



**“RIGHT AND WRONG”**

VISUAL	AUDIO	FACTS
<p>[Ad from the 50s or 60s with a doctor smoking] What cigarette do you smoke, Doctor?</p>	<p>[1960s music track] <b>Sometimes there’s just right and wrong.</b></p>	
<p><b>CLEAN AIR &amp; WATER ACTS RIGHT</b></p>	<p><b>In the 1970s, Congress passed the Clean Air and Water Acts. That was right.</b></p>	<p><b>The Clean Air Act, Established In 1970 “Has A 40-Year Track Record Of Cutting Dangerous Pollution.”</b> According to the Union of Concerned Scientists: “The Clean Air Act—whose basic structure was established in 1970, and then amended in 1977 and 1990—is a United States federal law designed to protect human health and the environment from the effects of air pollution. Under the Clean Air Act, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is required to regulate emission of pollutants that "endanger public health and welfare." State and local governments also monitor and enforce Clean Air Act regulations, with oversight by the EPA. This legislation has a 40-year track record of cutting dangerous pollution and has prevented more than 400,000 premature deaths and hundreds of millions of cases of respiratory and cardiovascular disease.” [<a href="#">Union of Concerned Scientists website accessed 9/27/2018</a>]</p> <p><b>The Clean Water Act, Enacted In 1972 “Is The Primary Federal Statute Regulating The Protection Of The Nation’s Waters.”</b> According to the Michigan State University’s Office of Environmental Health and Safety: “The Clean Water Act (CWA) is the primary Federal statute regulating the protection of the nation's waters. CWA was enacted in 1972 in response to nationwide water pollution issues and was amended in 1977 and 1987. Section 311 of CWA was amended by the Oil Pollution Act (OPA) of 1990, which has its own separate regulation and enforcement scheme. CWA established national programs for the prevention, reduction, and elimination of pollution in navigable water and groundwater. It also sets up a water quality standards program and required permits</p>



for discharge and treatment of wastewater and storm water.” [[Michigan State University office of Environmental Health and Safety, accessed 9/27/2018](#)]

**CONGRESSMAN YODER  
GUT PROTECTIONS  
WRONG**  
CITE: House Vote #528, 9/14/17

**But Congressman Kevin Yoder  
wants to gut them**

**...allowing corporations to spew  
toxins into the air.**

**That’s wrong.**

**Kevin Yoder Voted To Slash Funding For Environmental Protection And Undo Protections For Clean Air And Clean Water.** Representative Ken Calvert (R-CA) sponsored H.R. 3354, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, which would harm people’s health and the outdoors by slashing funding for many critical programs and by using radical policy riders to outright block environmental protections. This spending bill contained damaging cuts to programs that protect public health and fuel our outdoor economy, such as the more than \$500 million cut to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the 32 percent cut to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Additionally, this legislation contained a slew of anti-environmental and other ideological policy riders, including a measure that would allow the EPA to bypass the law and hide its repeal of drinking water protections for 117 million people. On September 14, the House approved H.R. 3354 by a vote of 211-198. The pro-environment position was NO. Kevin Yoder voted Yes. [[LCV Scorecard, House Vote #528, 9/14/2017](#)]

**Kevin Yoder Voted To Block Safeguards Against Air Pollution Including Mercury, Arsenic, And Chromium From Woodstoves And Boilers.** Representative Bill Johnson (R-OH) sponsored H.R. 1917, the Blocking Regulatory Interference from Closing Kilns (BRICK) Act of 2017, which would delay public health protections, in this case limits on deadly toxic pollution – including mercury, arsenic, and chromium – from brick manufacturing facilities. The BRICK Act was also modified in the Rules Committee to incorporate H.R. 453, the Relief from New Source Performance Standards Act of 2017. This bill (now section 3 of H.R. 1917) would delay stronger emission limits for new woodstoves and boilers, which reduce hazardous and toxic air pollutants – including particulate matter (soot), nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and carcinogens like benzene and formaldehyde. On March 7, the House approved H.R. 1917 by a vote of 234-180. The pro-environment position was No. Kevin Yoder voted Yes. [[LCV Scorecard; House Vote #99, 3/7/2018](#)]



**Kevin Yoder Voted To Exempt Waste Coal Burning Power Plants From Air Pollution Safeguards.** Representative Keith Rothfus (R-PA) sponsored H.R. 1119, the Satisfying Energy Needs and Saving the Environment (SENSE) Act, which would permanently exempt waste coal burning power plants from meeting certain clean air standards, including limits on hydrogen chloride and sulfur dioxide, both of which can cause significant respiratory problems. The courts have already ruled on this matter and found that waste coal-burning power plants are already meeting these air quality standards, and there is no evidence that allowing for higher levels of pollutants would do anything but expose our communities to dirtier air. On March 8, the House approved H.R. 1119 by a vote of 215-189. The pro-environment position was No. Kevin Yoder voted Yes. [[LCV Scorecard](#); [House Vote #101, 3/8/2018](#)]

**Kevin Yoder Voted To Block The EPA From Setting Limits On Methane Pollution.** Representative Markwayne Mullin (R-OK) offered an amendment to H.R. 3354, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018, which would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) from implementing its standards to reduce methane pollution from new and modified sources in the oil and gas industry. The EPA's methane standard requires low-cost, proven safeguards that are critical to reducing methane's contributions to climate change, with estimated climate benefits of \$170 million by 2025, and also curbs toxic air pollutants that contribute to smog and jeopardize the health of nearby communities. On September 13, the House approved the Mullin amendment by a vote of 218-195. The pro-environment position was No. Kevin Yoder voted Yes. [[House Vote #488, 09/13/2017](#)]

**Kevin Yoder Voted To Block The Clean Power Plan.** On behalf of House Energy and Commerce Committee Ranking Member Frank Pallone (D-NJ), Congressman Scott Peters (D-CA) offered an amendment to H.R. 5538, the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017, which would have struck damaging language in the bill that blocked implementation of the Environmental Protection Agency's Clean Power Plan, including termination of any assistance to states that have asked for help developing sensible state policies.

The Clean Power Plan establishes the first national carbon pollution limits for new and existing power plants and is the single biggest step our country has ever taken to tackle climate change. Communities across the United States are already suffering from the devastating impacts of climate change, such as more frequent and severe weather events like droughts, wildfires, floods, and storms, and unchecked climate change also threatens public health. On July 12, the House rejected the Pallone amendment by a vote of 182-244 (House roll call vote 431). The House passed H.R. 5538 on July 14, but the Senate took no action on this legislation. Yes was the pro-environment position. On Vote #431, Kevin Yoder voted No. [[LCV Scorecard, House Vote #431, 7/12/2016](#)]

**Kevin Yoder Voted To Block The Clean Power Plan.** Senator Shelley Moore Capito (R-WV) sponsored S.J. Res. 24, the Congressional Review Act "Resolution of Disapproval" that would permanently block the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Clean Power Plan. The Clean Power Plan established the first national limits on carbon pollution from existing power plants - our nation's single largest source of the pollution fueling climate change. S.J. Res. 24 is an extreme measure that would block the biggest step our country has ever taken to address climate change, threatening our health and our future. S.J. Res. 24 would also prohibit the EPA from ever developing "substantially similar" standards in the future. Following its passage in the Senate, on December 1, the House approved S.J. Res. 24. by a vote of 242-180 (House roll call vote 650). President Obama vetoed S.J. Res. 24 on December 18. NO was the pro-environment position. Kevin Yoder voted YES. [[LCV Scorecard; House Vote #650, 12/1/2015](#)]

**Kevin Yoder Voted For An Attack on Smog Protections & the Clean Air Act.** Representative Pete Olson (R-TX) sponsored H.R. 806, the Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2017, which would delay the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) recently-updated standards for ozone pollution and eviscerate a central pillar of the Clean Air Act. This legislation would allow the EPA to consider factors unrelated to health, like technical feasibility, in the initial standard setting process. This bill would also delay the EPA's ozone standards by at least ten years and double the current five-year review periods for updating all national

air quality standards, allowing unhealthy air to persist even longer. On July 18, the House approved H.R. 806 by a vote of 229-199. The pro-environment position was NO. Kevin Yoder votes YES. [[LCV Scorecard](#), [House Vote #391, 7/18/2017](#)]

**Kevin Yoder Voted To Eliminate Clean Water Act Safeguards Against Toxic Pesticides.** Rep. Gibbs (R-OH) introduced H.R. 953, the ‘Reducing Regulatory Burdens Act of 2017,’ which would eliminate Clean Water Act safeguards protecting communities from toxic pesticides and result in pesticides being discharged directly into water bodies without any meaningful oversight or public transparency. H.R. 953 is unnecessary to address the Zika virus or other mosquito-borne health threats and is simply a handout to pesticide manufacturers and other corporate interests. On May 24, the House passed H.R. 953. The pro-environment position was No. Kevin Yoder voted Yes. [[LCV Scorecard](#); [House Vote #282, 05/24/2017](#)]

**Kevin Yoder Voted To Block Rules Protecting Streams From Coal Mining Waste.** Representative Bill Johnson (R-OH) sponsored H.J. Res. 38, the Congressional Review Act "Resolution of Disapproval" of the Stream Protection Rule, which would threaten the drinking water and public health of communities living near coal mining operations by permanently blocking the Department of Interior's recently finalized Stream Protection Rule. This important rule sets out commonsense requirements for coal mining that will better protect ground water, surface water, and ecosystems from toxic coal mining waste, which has been linked to increased rates of cancer, birth defects, and other health problems in nearby communities. The rule will protect 6,000 miles of streams and 52,000 acres of forests, sets up new requirements for water quality monitoring and restoration, and generally compels coal mining companies to reduce their impact on the surrounding environment. The Congressional Review Act, an extreme legislative tool, would not only overturn the current rule, but would prohibit the Department of Interior from ever issuing "substantially similar" regulations in the future that reduce the harmful impacts of coal mining, decimating the health and environment of everyone who lives near or downstream from these operations. On February 1, the House approved H.R. Res. 38 by a vote of 228-194. The pro-environment



		<p>position was No. Kevin Yoder voted Yes. [<a href="#">LCV Scorecard</a>; <a href="#">House Vote #73, 02/01/2017</a>]</p>
<p><b>PROTECTING FOR PRE-EXISTING CONDITIONS RIGHT</b></p>	<p><b>Protecting people with pre-existing conditions? That's right.</b></p>	
<p>Newspaper headline:          "Insurers could charge huge premiums under Yoder-backed bill"          McClatchy September 25, 2018  <b>WRONG</b>          CITE: House Vote #528, 9/14/17</p>	<p><b>But Yoder wants to gut those protections.</b></p> <p><b>That's just wrong.</b></p>	<p><b>McClatchy Headline: "Insurers Could Charge Huge Premiums Under Yoder-Backed Bill, Health Care Experts Say."</b> In September of 2018, McClatchy newspapers published an article with the headline: "Insurers Could Charge Huge Premiums Under Yoder-Backed Bill, Health Care Experts Say." According to the article: "Rep. Kevin Yoder and other top House Republicans say they're committed to protecting people with pre-existing conditions — but their big push to change current law could actually mean ballooning insurance bills for people with chronic illness, health experts say. Republicans are struggling to defuse controversy about their plans to dramatically change the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare. Polls show that ending the law's strong protections for people with pre-existing conditions is political poison for GOP candidates." [<a href="#">McClatchy, 9/25/2018</a>]</p> <p><b>Kevin Yoder Voted For The American Health Care Act That Which Would Result In 23 Million Fewer Americans With Health Insurance By 2026.</b> In May 2017, Kevin Yoder voted for the American Health Care Act which would have significantly repealed portions of the Affordable Care Act by cutting Medicaid, cutting taxes on the rich, removing safeguard for pre-existing conditions and defunding Planned Parenthood. The overall legislation would have in part, also according to Congressional Quarterly, "ma[d]e extensive changes to the 2010 health care overhaul law, by effectively repealing the individual and employer mandates as well as most of the taxes that finance the current system. It would [have], in 2020, convert[ed] Medicaid into a capped entitlement that would provide[d] fixed federal payments to states and end[ed] additional federal funding for the 2010 law's joint federal-state Medicaid expansion. It would prohibit federal</p>

funding to any entity, such as Planned Parenthood, that performs abortions and receives more than \$350 million a year in Medicaid funds. [...] It would [have] allow[ed] states to receive waivers to exempt insurers from having to provide certain minimum benefits.” The vote was on passage. The House passed the bill by a vote of 217 to 213. [House Vote 256, [5/4/17](#); Congressional Quarterly, [5/4/17](#); Kaiser Family Foundation, [5/17](#); Congressional Actions, [H.R. 1628](#)]

**Current Law Under The Affordable Care Act (Obamacare) Prevents Insurance Companies From Refusing To Cover Patients With Pre-Existing Conditions Such As Asthma, Diabetes, Or Cancer.** A website for the Department of Health and Human Services explains: "Under current law, health insurance companies can't refuse to cover you or charge you more just because you have a "pre-existing condition" — that is, a health problem you had before the date that new health coverage starts. These rules went into effect for plan years beginning on or after January 1, 2014." According to the HHS website, "Health insurers can no longer charge more or deny coverage to you or your child because of a pre-existing health condition like asthma, diabetes, or cancer. They cannot limit benefits for that condition either. Once you have insurance, they can't refuse to cover treatment for your pre-existing condition." [[HHS, About the ACA, Pre-Existing Conditions accessed 9/14/2018](#)]

**Leading Patient Organizations: “People With Pre-Existing Conditions Could Be Denied Coverage.”** A May 1, 2017 joint press release by the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network and 9 other patient advocacy organizations said, “Weakening protections in favor of high-risk pools would also undermine the ban on discrimination based on health status. The individuals and families we represent cannot go back to a time when people with pre-existing conditions could be denied coverage or forced to choose between purchasing basic necessities and affording their health care coverage. Given these factors, we oppose the latest draft of the AHCA. We urge Members of Congress to reject this legislation.” [[American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network joint press release, 5/1/2017](#)]

**CBO: States That Opt Out Of Community Rating Protections Would Lead To**



		<p><b>Americans With Pre-Existing Conditions Being Priced Out Of The Insurance Market.</b> According to the CBO, “Community-rated premiums would rise over time, and people who are less healthy (including those with preexisting or newly acquired medical conditions) would ultimately be unable to purchase comprehensive nongroup health insurance at premiums comparable to those under current law, if they could purchase it at all—despite the additional funding that would be available under H.R. 1628 to help reduce premiums. As a result, the nongroup markets in those states would become unstable for people with higher-than-average expected health care costs. That instability would cause some people who would have been insured in the nongroup market under current law to be uninsured.” [CBO via Vox, <a href="#">5/24/17</a>]</p>
<p><b>RIGHT</b></p>	<p><b>Protecting our health and making health care more affordable? That’s right.</b></p>	
<p><b>KEVIN YODER WRONG</b></p>	<p><b>Kevin Yoder? He’s wrong.</b></p>	
<p>DISCLAIMER: LCV VICTORY FUND IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE CONTENT OF THIS ADVERTISING. PAID FOR BY LCV VICTORY FUND, <a href="http://WWW.LCVVICTORYFUND.ORG">WWW.LCVVICTORYFUND.ORG</a>, AND NOT AUTHORIZED BY ANY CANDIDATE OR CANDIDATE’S COMMITTEE.</p>	<p><b>LCV Victory Fund is responsible for the content of this advertising.</b></p>	