

ONE HUNDRED TWELFTH CONGRESS  
**Congress of the United States**  
**House of Representatives**  
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE  
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115

Majority (202) 225-2927  
Minority (202) 225-3641

**MEMORANDUM**

**September 11, 2012**

**To: Subcommittee on Energy and Power Democratic Members and Staff**

**Fr: Committee on Energy and Commerce Democratic Staff**

**Re: Supplemental Information on EPA's International Grantmaking**

On September 11, 2012, the Subcommittee on Energy and Power will hold a legislative hearing on H.R. 4255, a bill sponsored by Chairman Ed Whitfield that would block EPA from awarding “any grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other financial assistance” under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for any program, project, or activity that will occur outside of the United States. For more than a year, the majority has misstated the facts about EPA’s grantmaking for environmental work abroad and made unsubstantiated allegations about the Obama Administration’s track record in this regard. This memo clarifies the scope of EPA’s grantmaking practices and highlights the type of work these grants support.

**I. SUMMARY**

Since June 2011, Committee Republicans have been investigating EPA’s long-standing practice of awarding grants and entering into cooperative agreements for international environmental work. This investigation—and Chairman Whitfield’s legislation that flows from it—appears to be based on two fundamental premises. First, the Republicans have claimed repeatedly that EPA under the Obama Administration has “ramped up” grants to foreign recipients and done so “at an alarming rate.” Second, they have characterized these grants as a waste of taxpayer money and of dubious benefit to the American people. Both are wrong.

At the majority’s request, EPA provided the Committee with data and documents on more than 500 grants awarded under the Clinton, Bush, and Obama Administrations that have international components. The Committee’s Democratic staff then requested additional information from EPA on whether grantees spent this grant money in the United States or abroad. This information makes it clear that the majority’s assertion that the Obama

Administration has been awarding more grants to foreign recipients for environmental work is simply incorrect. Specifically, a review of the EPA information reveals the following:

- **In FY2011, EPA grantees spent less grant money abroad than they did during the last year of the Bush Administration.** Many EPA grants support U.S.-based organizations and universities that in turn conduct environmental research and outreach abroad. These grantees often spend the majority of their grant money in the United States. The amount of international grant funding actually spent abroad has fallen since the last year of the Bush Administration. Foreign expenditures covered by EPA grants totaled \$8.5 million in FY2008; in FY2011, foreign expenditures totaled \$6 million.
- **Most of the funding for international grants is spent in the United States.** Between FY2008 and FY2011, only one-third of the money awarded for international grants was spent outside of the United States. For EPA's competitive research grants, most of which go to U.S. universities, only 8% of the funding was spent abroad, often for travel to international conferences to share research and exchange data.
- **The Obama Administration has initiated fewer grants on average to foreign governments and institutions than the Bush Administration.** During the eight years of the Bush Administration, EPA initiated an average of 24 grants each year to entities based outside of the United States, such as foreign governments, foreign organizations, and international bodies. During the first three years of the Obama Administration, EPA initiated an average of 17 grants each year to foreign entities.

Committee Republicans also have suggested that these grants are of questionable benefit to the American people because the work occurs beyond U.S. borders. In fact, many of the grants are designed to cut air pollution, which is not contained by geopolitical boundaries; reduce greenhouse gas emissions that are fueling climate change; and provide much-needed assistance in countries suffering from tremendous poverty and health impacts from air pollution.

## II. BACKGROUND ON EPA'S GRANTS DATA

On June 27, 2011, Chairmen Upton, Whitfield, Shimkus, and Stearns sent a letter to EPA requesting a list of all grants awarded by EPA for work conducted outside of the United States.<sup>1</sup> In response, EPA provided the Committee with a list of 506 grants awarded since FY2001 that the agency tagged as having a foreign component. EPA did not include grants awarded for international projects related to the U.S.-Mexico border or the Great Lakes. The recipients of these 506 international grants include universities, non-profit organizations, and international governing bodies. Almost half—228—were awarded to applicants based in the United States.

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter from Chairman Fred Upton, Chairman Ed Whitfield, Chairman John Shimkus, and Chairman Cliff Stearns, Committee on Energy and Commerce, to the Honorable Lisa Jackson, Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (June 27, 2011).

EPA's international grants support U.S.-based organizations and universities that in turn conduct environmental research and outreach abroad. The amount of time and money actually spent in a different country varies grantee to grantee. Some of these U.S.-based grantees may conduct the majority of their work abroad. Other U.S.-based grantees may spend very little time or money abroad. For example, a U.S. organization conducting domestic public health research may consult with a renowned international expert on the topic. For tracking purposes, EPA tags these grants as "international" even if the majority of the grant money is spent in the United States. This system treats a grant to a U.S. university the same as a grant to a foreign government or organization.

In order to get an accurate picture of how much EPA grant money is actually going abroad, the Committee's Democratic staff requested that EPA break down how much each grantee spent in a foreign country. EPA compiled this information for 232 projects funded between FY2008 and FY2011.<sup>2</sup>

The Committee's Democratic staff analyzed all data and documents provided by EPA. As detailed below, this data does not support the majority's assertions that the Obama Administration has intensified grantmaking for international activities that do not benefit the American people.

### **III. KEY FINDINGS**

In June 2011, Committee Republicans wrote that EPA has "ramped up" its grantmaking to foreign entities "at an alarming rate."<sup>3</sup> In February 2012, at a hearing about EPA's budget, Chairman Whitfield cited a "rise in spending for grants going to other countries."<sup>4</sup> At the same hearing, Rep. David McKinley stated during his questioning of Administrator Lisa Jackson that EPA gave \$28 million to foreign governments last year.<sup>5</sup> In the memo distributed to Committee staff in advance of the subcommittee hearing on September 11, 2012, Committee Republicans wrote "spending on foreign grants has substantially increased" since 2001.<sup>6</sup> The facts do not support this narrative.

---

<sup>2</sup> At the time of our request, EPA was unable to provide Committee Democratic staff with this breakdown for years before FY2008.

<sup>3</sup> Committee on Energy and Commerce, *Committee Discovers EPA Sending Millions of Taxpayer Dollars Overseas for Programs Like "Breathe Easy, Jakarta"* (June 27, 2011).

<sup>4</sup> Opening Statement of the Honorable Ed Whitfield, Subcommittee on Energy and Power and Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, *Joint Hearing on The FY 2013 EPA Budget*, 112th Cong. (Feb. 28, 2012).

<sup>5</sup> Statement of the Honorable David McKinley, Subcommittee on Energy and Power and Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, *Joint Hearing on The FY 2013 EPA Budget*, 112th Cong. (Feb. 28, 2012).

<sup>6</sup> Memorandum from Energy and Commerce Committee Majority Staff to Members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Power, *Legislative Hearing on H.R. 4255, the "Accountability in Grants Act of 2012"* (Sept. 6, 2012).

**A. Under the Obama Administration, EPA grantees have spent less abroad on average than under the last year of the Bush Administration.**

Not all of the money awarded to a grantee for international work is spent abroad. In fact, the percentage of international grant funding spent abroad has fallen since the last year of the Bush Administration. In FY2008, 51% of EPA’s international grant funding was spent abroad. In FY2011, under the Obama Administration, only 21% of the EPA grant money awarded for international work was spent abroad. The amount spent abroad has fallen in real terms as well. Foreign expenditures covered by these grants totaled \$8.5 million in FY2008; in FY2011, foreign expenditures totaled \$6 million (Table 1).

**Table 1. EPA International Grant Payments, FY2008-FY2011**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total Amount Awarded</b>	<b>International Expenditures</b>	<b>% of Grant Money Spent Abroad</b>
2008	\$16,528,786	\$8,510,853	51%
2009	\$11,910,445	\$6,108,808	51%
2010	\$22,278,692	\$5,725,957	26%
2011	\$28,141,702	\$6,003,979	21%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$78,859,625</b>	<b>\$26,349,597</b>	<b>33%</b>

*Source: U.S. EPA*

Grant payments over this four year period totaled \$78.8 million. Only one-third—\$26.3 million—was actually spent outside of the United States. This means that in FY2011, grant funding spent outside of the United States comprised only 0.2% of EPA’s budget and a mere 0.0007% of total federal spending.<sup>7</sup>

At first glance, Table 1 appears to show an increase in the amount of money awarded for foreign grants, reaching \$28 million in FY2011. In fact, this apparent increase is due almost entirely to a rise in grants awarded by EPA’s Office of Research and Development (ORD) for research projects that have a small international component. In FY2011, ORD grants accounted for more than \$21 million (75%) of the grants EPA tagged as having an international component, but only 4% of that money was actually spent abroad (Table 2).

---

<sup>7</sup> Based on an FY2011 EPA budget of \$10.3 billion and federal outlays of \$3.6 trillion.

**Table 2. EPA Office of Research and Development (ORD) International Grant Payments, FY2008-FY2011**

<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Total Amount Awarded</b>	<b>International Component</b>	<b>% of Grant Money Spent Abroad</b>
2008	\$6,509,741	\$296,026	5%
2009	\$5,696,418	\$1,344,320	24%
2010	\$15,470,560	\$1,227,732	8%
2011	\$21,128,773	\$844,985	4%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$48,805,492</b>	<b>\$3,713,063</b>	<b>8%</b>

*Source: U.S. EPA*

Several ORD grants that EPA counts as international in fact have a tiny, if not tangential, international component. For example:

- In 2009, EPA awarded the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium a grant to identify potential health effects in pregnant women and infants in southwestern Alaska from exposure to mercury and persistent organic pollutants (POPs) in their subsistence-based diet.<sup>8</sup> Through FY2011, EPA had paid the consortium almost \$950,000 for this work, only \$7,000 of which was spent outside of the United States.<sup>9</sup> Consortium staff traveled to Denmark to meet with representatives of other nations who also are monitoring pollution in Arctic populations.<sup>10</sup>
- In 2009, EPA awarded a grant to UC-Berkeley’s Center for Environmental Research and Children’s Health to study the extent to which Mexican immigrant farm-worker women and their children living in California’s Salinas Valley are exposed to several endocrine disrupting and neurotoxic chemicals.<sup>11</sup> Through FY2011, EPA had paid UC-Berkeley \$2.1 million

---

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *An Epidemiologic Study of Time Trends and Health Effects of Persistent Organic Pollutants, Mercury and Micronutrients*, EPA Grant No. R833705 (online at [http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer\\_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/9137](http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/9137)).

<sup>9</sup> EPA data provided to Committee Democratic staff.

<sup>10</sup> Communication between Committee Democratic staff and Dr. Jim Berner, Senior Director for Science, Alaska Native Tribe Health Consortium (Feb. 16, 2012).

<sup>11</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Center for Environmental Research and Children’s Health*, EPA Grant No. R834513 (online at [http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer\\_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/9220/report/0](http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/9220/report/0)).

for this work, only \$14,700 of which was spent outside of the United States.<sup>12</sup> The center paid the world's preeminent environmental dentist, who is based in Sydney, Australia, to analyze teeth as part of the research.<sup>13</sup>

- In 2011, EPA awarded the Harvard School of Public Health Clean Air Research Center a grant to investigate the acute and chronic health effects of exposure to different mixtures of air pollution.<sup>14</sup> Through FY2011, EPA had paid the Harvard School of Public Health \$3 million for this work, only \$10,000 of which was spent outside of the United States.<sup>15</sup> Harvard researchers traveled to Spain for a conference in 2011.<sup>16</sup>
- In 2008, EPA awarded the University of Kentucky a grant to examine the effects of engineered nanomaterials on the brain.<sup>17</sup> Through FY2011, EPA had paid the University of Kentucky \$2 million for this work, only \$7,000 of which was spent outside of the United States for foreign travel.<sup>18</sup>
- In 2011, EPA awarded the University of Pittsburgh a grant to examine how exposure to air pollution and community stressors interact to exacerbate childhood asthma in New York City.<sup>19</sup> Through FY2011, EPA had paid the University of Pittsburgh \$1.2 million for this work, only

---

<sup>12</sup> EPA data provided to Committee Democratic staff.

<sup>13</sup> Communication between Committee Democratic staff and Dr. Brenda Eskenazi, Director, Center for Environmental Research and Children's Health (Feb. 15, 2012).

<sup>14</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Air Pollution Mixtures: Health Effects Across Life Stages*, EPA Grant No. R834798 (online at [http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer\\_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/9283](http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/9283)).

<sup>15</sup> EPA data provided to Committee Democratic staff.

<sup>16</sup> Communication between Committee Democratic staff and Alice Smythe, Coordinator, Harvard Clean Air Research Center (Feb. 24, 2012).

<sup>17</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Safety/Toxicity Assessment of Ceria (A Model Engineered NP) to the Brain*, EPA Grant No. R833772 (online at [http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer\\_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/8800](http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/8800)).

<sup>18</sup> EPA data provided to Committee Democratic staff; Communication between Committee Democratic staff and Professor Robert A. Yokel, University of Kentucky (Feb. 15, 2012).

<sup>19</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Community Stressors and Susceptibility to Air Pollution in Urban Asthma*, Grant No. R834576 (online at [http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer\\_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/9279/report/0](http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/9279/report/0)).

\$3,400 of which was spent outside of the United States.<sup>20</sup> University researchers traveled to Spain for a conference in 2011.<sup>21</sup>

**B. The Obama Administration has approved fewer grants to organizations based outside the United States.**

The analysis above focuses on the amount paid to grantees to cover international expenses. Because many grants span several years, some of the payments made in 2011, for example, are fulfilling grant commitments approved by and initiated under the previous administration. It is informative, therefore, to examine the number of grants *approved by and initiated under* each administration for institutions based outside of the United States, including foreign non-profit organizations, international governing bodies, and foreign governments.

This data shows that the Obama Administration has not intensified the pace of its grant-making to foreign governments and institutions.

On average, EPA under the Obama Administration has approved fewer grants to foreign entities than EPA under the Bush Administration (Table 3). During the eight years of the Bush Administration, EPA initiated 190 grants to entities based outside of the United States, an average of 24 each year.<sup>22</sup> During the first three years of the Obama Administration, EPA has approved 47 grants to entities based outside of the United States, an average of 17 each year.<sup>23</sup>

Between FY2001 and FY2011, EPA paid out \$45 million to foreign entities for grants initiated under the Bush Administration and \$9 million for such grants initiated under the Obama Administration. Even though EPA has yet to finish paying out grants started under the Obama Administration, it is impossible to conclude that EPA has intensified its grantmaking to foreign entities in the last three years.

---

<sup>20</sup> EPA data provided to Committee Democratic staff.

<sup>21</sup> Communication between Committee Democratic staff and Jane Clougherty, Assistant Professor of Environmental and Occupational Health, University of Pittsburgh (Feb. 15, 2012).

<sup>22</sup> This includes grants with a start date after January 20, 2001 (President Bush's inauguration) through January 19, 2009 (the end of his term). To calculate the average, we divided by 8 years.

<sup>23</sup> This includes grants with a start date of January 20, 2009 (President Obama's inauguration) through September 30, 2011 (the end of FY2011). To calculate the average, we divided by 2.75 years.

**Table 3. Number of Grants Approved and Initiated Under the Bush and Obama Administrations: 2001-2011**

<b>President Initiating the Grants</b>	<b>Number of Grants Initiated to Entities Based Outside of the U.S.</b>	<b>Average Number of Grants Per Year</b>	<b>Total Amount Paid for Grants Awarded to Non-U.S. Entities (through FY2011)</b>
Bush	190	24	\$45,199,880
Obama	47	17	\$9,081,683

*Source: Democratic Staff Analysis of U.S. EPA Data*

The greater number of grants to foreign entities during the Bush Administration than the Obama Administration does not mean that the Bush Administration grants were ill-advised. Many of the Bush Administration grants appear to support important initiatives that benefit the global environment and facilitate international cooperation. The comparison between the administrations does show, however, that the majority has misstated the facts when asserting that the Obama administration has “ramped up” grants to foreign governments and organizations.

#### **IV. EPA’S INTERNATIONAL GRANTMAKING SUPPORTS WORK CRITICAL FOR PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE ENVIRONMENT**

Committee Republicans have questioned the merits of the grantees’ work on international environmental issues. In a 2011 staff report, they wrote that “millions of taxpayer dollars are being arbitrarily doled out to obscure projects conducted by overseas interests with questionable benefit for the American people.”<sup>24</sup> In another majority document, the grants are described as “‘feel good’ environmental projects.”<sup>25</sup> During the February 28, 2012 hearing on the FY2013 budget for EPA, Chairman Whitfield called EPA’s international grantmaking an “example of EPA mission creep and abuse of discretion.”<sup>26</sup>

The Obama Administration is hardly the first administration to award grants for international environmental work. In fact, the agency has been awarding international grants at least since 1972.<sup>27</sup> Moreover, these international grants, which constitute a small percentage of

---

<sup>24</sup> Committee on Energy and Commerce, Memorandum to Energy and Commerce Committee Members from Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Majority Staff, *EPA’s Foreign Grant Program* (June 27, 2011).

<sup>25</sup> Committee on Energy and Commerce, *Second Quarter Report* (July 6, 2011) at 7.

<sup>26</sup> Opening Statement of the Honorable Ed Whitfield, Subcommittee on Energy and Power and Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, *Joint Hearing on The FY 2013 EPA Budget*, 112th Cong. (Feb. 28, 2012).

<sup>27</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Clearance of Foreign Grant and Contract Awards*, Order 4540.1 (Dec. 29, 1972).

EPA's grants program and an even smaller percentage of EPA's budget, support work that advances America's interests at home and abroad. The Global Methane Initiative and EPA's work to support clean cookstoves are two examples.

#### **A. Global Methane Initiative**

Methane is a potent greenhouse gas and a precursor to ground-level ozone, exposure to which can cause respiratory illness and aggravated asthma attacks. On July 28, 2004, President George W. Bush announced that the United States and 13 other countries had formed the Methane to Markets (M2M) Partnership, an initiative to work with the private sector to capture methane emissions from mines, landfills, agriculture, and other sources. President Bush stated that the international partnership would generate many benefits, including "improved energy security and air quality from the use of clean-burning methane as natural gas; improved coal mine safety; enhanced economic growth; and reduced greenhouse gas emissions of methane."<sup>28</sup>

The United States committed \$53 million over five years to the M2M program.<sup>29</sup> In 2007, EPA announced that it had awarded \$2 million in grants to organizations and governmental agencies in Argentina, Brazil, China, India, Korea, Mexico, Nigeria, Russia, and Ukraine to help reduce methane emissions.<sup>30</sup>

On October 1, 2010, the U.S. government joined with 36 other countries to launch the Global Methane Initiative (GMI), building on the success of the M2M Partnership and expanding efforts to deploy methane-reducing technology around the globe. The U.S. government pledged \$50 million over five years to support the initiative, and in 2010, EPA awarded more than \$4 million in grant funding for methane reduction projects.<sup>31</sup> U.S. government funding is essential to leverage additional funding from other sources. Between FY2005 and FY2010, the U.S. government's contribution of \$59 million generated almost \$400 million in additional funding from other sources.<sup>32</sup>

In addition to reducing methane emissions, the M2M Partnership and GMI have generated new market opportunities for U.S. businesses with expertise in methane recovery. The Director of the Appalachian Energy Center at Appalachian State University, which received funding for a project to convert landfill methane into energy in Brazil, said that EPA-funded projects such as his "support the development of relations and economic cooperation in the

---

<sup>28</sup> The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, *President Bush Announces Methane to Markets Partnership* (July 28, 2004).

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*

<sup>30</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *EPA Targets \$2 Million to Fight Climate Change with Projects in China, Russia, Seven Other Countries* (Sept. 18, 2007) (press release).

<sup>31</sup> Global Methane Initiative, *The U.S. Government's Global Methane Initiative Accomplishments: Annual Report* (Oct. 2011) (online at [www.epa.gov/globalmethane/pdf/2011-accomplish-report/usg\\_report\\_2011\\_full.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/globalmethane/pdf/2011-accomplish-report/usg_report_2011_full.pdf)).

<sup>32</sup> *Id.*

environmental technologies industry between U.S. organizations and our Brazilian counterparts, thereby facilitating increased opportunities for American businesses to benefit by exporting to Brazil, one of the world's largest environmental technology markets."<sup>33</sup> Similarly, the Jackson Hole Center for Global Affairs received a grant in 2008 to explore opportunities for recovery of coal mine methane in China. The center convened a four-day conference in China to bring together technical experts, Chinese officials, and representatives of the U.S. private sector to identify opportunities for partnership. The center's director said that China's massive share of coal mine methane emissions "opens business opportunities for U.S. companies with relevant technologies and know-how."<sup>34</sup>

A good example is Caterpillar's experience in China's coal mine methane market. In 2006, Caterpillar secured a \$58 million contract from China to provide power generation equipment for a new power plant fueled by methane from coal mines. According to EPA, the M2M Partnership facilitated this project by maintaining a coal mine methane clearinghouse in China, which provides information to potential investors and promotes development of coal mine methane projects.<sup>35</sup>

Grant funding for international work also directly benefits U.S.-based engineering firms that have expertise in capturing methane emissions. The Director of the Appalachian Energy Center at Appalachian State University, for example, said that he used a portion of EPA's grant funding to pay for U.S.-based engineering consultants to help a municipality in Brazil plan and design a landfill gas-to-energy facility.<sup>36</sup> The Virginia Center for Coal and Energy at Virginia Tech, which received a grant in 2008 to develop and evaluate techniques for recovering coal mine methane in China, subcontracted with Marshall Miller & Associates (MM&A), an engineering firm based in Bluefield, VA. The center reported that MM&A "was able to leverage the EPA project experience into multiple subsequent projects in China."<sup>37</sup> Other U.S.-based firms that have benefitted from this type of subcontracting include Ruby Canyon Engineering based in Grand Junction, CO; Raven Ridge Resources, also based in Grand Junction, CO; SCS Engineers, based in Long Beach, CA; and others.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Letter from David A. Wendt, Jackson Hole Center for Global Affairs, to Rep. Henry A. Waxman (Apr. 18, 2012).

<sup>34</sup> Letter from Dr. Jeff Ramsdell, Professor and Director, Appalachian Energy Center, Appalachian State University, to Rep. Henry A. Waxman (Apr. 25, 2012).

<sup>35</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Power Plant to be Largest Run on Coal Mine Methane* (May 18, 2006) (press release).

<sup>36</sup> Letter from Dr. Jeff Ramsdell, Professor and Director, Appalachian Energy Center, Appalachian State University, to Rep. Henry A. Waxman (Apr. 25, 2012).

<sup>37</sup> Virginia Center for Coal and Energy, Virginia Tech, *Project Benefits to the U.S.: Development of Guidelines and Evaluation of Techniques for Degassing Coal Mine Methane in Advance of Mining to Reduce Methane Emissions in the Southern Shanxi Province of China* (July 1, 2011).

<sup>38</sup> E-mail correspondence between Committee Democratic staff and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (Mar. 21, 2012).

## B. Clean Cookstoves

Around the world, approximately three billion people cook their food and heat their homes by burning coal, wood, dung, and crop residues in open fires or rudimentary stoves, often indoors. Chronic exposure to indoor air pollution from these cooking practices causes severe health problems, including childhood pneumonia, lung cancer, and other respiratory diseases. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that exposure to cookstove smoke causes almost two million premature deaths per year, more than deaths from malaria or tuberculosis. Exposure to cookstove smoke also can cause cataracts, the leading cause of blindness in developing countries. Women and children are most vulnerable to these health effects, as they spend more time near the stoves or flames.<sup>39</sup>

In 2002, EPA launched an initiative called the Partnership for Clean Indoor Air (PCIA) to coordinate and provide assistance to hundreds of public and private organizations working worldwide to help households adopt cleaner cooking and heating practices. In 2010, these partners distributed more than 2.5 million clean cookstoves to households, reducing harmful indoor air pollution for 14 million people.<sup>40</sup> Beginning in 2003, the Bush Administration awarded Winrock International, a non-profit organization, approximately \$2 million in grants to help coordinate PCIA's work.

PCIA is now part of the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, led by the United Nations Foundation, which has set the goal of placing clean cookstoves in 100 million households by 2020.<sup>41</sup> In September 2010, EPA pledged \$6 million—as part of an overall U.S. commitment of \$53 million over five years—to design, test, and evaluate cleaner cookstoves.<sup>42</sup>

As part of its ongoing support for clean cookstoves, EPA has supported small projects to develop new cookstove designs and deploy them in the developing world. For example, EPA awarded the Rochester Institute of Technology \$10,000 to design, build, and test a clean cookstove for use in Haiti and \$10,000 to Fort Lewis College to develop an anaerobic digester system for three Quechua villages in Ecuador.<sup>43</sup> In 2007, EPA awarded \$198,000 to the Center for Development with Solar Energy to produce and distribute cleaner-burning stoves in

---

<sup>39</sup> Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, *The Issues: Health* (online at [www.cleancookstoves.org/our-work/the-issues/health-impacts.html](http://www.cleancookstoves.org/our-work/the-issues/health-impacts.html))

<sup>40</sup> Letter from Elisa Derby, Senior Program Officer at Winrock International and Co-Coordinator, Partnership for Clean Indoor Air, to Rep. Henry Waxman (Apr. 25, 2012).

<sup>41</sup> Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves, *The Alliance* (online at [www.cleancookstoves.org/the-alliance/](http://www.cleancookstoves.org/the-alliance/)).

<sup>42</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *EPA to Contribute \$6 Million to Life-Saving International Project for Clean Cookstoves* (Sept. 21, 2010) (press release).

<sup>43</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Improved Cook Stoves for Haiti Using Thermoelectrics to Reduce Deforestation and Improve Quality of Life*, Grant No. SU834291 (online at [http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer\\_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/8986](http://cfpub.epa.gov/ncer_abstracts/index.cfm/fuseaction/display.abstractDetail/abstract/8986)).

Bolivia.<sup>44</sup> In 2004, EPA awarded \$150,000 to Solar Household Energy (SHE) to distribute and evaluate the effectiveness of solar ovens in Mexico. The co-founder of the organization said that this project would not have been possible without EPA's support, which "allowed SHE to become one of the pioneers in clean cook stove design and implementation."<sup>45</sup>

The issue of clean cookstoves is one that has garnered bipartisan support. In May 2012, Senator Susan Collins (R-ME) introduced a bill to formally authorize funding for U.S. agencies that are part of the effort, including EPA, the State Department, Department of Energy, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Institutes of Health. Senator Collins stated that this bill, by helping to replace primitive stoves with modern versions that emit far less soot, "would directly benefit some of the world's poorest people and reduce harmful pollution that affects us all."

## V. CONCLUSION: A PATTERN OF MISREPRESENTATION

From the beginning of the Committee Republicans' investigation into EPA's grant-making for international environmental work, they have consistently misrepresented EPA's data to fit a narrative about rising payments to foreign countries. Committee Democratic staff have raised concerns about the majority's approach on more than one occasion.

After Committee Republicans released a staff report in June 2011, Ranking Member Waxman sent a letter to Chairman Upton identifying several factual errors in the report and asking him to retract it pending a more careful review of EPA's grant-making history.<sup>46</sup> The report remains on the majority's website.

In February 2012, before the Committee's hearing about EPA's 2013 budget, Committee Democratic staff alerted Republican staff that several of the grants EPA had identified as international appeared to have a tiny international component. At the hearing itself, EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson also made this point, saying that "very little" of the money awarded for international work actually went abroad, citing the FY2011 figure as \$844,985.<sup>47</sup> She also said that it is "not true" that EPA gave \$28 million to foreign governments in FY2011, as Rep. McKinley asserted during the hearing.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> CEDESOL, *Newsletter: Partnership for Clean Indoor Air with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency* (Feb. 10, 2008).

<sup>45</sup> Letter from Louise Meyer, co-founder, Solar Household Energy, to Rep. Henry Waxman (Apr. 13, 2012).

<sup>46</sup> Letter from Ranking Member Henry Waxman to Chairman Fred Upton, Committee on Energy and Commerce (July 11, 2011).

<sup>47</sup> Statement of Lisa Jackson, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Administrator, Subcommittee on Energy and Power and Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy, *Joint Hearing on The FY 2013 EPA Budget*, 112th Cong. (Feb. 28, 2012).

<sup>48</sup> *Id.*

At the hearing, Chairman Whitfield asked the EPA Administrator to justify awarding grants to China to reduce emissions of persistent organic pollutants and a grant to Thailand to reduce methane emissions from swine farms. After the hearing, Ranking Member Waxman sent a letter to Chairman Whitfield, clarifying that Administrator Jackson and the Obama Administration had not approved the grants he flagged as problematic; in fact, they began under the Bush Administration. The letter again noted that several of the EPA grantees appeared to be spending the majority of their funding within the United States.<sup>49</sup>

Despite these repeated attempts by Committee Democratic staff and the EPA Administrator to clarify the record, Committee Republicans have continued to misuse and misrepresent EPA's data in order to make unsubstantiated claims about the Obama Administration's fiscal record.

---

<sup>49</sup> Letter from Ranking Member Henry Waxman to Chairman Ed Whitfield, Subcommittee on Energy and Power, Committee on Energy and Commerce (Mar. 12, 2012).