



Written by [David Kelly](#) on June 23, 2023

## EPA Official Finally Testifies on Proposed Emissions Rules

The House Committee on Oversight and Accountability finally heard [testimony](#) on Wednesday from a top Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) official who failed to appear at the originally scheduled [hearing](#) last month, when experts testified on the EPA's proposed tailpipe emission rules.

Joseph Goffman, the EPA's Office of Air and Radiation's administrator, had been invited to discuss his agency's proposed emissions standards and the challenges of a rapid electric vehicle (EV) transition that the Biden administration's green energy [plan](#) seeks to impose upon the nation.



LD/iStock/Getty Images Plus

The EPA's new proposed rules as [announced](#) in April will "accelerate the ongoing transition to a clean vehicles future and tackle the climate crisis." The projected transition to electric vehicles, according to the EPA, could result in EVs accounting for "67% of new light-duty vehicle sales and 46% of new medium-duty vehicle sales" by 2032.

The House committee sent a [letter](#) to the EPA expressing their disappointment with the EPA's refusal to attend the original hearing. "The EPA is not—nor should it want to be—immune to congressional oversight," the letter stated.

Noting previous congressional testimony, the letter shared that the "EPA stated it is only willing to appear at a hearing 'once the rules are final.'" The letter added:

To claim the EPA can only testify about final rules is a convenient excuse to avoid congressional scrutiny. The proposed rules at question will dramatically affect the vehicle market, and therefore American consumers and the American economy. The EPA ought to be willing to come before Members of Congress to answer questions about its proposed rules.

When Goffman finally appeared at Wednesday's [hearing](#), "Clearing the Air: Examining the Environmental Protection Agency's Proposed Emissions Standards," he faced scrutiny from committee members, with Congressman Pat Fallon (R-Texas) asking bluntly why he was a no-show to the originally scheduled hearing.

*The Epoch Times* [reported](#) the exchange:

"For my part, as with many things, it was primarily scheduling," Goffman responded....

When Fallon asked Goffman whether the choice to refuse had come from another agency official, Goffman said he had "participated in the decision."

"So you couldn't change and adjust your schedule for the United States' Congress?" the Texas congressman asked.



Written by [David Kelly](#) on June 23, 2023

---

“It was difficult,” replied Goffman....

“What was more important?” Fallon asked.

Goffman dodged the question: “Well, let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I am pleased to be here today. I understand that it’s my obligation and commitment not only to be here today but to continue to provide this committee and the Congress with—”

“I think this is an institutional thing,” Fallon interrupted, calling for “bipartisan, frankly, outrage” over the EPA’s decision not to attend the May hearing.

“I would hope that in the future you would clear your calendar for Congress,” he continued.

The committee heard expert testimony during the first [hearing](#), “Driving Bad Policy: Examining EPA’s Tailpipe Emissions Rules and the Realities of a Rapid Electric Vehicle Transition.”

Steve Bradbury from The Heritage Foundation [noted](#) that Congress has “not delegated to EPA the power to force the conversion to electric vehicles.”

He added:

EPA has made no bones about the goal of its proposed rules: The Agency is trying to use tailpipe emissions limits on carbon dioxide and criteria pollutants as a hammer and tongs to coerce the automotive industry to build far more electric vehicles (EVs) than market demand would currently support.

Using the Supreme Court’s 2022 decision in [West Virginia v. EPA](#) to point out the obvious usurpation of Congress’ authority by the EPA, Bradbury stated, “The current proposals represent an even more extreme example of regulatory overreach” than what was ruled against then by the Court.

He then exposed the current reality of the transition to EVs:

The American public is not jumping on the electric bandwagon. EVs are expensive—beyond the reach of many American families—and most Americans remain skeptical that EVs will reliably serve the full range of their needs, that quick and convenient charging stations will be widely available, that EVs will maintain their promised driving range over time or in cold weather, that they will have any resale or trade-in value whatsoever, and that insurance carriers will cover the huge costs of battery replacement when the battery is damaged in a minor accident.

Missing his opportunity to respond in person to critics of the EPA’s proposed rules, Goffman chose to avoid going on defense, sticking instead to the EPA’s Pollyanna-ish talking points that he [submitted](#) for this week’s rescheduled hearing appearance. He shared that the “proposals would deliver dramatic improvements in public health, notable savings for consumers and commercial fleets, and increased energy security for Americans,” adding that, “if finalized, these proposals would mark a significant step towards improving air quality, protecting people’s health, and addressing the climate crisis.”

This apparent disrespect by Goffman and the Biden administration for our constitutional Republic’s checks and balances to limit power is another example of why we need to remove these hubris-infected individuals from their posts — before their policies destroy this once-great nation.



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.