. (16-417).**  On March 1, 2016, Save the Illinois River, Inc., filed a petition for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief against the State of Oklahoma, et al.  The Plaintiffs asked the Court to strike down a state ballot question that would have “elevated the occupation choices of farming and ranching…to fundamental rights under the Oklahoma Constitution.” On May 27, 2016, the District Court for Oklahoma County dismissed the charges against the Defendants. On August 8, 2016, the judgment was affirmed by the Oklahoma Supreme Court. [Oklahoma State Court Network, accessed [12/13/16](http://www.oscn.net/dockets/GetCaseInformation.aspx?ct=Oklahoma&number=CV-2016-417)]

**Pruitt Sued by Humane Society on Behalf of his Predecessor.** “Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt is accused of harassment and misconduct in a suit filed Wednesday by his predecessor, Drew Edmondson, on behalf of the Humane Society of the United States. The national Humane Society petition, filed in Oklahoma County District Court, seeks injunctive relief and a declaratory judgment against what it says is Pruitt’s ‘nearly year-long campaign of legal harassment and public vilification of this organization for political gain.’ The suit, and accompanying press release, suggests the Humane Society believes Pruitt is acting at the behest of the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, a long-time Humane Society foe.” [Tulsa World, [1/22/15](http://www.tulsaworld.com/newshomepage2/attorney-general-scott-pruitt-sued-by-former-ag-drew-edmondson/article_f3e14596-5cd7-59e3-9645-f3fa00d165e6.html)]

Issued Opinions As Attorney General

2015

In 2015, Pruitt issued an opinion that found that a statute specifying interest rates owed to non-operating owners of interest in oil and gas wells was constitutional. Pruitt also issued an opinion on the proper balance of regulatory power over oil and gas operations between the state and its localities. In a five-part decision, Pruitt found that provisions of state law “limit(ed) municipal regulation of oil and gas operations,” and that “the power of political subdivisions to regulate oil and gas activity is limited…” He also found that “a municipal ordinance that conflicts with” code “is invalid and unenforceable,” and that “setbacks or fencing requirements for oil and gas well site locations adopted by a political subdivision that effectively prohibit certain types of oil and gas drilling…conflict with” code and “are…invalid.”

*2015-6—Constitutionality of Statute Specifying Interest Rates Owed to Non-Operating Owners of Interest in Oil and Gas Wells*

**September 2015: State Rep. Mike Sanders Received Opinion on Whether 12 Percent Interest Rate Owed to Non-Operating Owners of Interest in Oil and Gas Well’s Production When Holders of Proceeds from First Sale Failed to Distribute Proceeds within Time Periods Required by Statute.** [Attorney General Opinion 2015-6, [9/1/15](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2015-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

* **Question Also Noted that If Owner’s Title Was Unmarketable Then the Applicable Interest Rate Was 6 Percent.** According to the question asked in the case, “Title 52 O.S.2011, § 570.10(D) specifies an interest rate of 12 percent owed to non-operating owners of interest in an oil and gas well’s production when the holders of the proceeds from the first sale of oil or gas fail to distribute the proceeds within the time periods required by statute, unless the interest owner’s title is unmarketable, in which case the applicable interest rate is 6 percent. Does this statute violate the special laws prohibition in Article V, Section 46 of the Oklahoma Constitution?” [Attorney General Opinion 2015-6, [9/1/15](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2015-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

**Decision Found that Law Was Not in Violation of Oklahoma Constitution “Because It Does Not Single out Similarly Affected Persons for Disparate Treatment, But Rather Rests on a Proper and Legitimate Classification.”** According to the decision, “Title 52 O.S.2011, & 570.10(D) is not a special law fixing the rate of interest in violation of Article V, Section 46 of the Oklahoma Constitution because it does not single out similarly affected persons for disparate treatment, but rather rests on a proper and legitimate classification.” [Attorney General Opinion 2015-6, [9/1/15](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2015-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

*2015-12—Proper Balance of Regulatory Power over Oil and Gas Operations between the State and Its Localities*

**November 2015: State Reps Mike Ritze, Chris Kannady, and Kevin Calvey Received Opinion on Several Questions Regarding a Statute Allowing State to “Enact Reasonable Ordinances, Rules and Regulations Concerning Road Use, Traffic Noise and Odors Incidental to Oil and Gas Operations within Their Boundaries.”** [Attorney General Opinion 2015-12, [11/30/15](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2015-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

**Decision Made Five Key Findings.** [Attorney General Opinion 2015-12, [11/30/15](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2015-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

* **Provisions of State Law that “Limit Municipal Regulation of Oil and Gas Operations, Apply Equally to Charter Municipalities…and non-Charter Municipalities…”** [Attorney General Opinion 2015-12, [11/30/15](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2015-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]
* **“The Power of Political Subdivisions to Regulate Oil and Gas Activity Is Limited…”** [Attorney General Opinion 2015-12, [11/30/15](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2015-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]
* **“Setbacks Or Fencing Requirements for Oil and Gas Well Site Locations Adopted by a Political Subdivision that Effectively Prohibit Certain Types of Oil and Gas Drilling within the Subdivision’s Boundaries Conflict with” Code “And Are Therefore Invalid.”** [Attorney General Opinion 2015-12, [11/30/15](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2015-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]
* **“A Municipal Ordinance that Conflicts with” Code “Is Invalid and Unenforceable Regardless of When the Ordinance Was Adopted Or Whether It Provides for an Appeal Process.”** [Attorney General Opinion 2015-12, [11/30/15](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2015-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]
* **“Local Regulation…Must Bear a Substantial Relation to Public Health, Safety, Morals Or General Welfare of the Community, a Determination that Can Only Be Reached by Examining the Specific Language of the Regulation and the Application to a Particular Set of Facts.”** [Attorney General Opinion 2015-12, [11/30/15](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2015-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

2014

*No cases of note*

2013

In 2013, Pruitt issued an opinion that members of the Oklahoma Legislature were ineligible to be appointed to the Oklahoma Energy Initiative Board under the provisions of the Oklahoma Energy Initiative Act.

*2013-20—Appointment of Legislators to Boards by the Oklahoma Legislature*

**October 2013: State Representative Weldon Watson Received Opinion on Whether Legislators Were Allowed to Be Appointed for Membership on the Oklahoma Energy Initiative Board.** [Attorney General Opinion 2012-20, [10/29/13](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2013-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

**October 2013: State Representative Weldon Watson Received Opinion on Whether Legislators Were Allowed to Be Appointed for Membership on the Oklahoma Energy Initiative Board.** [Attorney General Opinion 2013-20, [10/29/13](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2013-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

**Oklahoma Energy Initiative Was to Serve “as a Strategic Program Designed to Create, Advance, and Promote New and Existing Energy Research and Development Efforts Related to Oklahoma’s Core Energy Competencies…”** According to the opinion, “members of the Oklahoma Legislature, during the term for which they have been elected, are ineligible to receive ‘any appointment’ from the Governor, the Governor and the Senate or from the Legislature…The Oklahoma Energy Initiative Act…created the Oklahoma Energy Initiative, which is to serve ‘as a strategic program designed to create, advance and promote new and existing energy research and development efforts related to Oklahoma’s core energy competencies…’” [Attorney General Opinion 2013-20, [10/29/13](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2013-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

* **Opinion: “Powers Vested in the Oklahoma Energy Initiative Board Are Not Legislative in Nature…Rather, They Involve Executive Powers…”** “Included among the powers and duties conferred upon the Oklahoma Energy Initiative Board is the responsibility for ‘establishing procedures used for the Initiative and operations of the Board,’ which ‘may provide for protection from public disclosure of trade secrets and proprietary information of any kind…’ the Board is vested with the power and duty to ‘commission programs, through the contributing institutions, to achieve the purpose and satisfy the objectives of the Initiative as provided in the Oklahoma Energy Initiative Act…’ The powers vested in the Oklahoma Energy Initiative Board are not legislative in nature—they are not lawmaking powers—rather, they involve executive powers: the hiring of staff, the establishment of internal procedures, the commissioning of programs, and distributing program funding.” [Attorney General Opinion 2013-20, [10/29/13](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2013-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

**Decision: “We Conclude that Members of the Oklahoma Legislature Are Ineligible to Be Appointed to the Oklahoma Energy Initiative Board…The Fact…Does Not Invalidate the Board Or Its Functions.”** “The Oklahoma Legislature cannot avoid the implication of the prohibition by requiring that one Board member be a Senator and one be a Representative and leaving the naming of which…to the leaders of the Senate and the House…we conclude that members of the Oklahoma Legislature are ineligible to be appointed to the Oklahoma Energy Initiative Board under the provisions of the Oklahoma Energy Initiative Act…The fact that members of the Legislature are ineligible to be appointed to the Oklahoma Energy Initiative Board, does not invalidate the Board or its functions.” [Attorney General Opinion 2013-20, [10/29/13](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2013-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

2012

Pruitt issued an opinion that clarified that “a board of county commissioners has the authority…to issue road crossing permits to citizens, including public utility companies and cable television systems, to lay pipe and conduits under roads or highways…” The broad regulatory power included the authority to charge fees for road crossing permits.

Pruitt issued an opinion that when a majority of Commissioners on the Corporation Commission were present, “the hearing is subject to the Open Meeting Act.” Certain meetings, however, did not fall under the Open Meeting Act, including a meeting with the House or Senate “to provide information about the commission’s business to aid the Legislature in its process of decision-making…”

Pruitt also issued an opinion that welding performed on intrastate gas pipelines, gas gathering pipelines and gas processing facilities was not “mechanical work” as defined by the Mechanical Licensing Act.

*2012-10—County Commissioners and Road Crossing Permits*

**July 2012: State Representative Jason Murphey Received Opinion on Whether County Commissioners Had Statutory Authority to Issue Road Crossing Permits.** [Attorney General Opinion 2012-10, [7/23/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

* **“You Ask a Number of Questions Relating to the Authority of a Board of County Commissioners to Issue Road Crossing Permits and to Charge Fees for the Issuance of Those Permits.”** According to the decision, “You ask a number of questions relating to the authority of a board of county commissioners to issue road crossing permits and to charge fees for the issuance of those permits. You have not asked about the propriety of using a county road or highway easement or rights of way for any particular purpose or the authority of a county or a private party owning the fee interest below the roadway to charge a public utility or private person for the use of the roads or highways. You ask only about the road crossing permits and we address only that in this Opinion.” [Attorney General Opinion 2012-10, [7/23/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

**Opinion: “A Board of County Commissioners Has the Authority…to Issue Road Crossing Permits to Citizens, Including Public Utility Companies and Cable Television Systems, to Lay Pipe and Conduits under Roads Or Highways…”** According to the opinion, “A board of county commissioners has the authority pursuant…to issue road crossing permits to citizens, including public utility companies and cable television systems, to lay pipe and conduits under roads or highways under the board’s jurisdiction.” [Attorney General Opinion 2012-10, [7/23/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

* **“Broad Regulatory Power Includes the Authority to Charge Fees for Road Crossing Permits.”** “A board of county commissioners has the express power to adopt rules, regulations and conditions related to road crossing permits…This broad regulatory power includes the authority to charge fees for road crossing permits.” [Attorney General Opinion 2012-10, [7/23/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]
* **“The Amount of…Road Crossing Permit Fees…Shall Not Be Used as a Revenue-Generating Measure.”** “The amount of…road crossing permit fees…shall not be used as a revenue-generating measure.” [Attorney General Opinion 2012-10, [7/23/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]
* **“County Commissioner’s Regulatory Authority…Includes the Power to Assess a Fine for Non-Compliance with Rules regarding Road Crossing Permits…”** “A board of county commissioner’s regulatory authority…includes the power to assess a fine for non-compliance with rules regarding road crossing permits…” [Attorney General Opinion 2012-10, [7/23/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]
* **“Excess…Fee Or Fine…Would Be Unlawful…”** “A fee or fine in excess of the amount reasonably required for administration and regulation of the permit would be unlawful.” [Attorney General Opinion 2012-10, [7/23/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

*2012-24—Compliance with Open Meeting Act*

**December 2012: Oklahoma Corporation Commissioner Received Opinion on Compliance with Oklahoma Open Meeting Act.** The question asked about compliance with Oklahoma Open Meeting Act “when a majority of commissioners of the Oklahoma Corporation Commission attends public utility hearings.” [Attorney General Opinion 2012-24, [12/21/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

**Opinion: When Majority of Commissioners of Corporation Commission “Are Present a…Public Utility Hearing on a Legislative Matter…The Hearing Is Subject to the Open Meeting Act.”** According to the opinion, “When a majority of commissioners of the Oklahoma Corporation Commission are present at the same time at a public utility hearing on a legislative matter conducted by an administrative law judge, the hearing is subject to the Open Meeting Act. The commissioners are engaged in the ‘conduct of business…’” [Attorney General Opinion 2012-24, [12/21/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

* **Certain Meetings Did Not Qualify under Open Meeting Act.** “When a majority of commissioners attends a meeting with another governmental agency to discuss mutual business, or attends a meeting of a private entity concerning a topic of interest to the Oklahoma Corporation Commission’s business, the commissioners are not subject to the requirements of the Open Meeting Act unless, at the meeting, the commissioners are considering discrete proposals or specific matters that are within their jurisdiction…” [Attorney General Opinion 2012-24, [12/21/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]
* **One of These Scenarios Was Meeting with Senate or House “to Provide Information about the Commission’s Business to Aid the Legislature in Its Process of Decision-Making…”** “When a majority of the members of the Oklahoma Corporation Commission attends an Oklahoma Senate or House of Representatives meeting to provide information about the Commission’s business to aid the Legislature in its process of decision-making, the commissioners are not required to follow the requirements of the Open Meeting Act, as such a gathering does not meet the definition of ‘meeting…’” [Attorney General Opinion 2012-24, [12/21/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

*2012-25—Licenses for Pipeline Workers*

**December 2012: State Senator Bryce Marlatt Received Opinion on Licenses Required for Pipeline Workers.** The question asked whether welding contractors had to be licensed under the mechanical licensing act “in order to work on gas processing facilities, intrastate gas pipelines, or gas gathering pipelines at the direction of the owner of such facilities if the contractors are otherwise certified by the Commissioner of Labor and are compliant with the owner’s minimum safety standards” or other standards. [Attorney General Opinion 2012-25, [12/21/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

* **Opinion: “Welding Performed on Intrastate Gas Pipelines, Gas Gathering Pipelines and Gas Processing Facilities, Is Not ‘Mechanical Work’ as Defined by the Mechanical Licensing Act…”** According to the opinion, “Welding that is regulated by the Department of Labor…including welding performed on intrastate gas pipelines, gas gathering pipelines and gas processing facilities, is not ‘mechanical work’ as defined by the Mechanical Licensing Act…contractors performing such work are not subject to the licensing requirements of the Mechanical Licensing Act under the jurisdiction of the Construction Industries Board.” [Attorney General Opinion 2012-25, [12/21/12](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2012-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

2011

Pruitt issued an opinion that declared that “no monies” in the Oklahoma State Park Trust Fund “may be used for…administrative expenses.” According to the opinion,“The purposes for which the Oklahoma State Park Trust Fund may be used are…to protect and conserve state park lands…to preserve historic properties under the jurisdiction of the Commission…to provide for one-time capital upgrades and improvements of state park resources and…to pay fees and expenses associated with the services of a custodian of the Trust Fund…”

*2011-13—Monies in the Oklahoma State Park Trust Fund*

**September 2011: Executive Director of Oklahoma Tourism and Recreation Department Received Opinion on Various Uses of the Oklahoma State Park Trust Fund.** [Attorney General Opinion 2011-13, [9/8/11](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2011-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

* **“The Principal of the Trust Fund Consists of…Monies from Any and All Mineral Lease Payments, Seismograph Fees, Royalty Payments, Or Other Payments Associated with Oil and Gas Mineral Operations at State Parks…Any funds Appropriated to the Land Trust by the Legislature…”** According to the opinion, “The principal of the Trust Fund consists of…monies from any and all mineral lease payments, seismograph fees, royalty payments, or other payments associated with oil and gas mineral operations at state parks that are managed by the Oklahoma Tourism and Recreation Department, any funds appropriated or transferred to the Trust Fund by the Legislature, and any monies or other assets contributed to the Trust Fund from any other source, public or private…” [Attorney General Opinion 2011-13, [9/8/11](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2011-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

**Opinion: “No Monies in the Trust Fund May Be Used for the Administrative Expenses…Trust Fund Monies May Be Used for Expenses Associated with the Services of a Custodian of the Trust Fund.”** According to the opinion, “No monies in the Trust Fund may be used for the administrative expenses of the Oklahoma Tourism and Recreation Commission or expenses incurred by the Commission in the administration of the Trust Fund…However, Trust Fund monies may be used for expenses associated with the services of a custodian of the Trust Fund.” [Attorney General Opinion 2011-13, [9/8/11](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2011-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

* **Allowable Purposes for Money Included “to Protect and Conserve State Park Lands…to Preserve Historic Properties…to Provide for One-Time Capital Upgrades and Improvements of State Park Resources and…to Pay Fees and Expenses…”** “The purposes for which the Oklahoma State Park Trust Fund may be used are…to protect and conserve state park lands…to preserve historic properties under the jurisdiction of the Commission…to provide for one-time capital upgrades and improvements of state park resources and…to pay fees and expenses associated with the services of a custodian of the Trust Fund…” [Attorney General Opinion 2011-13, [9/8/11](https://www.ok.gov/oag/documents/2011-Oklahoma%20Attorney%20General-Opinion%20Book.pdf)]

Oklahoma Utility Rate increases

Scott Pruitt’s office has overseen four rate hike requests by Oklahoma’s two largest utility companies – two from Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company (OG&E) and two from Public Service Company of Oklahoma (PSO). In case 20110087, in which OG&E requested a $73,255,958 increase, the Attorney General’s office argued for measures that would have kept rates consistent throughout a given year. The utility was granted a $4,313,606 increase. In case 201300217, PSO argued for a $37,305,852 rate increase. Pruitt’s office “filed testimony recommending lower revenue requirements than the revenue requirement requested by PSO.” The utility was not granted its rate increase. In a later case (201500208), PSO requested an increase of $83,828,642. During the proceedings, Pruitt’s office requested a study to evaluate the costs associated with the rate increase, “recommended that any rate increase be allocated by an equal percentage increase to all customer classes to help mitigate rate shock to the residential class,” and argued for keeping coal plants open to ensure costs stayed low. The utility was awarded a $14,469,574 increase. OG&E’s most recent case, 201500273, is still working its way through the regulatory process. During the proceedings, a representative for Mr. Pruitt’s office was critical of the way in which the rate increase was justified by OG&E; he argued that the utility’s proposed cost of service was lower than the company claimed.

Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company

|  |
| --- |
| **Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company** |
| **Cause No.** | **Order No.** | **Final Order Date** | **Requested** | **Approved** |
| **201100087** | **599558** | **7/9/2012** | $ 73,255,958 | $ 4,313,606 |
| **201500273** | **n/a** | **n/a** | $ 92,494,692.00 | TBD |

*Case Number: 201100087*

Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company requested a $73,225,958 rate increase. The increase was approved at a total of $4,313,606.

**Edwin Farrar of the Oklahoma Attorney General’s Office Recommended That All Rate Payers Share In A Rate Decrease.** “Q: You recommended a decrease in OG&E's rates in your responsive testimony in this 3 Cause? What is your recommendation for the distribution of that decrease in rates? Farrar: I recommend that all customers share in the decrease in rates. However, I recommend 5 that efforts be made to move customers toward the cost of providing them electric power which will result in some classes receiving a proportionally higher rate reduction. A: I recommend that all customers share in the decrease in rates. However, I recommend that efforts be made to move customers toward the cost of providing them electric power which will result in some classes receiving a proportionally higher rate reduction.” [Rate Design Testimony Of Edwin C. Farrar On Behalf Of Oklahoma Attorney General, 11/16/16]

**Pruitt’s Representative Recommended A Conservation Tariff In Place Of OG&E’s Summer Tail Block Rate, A Measure That Would Keep Utility Rates Balanced Throughout The Year .** Farrar: “I recommend the residential summer tail block rate be eliminated and replaced with a conservation tariff. The current Demand Reduction Program (‘DRP’) charge for the primary residential class should be maintained until next June and it then should be replaced with the rate of $0.0128 per kWh for all summer consumption over 1,400 kWh per month. The Commission should grant a waiver to the Commission’s rules limiting 8 rates for the DRP for this purpose. The Commission should reset the DRP tail-block rate during its 2012 review of that tariff.’’ [Rate Design Testimony Of Edwin C. Farrar On Behalf Of Oklahoma Attorney General, 11/16/16]

**Farrar: The “Commission Should Refuse To Adopt The AL's Recommendation Concerning The Ad Valorem Adjustment And Adopt The Position Of The Attorney General And The OIEC By Removing The Portion Of OG&E’s Adjustment Related To 2012 Expense Levels.”** “In the present case, the Attorney General’s witness, Ed Farrar, recommended in his responsive testimony that ‘ad valorem taxes should not be projected past the six month updated period of June 11, 2011 consistent with plant and other components of the revenue requirement’ (Farrar Resp.Test.11/9/11, p. 27). Mr. Farrar’s recommendation properly sought to limit consideration of known and measurable changes to the statutorily prescribed six-month post-testyear period. In addition, Mr. Farrar also noted that restricting the ad valorem updates to that period would match other expense and revenue updates and, in addition, recognized that failure to so restrict those tax updates would result in a mismatch of material changes and preclude consideration of offsetting decreases (see also Testimony of Mark Garrett, Report p. 138). This recommendation recognizes the fact that not only does consideration of adjustments beyond the prescribed six-month period violate t he pertinent statute, it also constitutes poor regulatory policy in that it results in single-issue ratemaking when an accounting mismatch occurs. In conclusion and based upon the above argument and authority, the Attorney General submits that the ALJ erred in allowing OG&E's 2012 adjustments to ad valorem tax expense. Pursuant to section 284 of Title 17, it is improper to consider known and measurable changes occurring outside the test year or the six-month period immediately following the test year. Any argument to the effect that such authority exists under this Commission's general supervisory powers is overcome by the legislature's decision to directly address the scope of this specific type of review. Thus, this Commission should refuse to adopt the AL's recommendation concerning the ad valorem adjustment and adopt the position of the Attorney General and the OIEC by removing the portion of OG&E's adjustment related to 2012 expense levels.” [AG's Exceptions to the Report of the ALJ, 6/11/12]

**Assistant Attorney General William Humes and Nicole King Filed A Letter On Behalf Of Pruitt Calling On The Commission To Disregard Return On Equity Recommendations Because They Relied Too Heavily On“The Testimony Of OG&E’ S Witness.”** “On page 262 of the Report, the AU rejects the ROE recommendations of Staff, the Attorney General, Wal-Mart, and OIEC stating that an ROE of 10.75% ‘is reasonable and appropriate because there is substantial evidence to support this ROE.’ The Attorney General would initially submit that merely because there is evidence to support the 10.75% ROE does not necessarily make that ROE ‘reasonable and appropriate.’ Further, the Attorney General submits that the AU’ s discussion contained in the Report lacks a basis upon which the reasonableness of her recommendation may be determined. The Attorney General would request that this Commission reconsider the issue of whether the adopted ROE is truly reasonable and appropriate considering current economic conditions and the recommendations of other parties. A review of the AL’s discussion and rationale for adopting an ROE of 10.75% reveals that she relies heavily upon the testimony of OG&E’ s witness, Mr. Hevert, to rebut and discredit the recommendations of witnesses for OIEC, Staff, and the Attorney General (see Report, pp. 262-96). However, at no point in the AL’s discussion does she cite to specific record evidence to demonstrate the basis upon which she found Mr. Hevert’s testimony, and in particular his methodology for determining ROE, more compelling than that of other witnesses. Further, the ALJ does not in her discussion state that she found Mr. Hevert’ s testimony more credible than other testimony.” [AG's Exceptions to the Report of the ALJ, 6/11/12]

* **The Return On Equity Was Set At 10.2 Percent At The Conclusion Of The Rate Change Proceedings.** “Based upon the Commission’s review and evaluation of the pleadings, testimony of witnesses, the Joint Stipulation and Settlement Agreement, and evidence contained in the record for this Cause, and upon a full and final consideration thereof, the Commission makes the following findings and conclusions: … the stated Return on Equity until OG&E’s next general rate proceeding is 10.2 percent. The identified ROE for any provision of a tariff in effect upon the implementation of new rates pursuant to a final order in this Cause shall be the lesser of 10.2 percent or the present return currently in effect for such tariff, until changed by this Commission in a subsequent order. The rate of return to be used under various recovery riders previously approved by the 0CC, including riders for OG&E’s Smart Grid implementation and Crossroads wind farm will be based on the OG&E’s proposed debt and equity ratios as reflected in OG&E’s application and 10.2 percent ROE.” [Final Order Approving Joint Stipulation And Settlement Agreement, 7/9/12]

**Assistant Attorney General On Behalf Of Pruitt: “The Attorney General Submits That The ALJ Erred By Accepting OG&E’s Adjustments To Ad Valorem Taxes That Extended Beyond The Statutorily Prescribed Six-Month Post-Test-Year Period.”** “The Attorney General submits that the ALJ erred by accepting OG&E’s adjustments to Ad Valorem Taxes that extended beyond the statutorily prescribed six-month post-test-year period. The Attorney General further submits that notwithstanding the statutory violation, allowing the 2012 Ad Valorem Tax adjustments constitutes poor regulatory policy as doing so creates a mismatch between revenues and expenses that is contrary to basic principles of proper ratemaking. Lastly, the Attorney General submits that the ALJ has not provided a substantial or persuasive record upon which to base her determination as to an appropriate and reasonable ROE. The Attorney General requests that this Commission reconsider the AL’s recommendation as to these issues and adopt the Attorney General’s recommendation as set forth in oral and written testimony.” [AG’s Exceptions to the Report of the ALJ, 6/11/12]

**The Attorney General Signed Onto A Joint Settlement That Would Not Increase Rates For Residential Users.** “Residential prices will be adjusted as follows: The residential customer charge will not be increased, and ii. Any increase to the energy prices to accommodate the inclusion of rider amounts being included in base prices will be made to the winter first block, summer first block, and shoulder month prices.” [Settlement Agreement, 1/11/12]

*Case Number: 201500273*

Oklahoma Gas & Electric Company requested a $92,494,692 rate increase. The increase is still pending approval.

**Attorney General Representative James W. Daniel Was Critical Of The Way In Which The Rate Increase Was Justified.** “Q. PLEASE SUMMARIZE THE RESULTS OF YOUR REVIEW AND ANALYSIS. A. Based upon my review and analysis, I have reached the following conclusions and recommendations: OG&E improperly classified a substantial portion of its distribution plant related costs for conductors (both overhead and underground), poles and conduit as ‘customer-related.’ These distribution costs were incurred to meet customer demands and should be classified as demand-related costs. OG&E’s proposed distribution of its proposed revenue increase to the customer classes gradually moves customer class revenue levels towards each class’s cost of service in order to temper customer impacts. I agree with OG&E’s proposed revenue distribution objective, especially in light of OG&E’s proposed restructure of the standard residential rates. However, OG&E’s proposed revenue distribution should be revised to reflect the impact of item above. OG&E’s proposed residential monthly customer charge increase of over 100% is excessive and contrary to one of OG&E’ s witness’s testimony. It results in severe rate increases for many residential customers and should be rejected by the Commission. OG&E’s proposal to restructure the standard residential rate design by including a demand charge causes a substantial rate increase for some customers, while other customers will receive a rate decrease. Due to these significantly disparate rate impacts among the residential customers, OG&E’s proposed demand charge should be implemented gradually. OG&E’s proposed new residential customer prepay billing option (‘Pay Go’’) should be revised per the recommendations of OAG witness Ed Farrar. OG&E failed to consider customer bill impacts when designing its proposed rates. The Commission should reject OG&E’s residential rate design due to the substantial bill increases for numerous residential customers.”[Responsive Testimony And Exhibits Of James W. Daniel On Behalf Of E. Scott Pruitt, Oklahoma Attorney General 3/31/16]

**Attorney General Representative Claimed That OG&E’s Proposed Cost Of Service Was Lower Than The Company Claimed.** According to responsive testimony by James W. Daniel:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Customer Class | OG&E'sProposed Cost of Service | Revised Cost of Service | Difference |
| Residential | $ 664.539.473 | $ 641.036.295 | $ (23.503.178) |
| General Service | 134.309.466 | 118.430.749 | (15.878.717) |
| Oil & Gas | 9.547.527 | 9.379.969 | (167.558) |
| Schools Non-Demand | 18.196.628 | 20.940.560 | 2.743,932 |
| Schools Demand | 10.075.344 | 11.505.964 | 1.430.619 |
| Power & Light | 289.194.665 | 316.01 0.751 | 26.816,086 |
| Large Power & Light | 136.143.450 | 144.126.312 | 7.982.862 |
| Municipal Pumping | 4.173.748 | 4.303.683 | 129.935 |
| Lighting | 33.740.688 | 33.080.157 | (660.531 ) |
| Total | $ 1.299.920.989 | $ 1.298.814.440 | $ (1.106,549) |

“As shown on the table above, the correct classification of distribution plant, as I am proposing, will decrease the cost of service for the residential class by $23,503,178. This corrected cost of service for the residential class is lower than OG&E's proposed residential revenue level. In other words, the Company's proposed residential rates will provide subsidies to other customer classes. The level of inter-class subsidies paid and received based on the corrected cost of service model is provided on my Exhibit JWD-1.” [Responsive Testimony And Exhibits Of James W. Daniel On Behalf Of E. Scott Pruitt, Oklahoma Attorney General 3/31/16]

Public Service Company

|  |
| --- |
| **Public Service Company of Oklahoma** |
| **Cause No.** | **Order No.** | **Final Order Date** | **Requested** | **Approved** |
| **201300217** | **639314** | **4/14/2015** | $ 37,305,852.00 | $ - |
| **201500208** | **658529** | **12/1/2016**  | $ 83,828,642.00 | $ 14,469,574.00 |

*Case Number: 201300217*

The Public Service Company of Oklahoma (PSO) requested a rate increase that totaled $37,305,852. No increase was approved as of the final order date – April 15, 2015.

**Pruitt’s Office Filed Testimony Recommending Lower Revenue Requirements Than Were Requested By The Public Service Company of Oklahoma (PSO).** According to testimony by Mark E. Garret given before the Corporation Commission of Oklahoma, on behalf of the Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers, “Q: DID OIEC AND OTHER PARTIES RECOMMEND LOWER REVENUE REQUIREMENTS THAN THE REVENUE REQUIREMENT REQUESTED BY PSO? A: Yes. PUD Staff, the Attorney General, and OJEC all filed testimony recommending lower revenue requirements than the revenue requirement requested by PSO.” [Responsive Testimony Of Mark E. Garrett, 5/7/14]

*Case Number: 201500208*

The Public Service Company of Oklahoma (PSO) requested a rate increase that totaled $83,828,642. The Oklahoma Corporation Commission approved a $14,469,574 increase on December 1, 2016.

**Pruitt’s Office Requested A Study On The Costs Associated With The Rate Increase.** According to the AG’s motion for assessment of costs, “For the reasons stated herein above, the AG requests the Commission issue an order providing that the specific costs associated with the services of expert witnesses, consultants and analytical services for the AG in this Cause shall be paid by PSO; that PSO shall be authorized to treat those specific costs as a regulatory asset; that those costs shall be deemed to be recoverable; and that the costs shall be deferred and recovered by PSO from PSO customers over a two-year period of time, beginning when new rates are implemented.” [Attorney General’s Motion for Assessment of Costs, 7/20/15]

**Witness Testified On Behalf Of Pruitt And “Recommended That Any Rate Increase Be Allocated By An Equal Percentage Increase To All Customer Classes To Help Mitigate Rate Shock To The Residential Class.’ He Was ‘Concerned With The Significant Increase Requested In This Rate Case, And Stated That A I Significant Move Toward Full Cost Of Service For Residential Customers Would Result In Rate Shock.”** “Mr. Farrar first discussed rate design proposals recommended in the Responsive Testimony of the Public Utility Division Staff (‘Staff ‘), Oklahoma Industrial Energy Consumers (‘OIEC’), and the Oklahoma Hospital Association (‘OHA’). These parties all recommended allocating any increase in rates in a manner that would move all customer classes close to full cost of service, which would result in a higher increase for residential customers. Mr. Farrar stated that he was concerned with the significant increase requested in this rate case, and stated that a I significant move toward full cost of service for residential customers would result in rate shock. He noted that many residential customers have limited financial flexibility. Accordingly, Mr. Farrar recommended that any rate increase be allocated by an equal percentage increase to all customer classes to help mitigate rate shock to the residential class.” [Summary Of Rebuttal Testimony Of Edwin C. Farrar On Behalf Of Oklahoma Attorney General, 12/2/15]

**Pruitt Argued Through His Assistant Dara Derryberry That Rates Could Be Kept Lower By Not Closing Coal Fired Plants.** “At various stages of the development and review of PSO’s ECP [Environmental Compliance Plan], the Attorney General has expressed to PSO, to the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, and to this Commission, his concerns about the costs of the ECP. It is PSO’s burden of proof, not that of the Attorney General, to establish that PSO’s ECP is the lowest reasonable cost option, and the evidence presented by the Attorney General in this Cause, which the ALJ disregarded , establishes that PSO has not yet met its burden. See AG’s Exceptions to ALJ Report at 3-4; AG’s Proposed Findings at 15-20. In finding PSO’s ECP prudent, the ALJ ‘agreed’ with PSO that retiring its coal plants is the most reasonable means of environmental compliance. See ALJ Suppl. Report at 45. The ALJ even points to ‘subsequent events [that] have further validated the reasonableness of the plan.’ Id. at 46. However, the Judge fails to mention the most relevant ‘subsequent event’: In advance of the issuance of the ALJ’s Report in this Cause, this Commission recently found that Oklahoma Gas and Electric Company (OG&E)’s ECP, which avoids the premature retirement of one of its coal plants by using a compliance measure rejected by PSO, is ‘reasonable , ... striking an appropriate balance between exposure to natural gas prices and exposure to coal and carbon prices.’ See Cause No. PUD 201600059, Order No. 652208 at 10 (April 28, 2016). The Commission found that by ‘maintaining a diverse generation resource portfolio where coal provides in the range of 20-35% of the Company’s total installed generation capacity,’ OG&E’s ECP ‘will produce additional fuel diversity that should allow OG&E to better respond to future market changes. Id. at 11. The Commission ‘s reasoning in evaluating the prudency of OG&E’s ECP applies to its evaluation of PSO’s ECP, and the ALJ erred in disregarding it.” [Attorney General 's Exceptions to ALJ 's Suppl. Report, 8/16/16]

*Notable Non-Environmental Suits*

**2015: Pruitt Tried To Sue Colorado Over Pot Legalization.** According to The Daily Oklahoman, “Colorado defended its marijuana laws on Friday against a legal attack from Oklahoma and Nebraska and argued to the U.S. Supreme Court that its sovereignty is being challenged by the two neighboring states … This lawsuit, however, even if successful, won’t fix America’s national drug policy - at least not without leadership from Washington, D.C., which remains noticeably absent.’Oklahoma reactionAaron Cooper, a spokesman for Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt, said ‘Colorado’s legalization and promotion of commercialized marijuana is unprecedented and has negatively impacted surrounding states like Oklahoma and Nebraska.” [The Daily Oklahoman, 3/28/15]