Air Pollution Laws in the United States

- CAA amendments of 1970
- CAA amendments of 1977
- CAA amendments of 1990
- “one of the most significant pieces of environmental legislation ever enacted”
CAA Amendments of 1990

- National ambient air quality standards (NAAQS)
- Mobile source emission standards
- New source performance standards (NSPS)
- National emission standards for hazardous air pollutants (NESHAPs)
- Acid Deposition Control
- Stratospheric Ozone Protection
- Risk Management Plan (RMP)
Effectiveness of Legislation

Benefits of the Clean Air Act have outweighed its costs 30 to 1

By 2020, benefits expected to reach $2 trillion dollars

“Legislation with teeth”
From Sources to Health Impacts

- Emissions
- Atmospheric concentrations
- External exposure
- Internal dosage
- Toxicity
- Biological response
Health Impacts

According to a study done by the Clean Air task Force and LULAC - Latinxs are 51 percent more likely than non-Hispanic whites to live in counties with unsafe ozone levels.

1.8 million Latinxs live within a half-mile of oil and gas facilities.

More than 1 in 3 Latinxs now live in an area that violates federal standards for ozone, a chemical that is desirable high in the atmosphere but at ground level is a pollutant linked to asthma and other health problems.

Latinx kids have roughly 153,000 asthma attacks, and 112,000 lost school days.

Asthma is more common among Latinx kids than among other children: About 8.5 percent have asthma, compared with 7.9 percent of white children and 5.5 percent of Asian children.

1.8 million Latinos (3 percent) live in areas where air pollution from oil and gas facilities exceeds the EPA level of concern for cancer risk.
Mercury Air Toxics Standards

- The EPA first found regulation "appropriate and necessary" in 2000, and reaffirmed that finding in 2012 and 2016
- The new rule would:
  - refuse to consider all benefits when evaluating the "worth" of a rule;
  - ignore unquantified direct benefits of reducing air toxics;
  - rely on outdated information and disregard new information; and
  - undermine the public health gains from MATS and potentially other public health protections
- the agency must make "a direct comparison of costs and benefits" to assess whether the rule’s benefits are "worth" the costs, rather than finding that the costs are reasonable in and of themselves
- costs should continue to be defined expansively, but benefits should now only include those that are directly attributable to reductions of the specific pollutants “targeted” by the regulation; benefits from other pollutant reductions that are also caused by the regulation (so-called “co-benefits” or ancillary benefits) should not be considered.
EPA rule under the Clean Air Act to manage emissions from chemical facilities

- These emissions include but are not limited to flammable and carcinogenic chemicals like formaldehyde, chloroform, ammonia, and benzene

After the explosion in West, Texas at a fertilizer plant the Obama Administration updated these rules governing releases at chemical facilities

- Then the Trump Administration subsequently rolled them back
Environmental Justice

- We worked with communities on the fenceline of these facilities to complete a report called: Double Jeopardy in Houston: Acute and Chronic Chemical Exposures Pose Disproportionate Risks for Marginalized Communities
## Houston Community Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Houston Urban Area</th>
<th>Galena Park</th>
<th>Harrisburg/Manchester</th>
<th>H/M RMP 1 Mile</th>
<th>Bellaire</th>
<th>West Oaks/Eldridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People of Color</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Poverty</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Home Value</td>
<td>$197,888</td>
<td>$68,118</td>
<td>$71,088</td>
<td>$80,028</td>
<td>$78,159</td>
<td>$647,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$534,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$243,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$177,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Household Income</td>
<td>$82,920</td>
<td>$49,732</td>
<td>$48,233</td>
<td>$45,431</td>
<td>$45,520</td>
<td>$226,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$191,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$91,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$82,178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The CAA is strong because decisions on air pollution must be science based and must protect public health.

Comments on regulations by Latinx people, medical professionals, and scientific experts help maintain strong safeguards.

Agencies should be working to maintain public health regulations particularly as they impact vulnerable communities disparately.
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