

**From:** Lee, Monica  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2015 4:54 PM  
**To:** Timothy Cama  
**Subject:** RE: GAO ruling on WOTUS

Tim – wanted to follow up on one point from your story.

It also said the EPA broke the law with a blog post that linked to two environmental groups' pages urging readers to contact members of Congress to oppose legislation.

In the report, GAO wrote that they agree they cannot be certain that at the time EPA linked to the non-profit websites that an action prompt to contact Congress even existed (pg. 23 and 25)

Give me a call if you want to talk through, but I think that's a significant point to make.

Also, can you call this rule by the official name we use and EPA and Army: Clean Water Rule? It hasn't been WOTUS for almost a year and a half now.

Thanks.

**From:** Lee, Monica  
**Sent:** Monday, December 14, 2015 3:50 PM  
**To:** Harrison, Melissa <Harrison.Melissa@epa.gov>; Timothy Cama <tcama@thehill.com>  
**Subject:** RE: GAO ruling on WOTUS

Statement and background below. Also attached is our letter to GAO from August.

## **Statement**

We disagree with their assessment, and we will fulfill whatever reporting requirements are necessary.

We maintain that using social media to educate the public about our work is an integral part of our mission. We have an obligation to inform all stakeholders about environmental issues and encourage participation in the rulemaking process. We use social media tools just like all organizations to stay connected and inform people across the country about our activities.

Our social media activity simply directed the recipient to the general webpage about the Clean Water Rule. EVERY stakeholder and EVERY stakeholder group --- whether they supported or opposed the rule --- was provided the same link to the general webpage on education and outreach materials, emails, and presentations, and were told the deadline for submitting public comments and how to do so.

At no point did the EPA encourage the public to contact Congress or any state legislature.

The purpose of seeking comment on the Clean Water Rule and all such proposals is to invigorate the process with new information and new perspectives. The public comment process is not only required by law, in this instance, but most often leads to stronger and better rules, based on science and the law. The agency learns from an engaged citizenry, and to do this, we ask for their input.