ike King grew up in Kanawha County, West Virginia, in the heart of coal country, where miners and their families lived in dust-cov- ered coal camps and local waterways such as Morris Creek in Montgomery were fouled by pollution. “The few times we had fish try to come up the river, their gills would actually fall off due to the high acidity of the water,” he recalls. “The water was orange and white, with a horrible smell of rotten eggs.”

King’s description of Morris Creek a decade ago is in stark contrast to the condition of the creek today. The listing of the creek in 1996 as “impaired” under the Clean Water Act presents an occasion to look at the environmental laws and regulations today, the 40th anniversary of the Clean Water Act provides an occasion to recall the strong bipartisan commitment this nation had actually increased by 16 percent over that time³.

While the Cuyahoga River no longer catches fire and Lake Erie is no longer considered “dead,” as was the case before the Clean Water Act was passed into law, the EPA still estimates that 850 billion gallons of sewage are discharged into streams every year⁴, and that more than 40 percent of U.S. streams are still considered in poor biological condition⁵.

Despite the clear evidence of the need to strengthen efforts to clean up our streams, the Clean Water Act and other laws that protect America’s waters are facing an unprecedented assault in Congress. During the 112th Congress alone, 38 bills were introduced and passed in the House of Representa-tives to weaken clean water laws or to undermine the ability of federal agencies to enforce them. Fortunately, most were not introduced or passed in the Senate.

No part of the country has seen a greater erosion of support for clean water protections over the past 40 years than the Southeast. All but one of the 65 representatives from southeastern states voted to support the Clean Water Act in 1972, but in the last two years, representatives of these states have voted in favor of weakening clean water laws 75 percent of the time. Among the eight states examined in this report, Alabama’s delegation was the most hostile to clean water laws, voting in favor of weakening them 87 percent of the time.

This report describes in detail the 112th Congress’s unprecedented assault on clean water laws and the support for that agenda among the delegations of eight southeastern states. The purpose is not to berate those members of Congress, but to remind them of the real difference that the Clean Water Act is making in the lives of their constituents. From oyster farms in Virginia Beach to dairy farms in the Carolinas, the Clean Water Act is creating jobs and business opportunities, restoring fish and duck populations and ensuring that more and more Americans enjoy the fundamental right of access to clean and safe water.

As former Congressman James Oberstar said in a re-cent interview, “NASA has spent billions over the years sending men to the moon and on dozens of other space missions, and very often the thing they most wanted to discover on these missions was fresh water. That should tell us what we need to know about protecting the fresh water we have here on earth.”
Biggest Clean Water Threats in the 112th Congress

Dirty Politics and the Clean Water Act

An Overview of the 112th Congress

When the 112th Congress convened on January 3, 2011, it marked the beginning of an unprecedented assault on our nation’s clean water laws. According to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, the U.S. House of Representatives voted 38 times to weaken the Clean Water Act and other laws protecting water resources in just the past two years.

The first round of anti-clean water votes were in the form of riders to the budget bill, H.R. 1. While none were signed into law, these riders would have eliminated funding for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to conduct meaningful oversight of mountaintop removal coal mining operations in Appalachia, implement a cleanup plan for the Chesapeake Bay and waterways in Florida, and control discharges that would have an “unacceptable adverse effect” on water, fish or wildlife.

Other bills passed by the House attempted to stymie EPA’s ability to enforce clean water laws enacted during previous sessions of Congress. Two of these measures (H.R. 2354 and 5325) would prevent the Army Corps of Engineers from protecting certain streams and wetlands under the Clean Water Act, and prevented the EPA from ever proposing a rule specifically to protect those waters. Another bill would block any major rule-makings by the EPA unless both houses of Congress approve it within 70 legislative days (H.R. 10). The Regulatory Accountability Act (H.R. 3010), tried to create significant hurdles to adopting clean water regulations and required the EPA to choose the least costly alternative in selecting a rule, rather than the most protective for public health and the environment.

Some of the bills passed by the House were designed simply to perpetuate the misleading notion that environmental protection costs jobs. One act stated that, unless unemployment dropped below six percent, no regulation to protect the environment could be passed (H.R. 4078). Another bill required additional analyses for all proposed EPA rules that could have an impact, no matter how indirect, on small businesses (H.R. 527).

The Clean Water Act created a framework for water permitting based on federal-state partnership in permitting and enforcement activities. The federal government, through the EPA, establishes guidelines, objectives and limits, and provides technical and financial assistance, including matching grants to local governments to build wastewater and stormwater treatment systems. The states issue and monitor permits required by the Clean Water Act and set most specific water quality standards, while the federal law provides a level playing field throughout the nation.

If the federal government cannot enforce and support the Clean Water Act, history suggests that states will soon engage in a “race to the bottom,” as politically connected polluters are able to exert greater influence over state regulators and legislators who control the purse strings of state agencies.

Americans are fortunate that none of these bills have become law, but we should all be alarmed that they gained enough traction to pass the House of Representatitives.

In May 2011, Rep. John Mica (R-FL), chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, introduced the Clean Water Cooperative Federalism Act. H.R. 2018 was designed to prevent the EPA from revising weak state water quality standards or issuing new ones unless an individual state concurs, even if the standard is insufficient to protect human health or aquatic life. According to the agency, the bill would “overturn almost 40 years of federal legislation by preventing EPA from protecting public health and water quality.”

The Recycling Coal Combustion Residuals Accessibility Act, sponsored by Rep. David McKinley (R-WV), would ensure that utilities can continue disposing of toxic coal ash, the waste generated from burning coal, in unsafe dams like the one that failed at a Tennessee Valley Authority plant in Kingston, Tenn., in 2008. The law creates an unenforceable program for states to manage coal ash and would allow coal-fired units to avoid health-protective measures such as fixing unsafe coal ash dumps, cleaning up contaminated sites, or closing leaking and unstable coal ash ponds and landfills. The bill would also permanently prevent EPA from finalizing rules to regulate over 1,000 aging coal ash dumps nationwide.

The “Stop the War on Coal” bill, sponsored by Rep. Bill Johnson (R-OH) is a repackaging of all the bills noted above, as well as an addition. The bill would also prohibit the Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement from issuing any proposed regulation under the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act that would reduce coal mine employment by as much as one job, reduce taxes received from coal mining by as much as one dollar, or reduce the amount of coal available for mining by one ton. The bill even eliminated the agency’s ability to designate an area as unsuitable for surface coal mining, which is one of the most important protections available under the mining law.

In total, the House of Representatives in the 112th Congress voted to:
- Strip EPA of its authority under the Clean Water Act to set water quality standards or enforce pollutant discharge limits in states that fail to implement the law;
- Eliminate EPA authority to veto “dredge and fill” permits for mountaintop removal mines and other activities;
- Deny EPA funding to protect wetlands and tributaries that flow into navigable waters; and
- Block the EPA from using the Clean Water Act to regulate the discharge of pesticides into rivers, lakes, and streams.
Virginia

While Virginia’s water division has been more successful than neighboring states at cleaning up impaired rivers and streams, state legislators in 2011 voted to dramatically restrict the agency’s ability under the Clean Water Act to protect public health and the environment from pollution from surface coal mines. Recently enacted legislation limits the ability of state regulators to use water quality testing to make permitting and enforcement decisions involving pollution discharges from coal strip mines.

The support for bills to weaken clean water protection shown by state legislators has largely been mirrored by Virginia’s members of Congress who collectively voted in favor of federal bills that would weaken clean water protections 65 percent of the time during the 112th Congress. This is in stark contrast to the unanimous support for the Clean Water Act by Virginia’s representatives in 1972.

**Votes Against Clean Water**

Percentage of representatives from Virginia that voted to weaken clean water laws in the 112th Congress.

- **H.R. 3409** — The War on Coal Act includes the following three bills plus a provision to prevent an Office of Surface Mining rule that would protect streams from mountaintop removal coal mining impacts. SCORE: .................................................. 45%
- **H.R. 2401** — The TRAIN Act would create a duplicative interagency panel to study the economic impacts of several standards such as the EPA’s mercury rule, causing potential delays for safeguards for up to six years. SCORE: .................................................. 64%
- **H.R. 2273** — The Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act would stop the EPA’s ability to regulate coal ash disposal in favor of a non-enforceable state program. SCORE: .................................................. 64%
- **H.R. 2018** — The Clean Water Federalism Act would remove the EPA’s authority to enforce the Clean Water Act, dramatically weakening clean water protections. SCORE: .................................................. 45%

Overall percentage of votes by Virginia representatives AGAINST clean water in the 112th Congress. **65%**

**Clean Water = Good Business**

An oysterman sees direct benefits of a cleaner Chesapeake Bay

Hap Chalmers understands the importance of clean water better than most. As the owner of Lynnhaven Oyster Company in Virginia Beach, Va., his livelihood depends on it.

The oysters from Lynnhaven River were once so renowned that they were coveted by royalty. But while they may be thought of as little more than a delicacy to dine on, oysters also serve as one of nature’s best water filtration systems. The Chesapeake Bay in Maryland and Virginia, which Lynnhaven River flows into, once housed such a immense population of oysters that all the water in the estuary was filtered every few days.

A number of environmental threats cut short the reign of these once-famous oysters. These threats included loss of habitat, over-harvesting and excess water pollution.

Chalmers recalls when he began his oyster business ten years ago: “Back then, Virginia Beach was the fastest growing city in the country and … there were no best management practices in place. The water was cloudy and murky all year round. Now fall, winter and spring, it’s very clear and you can see the bottom off my dock is about six feet deep.”

In 1998, due to high fecal coliform bacteria levels from faulty sewage and stormwater management systems in the rapidly growing city, the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality designated the Lynnhaven, Lees Hill and Broad rivers as impaired waters.

With Clean Water Act funding, the Virginia DEQ developed and implemented a “Total Maximum Daily Load” plan to limit pollution and restore the health of the Lynnhaven. Many stakeholders were involved in the plan, including Virginia Beach, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, the Army Corps of Engineers and the local group, Lynnhaven River NOW, to which Chalmers belongs.

Improved shoreline buffer zones assisted in providing long-term protection from erosion and runoff after heavy rains. Sewage pump stations were modified with generators to alleviate the destructive impacts of extreme weather events. And oyster reefs were created to help the bivalves do what they do best — water filtration.

Chalmers’ business, which he runs with his son, not only benefits the local economy but the health of the bay. The millions of oysters they planted this year will filter more than one billion gallons of water per week.

“The better we do in our business, the cleaner the water gets. The same for other oystermen, too,” Chalmers says.

These efforts culminated in 2010, when the Lynnhaven River was removed from the Clean Water Act’s list of impaired waters. More than 1,450 acres now meet water quality standards to ensure safe consumption of shellfish; the most since 1931, according to Lynnhaven River NOW.

Expressing his gratitude for living and working on the Lynnhaven River, Chalmers says, “Because the community has pulled together, nobody fighting the progress, everyone is for it — the city, the government, the Army Corps and the citizens. It’s amazing.”
West Virginia

West Virginia is home to more than 32,000 miles of streams and rivers and more than 22,000 acres of lakes and reservoirs. In 2010, less than 60 percent of those streams and rivers were rigorously assessed; of those, nearly two-thirds were impaired. Frequent causes of impairment are fecal coliform bacteria, metals such as iron, manganese, selenium and aluminum, and high acidity. Less than one percent of impaired rivers and streams have been restored to state water quality standards.

The state water permitting program has been widely criticized as ineffective and public interest groups have petitioned the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to take over the state’s program. An investigation by the New York Times reported that six former and current state environmental department employees complained that their enforcement efforts had been “undermined by bureaucratic disorganization, a departmental preference to let polluters escape punishment if they promise to try harder, and a revolving door of regulators who leave for higher-paying jobs at the companies they once policed.”

Support for clean water laws by the state’s congressional delegation has declined precipitously since 1972, when all five representatives voted in favor of the Clean Water Act. Today, the delegation has among the worst voting records on clean water laws in Congress, supporting measures to weaken clean water protections 85 percent of the time.

### Votes Against Clean Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of representatives from West Virginia that voted to weaken clean water laws in the 112th Congress.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.R. 3409</strong> — The War on Coal Act includes the following three bills plus a provision to prevent an Office of Surface Mining rule that would protect streams from mountaintop removal coal mining impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCORE:</strong> 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.R. 2401</strong> — The TRAIN Act would create a duplicative interagency panel to study the economic impacts of several standards such as the EPA’s mercury rule, causing potential delays for safeguards for up to six years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCORE:</strong> 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.R. 2273</strong> — The Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act would stop the EPA’s ability to regulate coal ash disposal in favor of a non-enforceable state program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCORE:</strong> 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.R. 2018</strong> — The Clean Water Federalism Act would remove the EPA’s authority to enforce the Clean Water Act, dramatically weakening clean water protections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCORE:</strong> 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall percentage of votes by West Virginia representatives AGAINST clean water in the 112th Congress: 85%
K

Kentucky has nearly 50,000 miles of rivers and streams and almost 230,000 acres of lakes and reservoirs. As of 2010, just 22 percent of rivers and streams had been assessed by state officials, with two-thirds found to be impaired by one or more pollutants. The most frequent causes of stream impairment are sediment, fecal coliform bacteria and nutrients that can cause eutrophication and specific conductivity.

Kentucky’s water quality program has been harshly criticized by newspapers in the state for its “cozy relationship with the coal industry,” and ineffective enforcement program, as evidenced by the fact that only nine of the nearly 7,000 miles of rivers and streams listed as impaired have been restored to state water quality standards. The Lexington Herald-Leader wrote in reaction to a law-suit filed against coal companies for Clean Water Act violations in 2011, “state regulators had been asleep at the wheel for years,” to the extent that, “the state had no way of knowing whether the coal companies had violated their water pollution permits.”

In 1972, Kentucky’s congressional delegation voted unanimously to enact the Clean Water Act, but during the 112th Congress, 73 percent of votes by Kentucky’s representatives impacting clean water laws favored weakening protections.

Votes Against Clean Water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of representatives from Kentucky that voted to weaken clean water laws in the 112th Congress.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.R. 3409</strong> — The War on Coal Act includes the following three bills plus a provision to prevent an Office of Surface Mining rule that would protect streams from mountaintop removal coal mining impacts. SCORE: 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.R. 2401</strong> — The TRAIN Act would create a duplicative interagency panel to study the economic impacts of several standards such as the EPA’s mercury rule, causing potential delays for safeguards for up to six years. SCORE: 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.R. 2273</strong> — The Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act would stop the EPA’s ability to regulate coal ash disposal in favor of a non-enforceable state program. SCORE: 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H.R. 2401</strong> — The Clean Water Federalism Act would remove the EPA’s authority to enforce the Clean Water Act, dramatically weakening clean water protections. SCORE: 67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall percentage of votes by Kentucky representatives AGAINST clean water in the 112th Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCORE: 73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the percentage of votes by Kentucky representatives against clean water in the 112th Congress was 73%.

Lack of Clean Water Stinks

Fixing faulty septic systems cleans up a Kentucky waterway

Clark County in central Kentucky is known for its rolling hills, fertile soil and thoroughbred horses. Snaking 25 miles through the county is Strodes Creek, a headwater stream of the South Fork of the Licking River.

Threats to water quality in the creek were pervasive — silt, bacteria and oxygen-depriving nutrients had the potential to render it unsuitable for aquatic life. The source of this pollution mostly stemmed from poor agricultural practices and failing septic tanks.

John Jones had one of those failing septic tanks. Although he spent the majority of his career meeting complex demands as an explosives operator for a U.S. Army weapons storage facility, he realized people were having some severe problems and were able to correct it,” Jones says, perhaps remembering the pool of sewage that would collect near his home.

“Hats off to the people in charge of this project because they realized people were having some severe problems and were able to correct it,” Jones says, perhaps remembering the pool of sewage that would collect near his home.

Shandra Cecil, the director of the Strodes Creek Conservancy, explains how an assortment of minor projects like the one in Jones’ community benefit the overall health of the watershed.

“All of the small nonpoint source issues, when put together, can really do damage to the creek,” she says. “But regardless of how small, eventually [projects] will start creating cumulative benefits.” The conservancy has implemented a number of projects including planting trees, controlling agricultural pollution, repairing septic tanks and restoring streams.

Nutrate and phosphorus pollution were reduced collectively by 4,000 pounds per year, and silt contamination was reduced by eight tons each year. From a significant reduction in pollutants of Strodes Creek to peace of mind for homeowners like Jones, this watershed project has had impressive results across the board.

“There is less algae and the odor from the creek has subsided,” Cecil says. “We had a landowner call our mayor and say they’re not sure what we’re doing, but that they are enjoying the creek more.”
North Carolina is home to almost 40,000 miles of rivers and streams and more than 300,000 acres of lakes and reservoirs. About one-third of the rivers and streams have been assessed by the state, with more than 30 percent of those found to be impaired for one or more criteria. The most common causes of stream impairment are high levels of turbidity, mercury and E. coli.

Just one to two percent of impaired streams and rivers have been cleaned up in North Carolina. The ability of the state to make substantial further progress is questionable following the enactment of Senate Bill 781 by the General Assembly in 2011, which cut the Clean Water Management Trust Fund by nearly 90 percent and conservation funding by 85 percent. The bill also forbade the state from enacting protections that are stronger by 85 percent. The bill also forbade the state from enacting protections that are stronger by 85 percent and conservation funding cut the Clean Water Management Trust Fund by 78 percent. As a result, following the enactment of Senate Bill 781, the state was able to cover 75 percent of the cost for projects to improve water quality, while the Kinsers made up the difference.

The Kinsers’ first project involved installing two water treatment units that prevent debris contamination and regulate water temperature. Next, they built fencing to keep their horses from getting into Fourth Creek and its tributaries, mitigating the animals’ potential to contribute to the creek’s contamination.

Additional projects allowed the Kinsers to continue reducing their environmental impact. They built more fencing and a trail for their horses to prevent runoff from flowing from the horse corrals into the creeks. And they constructed a four-bin composting facility to contain the waste their six horses produce every day, which they now use for fertilizer.

The river has cleared up, and bacteria levels have lowered to a level that meets water quality standards. One section of Fourth Creek has been completely removed from the impaired list while other sections have been partially delisted.

The Kinsers’ first project involved installing two water treatment units that prevent debris contamination and regulate water temperature. Next, they built fencing to keep their horses from getting into Fourth Creek and its tributaries, mitigating the animals’ potential to contribute to the creek’s contamination.

Additional projects allowed the Kinsers to continue reducing their environmental impact. They built more fencing and a trail for their horses to prevent runoff from flowing from the horse corrals into the creeks. And they constructed a four-bin composting facility to contain the waste their six horses produce every day, which they now use for fertilizer.

The river has cleared up, and bacteria levels have lowered to a level that meets water quality standards. One section of Fourth Creek has been completely removed from the impaired list while other sections have been partially delisted.
Tennessee is home to more than 60,000 miles of rivers and streams and almost 600,000 acres of lakes and reservoirs. As of 2010, half of the state’s rivers and streams had been assessed by state officials, about 40 percent of which were found to be impaired based on one or more criteria. The most frequent causes of stream impairment were high levels of E. coli, sedimentation, habitat alteration and dissolved oxygen. Less than 100 of the 13,000 miles of impaired rivers and streams in Tennessee have been restored to good condition.

Tennessee’s decision-makers have increasingly supported measures to weaken clean water protections in recent years. At the state level, there were 16 different bills to weaken clean water laws introduced in the legislature in 2009. At the federal level, Tennessee’s delegation voted unanimously in favor of the act.

Glyn Griswold and John Shores, better known as Uncle Johnny, and the main force behind Uncle Johnny’s Nolichucky Hostel and Outfitters in Erwin, Tenn. They see the Nolichucky River as an old friend, one that they’re happy to introduce to everyone they meet. When Shores, an avid kayaker, opened the doors of his hostel for Appalachian Trail hikers in 1998, he recognized that his location next to the Nolichucky gave him an opportunity to serve a greater population of outdoor enthusiasts. Both he and Griswold have spent many days paddling the Nolichucky over the years. The men also make it their business to know the Nolichucky’s old habits and the ways it changes.

Griswold explains how even a newcomer to the river can note how the Nolichucky has changed from its old ways. “If you come out onto the Nolichucky and look out across the stains on the rocks, you’ll see that they’re watermarks,” Griswold says. “You’ll see where how over the past 30 years, the river level has decreased dramatically. The evidence is right there on the stone.”

Rural development on the Toe and Cane rivers has impacted the area where the rivers converge into the Nolichucky. “Quite sadly, the watershed has been damaged, and there’s just not that much water coming down now,” he emphasizes.

In 2002, the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation listed different portions of the Nolichucky as impaired for E. coli bacteria and high levels of sediment. The pollution was mostly due to poor agricultural practices. Under the auspices of the Clean Water Act, county, state and federal agencies provided technical and financial assistance to local farmers so they could implement various “best management practices” on their farms, including taking measures to protect heavy use areas, installing fencing and alternative watering facilities to prevent live-stock from entering streams.

Overall percentage of votes by Tennessee representatives AGAINST clean water in the 112th Congress

H.R. 3409 — The War on Coal Act includes the following three bills plus a provision to prevent an Office of Surface Mining rule that would protect streams from mountaintop removal coal mining impacts.

H.R. 2401 — The TRAIN Act would create a duplicative interagency panel to study the economic impacts of several standards such as the EPA’s mercury rule, causing potential delays for safeguards for up to six years.

H.R. 2273 — The Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act would stop the EPA’s ability to regulate coal ash disposal in favor of a non-enforceable state program.

H.R. 2401 — The Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act would stop the EPA’s ability to regulate coal ash disposal in favor of a non-enforceable state program.

H.R. 2018 — The Clean Water Federalism Act would remove the EPA’s authority to enforce the Clean Water Act, dramatically weakening clean water protections.

Overall percentage of votes by Tennessee representatives AGAINST clean water in the 112th Congress

SCORE: ................................. 78%

SCORE: ................................. 78%

SCORE: ................................. 78%

SCORE: ........................................ 78%

SCORE: ................................. 78%

SCORE: ................................. 78%
South Carolina has nearly 30,000 miles of rivers and streams and more than 400,000 acres of lakes and reservoirs. Less than 20 percent of rivers and streams have been assessed by the state, but of those that have been assessed, two-thirds were found to be impaired for one or more water quality criteria. The most common causes of stream impairment are high levels of fecal coliform, dissolved oxygen and acidity. About six percent of rivers and streams once listed as impaired have so far been cleaned up.

In 1972, South Carolina’s Congressional delegation voted unanimously to enact the Clean Water Act. During the 112th Congress, on the other hand, 83 percent of votes by South Carolina’s representatives on bills impacting clean water laws were in favor of weakening protections.

Percentage of representatives from South Carolina that voted to weaken clean water laws in the 112th Congress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 3409</td>
<td>The War on Coal Act includes the following three bills plus a provision to prevent an Office of Surface Mining rule that would protect streams from mountaintop removal coal mining impacts.</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2401</td>
<td>The TRAIN Act would create a duplicative interagency panel to study the economic impacts of several standards such as the EPA’s mercury rule, causing potential delays for safeguards for up to six years.</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2273</td>
<td>The Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act would stop the EPA’s ability to regulate coal ash disposal in favor of a non-enforceable state program.</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2018</td>
<td>The Clean Water Federalism Act would remove the EPA’s authority to enforce the Clean Water Act, dramatically weakening clean water protections.</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall percentage of votes by South Carolina representatives AGAINST clean water in the 112th Congress: 83%

Voters Against Clean Water

A farmer's commitment to improving water quality

What is the greatest benefit of having the Clean Water Act on his side? That's simple, Dorn says: “Peace of mind.”

Solution: Dairy farm implemented pasture grazing management, fenced off streambanks and providing alternative water sources for livestock, planted vegetation creekside. Other farms implemented other agricultural best management practices.

Result: Pasture grazing management and animal fencing significantly reduced concentrations of fecal coliform bacteria.

Problem: Fecal coliform bacteria, phosphorus and decreased oxygen levels were degrading Stevens Creek, making the water unsuitable for aquatic life or drinking water.

What is the greatest benefit of having the Clean Water Act on his side? That’s simple, Dorn says. “Peace of mind.”

In 1995, with funds allocated through the Clean Water Act, Dorn’s community was given a way to improve its streams. The project, led by the Edgefield Soil and Water Conservation District, focused on improving water quality through agricultural “best management practices” at two livestock operations located near the streams, including Dorn’s dairy farm. At the time, Hickory Hill’s ponds were predominantly unfenced, alternative livestock watering systems were unfeasible and the farm was subject to weather-related pollution problems.

The rainstorms that watered the grass for the cows also naturally increased agricultural stream pollution. Heavy run-off often carried large amounts of feed from the commodity sheds, used at farms like Hickory Hill, into nearby Sleepy Creek where pollutants began a detrimental journey downstream.

What is the greatest benefit of having the Clean Water Act on his side? That’s simple, Dorn says. “Peace of mind.”
Georgia

Ditching Storm Water

One man’s mission to improve waters for wildlife and communities

Ducks and Styrofoam cups have something in common — at least, for Dr. Brant Keller they do. The director of Public Works and Utilities for the city of Griffin, Ga., Keller is an avid duck hunter, and in visiting many waterways around the country, he often finds ducks and debris competing for the same space.

“Water is a finite source. The water that we’re managing is the very same prehistoric dinosaur water, so we’ve got to manage such a significant resource really well,” he says. “It took the Clean Water Act in 1972 to clean up the cesspools we called rivers ... but we have a long way to go.”

Following the establishment of the Georgia Stormwater Utility in 1997, Keller brought his determination to the city of Griffin in the Flint River Basin. He quickly found a number of community water containment and quality issues that needed to be addressed. In Griffin’s Waterford subdivision, he found the drainage system could not handle the amount of runoff.

In order to address this problem, Keller directed the construction of a regional stormwater detention pond, established by a public-private partnership and funded by a county sales tax. Keller’s project resulted in several successful projects that utilized grant support through the Clean Water Act for future water quality assessment.

In 1972, Georgia Representative Benjamine Blackburn was the only representative in the Southeast to vote against the Clean Water Act, however the state’s delegation in Congress has shifted toward Blackburn’s anti-regulatory views since then. In the 112th Congress, 69 percent of votes cast by Georgia’s representatives on bills that impact clean water laws were in support of weakening those protections.

Overall percentage of votes by Georgia representatives AGAINST clean water in the 112th Congress

Percentage of representatives from Georgia that voted to weaken clean water laws in the 112th Congress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 3409 — The War on Coal Act includes the following three bills plus a provision to prevent an Office of Surface Mining rule that would protect streams from mountaintop removal coal mining impacts.</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 4001 — The TRAIN Act would create a duplicative interagency panel to study the economic impacts of several standards such as the EPA’s mercury rule, causing potential delays for safeguards for up to six years.</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2273 — The Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act would stop the EPA’s ability to regulate coal ash disposal in favor of a non-enforceable state program.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2018 — The Clean Water Federalism Act would remove the EPA’s authority to enforce the Clean Water Act, dramatically weakening clean water protections.</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall percentage of votes by Georgia representatives AGAINST clean water in the 112th Congress

69%
Alabama

Alabama has more than 75,000 miles of rivers and streams and nearly 500,000 acres of lakes and reservoirs. Less than 15 percent of those rivers and streams were assessed by the state in 2010, with one-third of those found to be impaired for one or more water quality criteria. The most common causes of stream impairment were high levels of sediment, fecal coliform bacteria, oxygen depletion and mercury. Just 50 miles of impaired rivers and streams have been cleaned up so far.

The Alabama Department of Environmental Management has been widely criticized for failure to respond to citizen complaints, inspect sites with Clean Water Act permits and issue penalties to violators. The state has also been criticized for not providing adequate funding to ADEM to hire enough inspectors to keep track of the tens of thousands of permits in the state. In 2010, 14 organizations petitioned the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to revoke Alabama’s authority to regulate water permits.

Alabama’s representatives in the 112th Congress had the most track of the tens of thousands of votes by Alabama representatives AGAINST clean water in the 112th Congress.

Votes Against Clean Water

Percentage of representatives from Alabama that voted to weaken clean water laws in the 112th Congress.

H.R. 3409 — The War on Coal Act includes the following three bills plus a provision to prevent an Office of Surface Mining rule that would protect streams from mountaintop removal coal mining impacts.

SCORE: .......................................................... 86%

H.R. 2401 — The TRAIN Act would create a duplicative interagency panel to study the economic impacts of several standards such as the EPA’s mercury rule, causing potential delays for safeguards for up to six years.

SCORE: .......................................................... 86%

H.R. 2273 — The Coal Residuals Reuse and Management Act would stop the EPA's ability to regulate coal ash disposal in favor of a non-enforceable state program.

SCORE: .......................................................... 86%

H.R. 2018 — The Clean Water Federalism Act would remove the EPA’s authority to enforce the Clean Water Act, dramatically weakening clean water protections.

SCORE: .......................................................... 86%

Overall percentage of votes by Alabama representatives AGAINST clean water in the 112th Congress

87%
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