

## Fact Sheet

### EPA's Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on CO2

In March 2007, EPA was ordered by the U.S. Supreme Court, in the case *Massachusetts v. EPA*, to respond to a relatively narrow issue: whether, under Section 202(a)(1) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gas emissions from a class or classes of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines cause or contribute to air pollution which may be reasonably anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.

EPA originally planned to incorporate its endangerment decision into a rule implementing President Bush's "Twenty in Ten" energy plan that would set a 35-billion gallon renewable fuels standard and increased vehicle fuel economy standards. However, on December 19, 2007, Congress passed and the president signed into law the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA). The EISA contained, among other things, a 36-billion-gallon renewable fuels mandate and stricter fuel economy standards for cars and light trucks. In light of this new law, EPA postponed its endangerment decision, and its response to *Massachusetts*, until 2008. On July 30, 2008, EPA published in the *Federal Register* the ANPR, in response to the Supreme Court's order in *Massachusetts*.

The ANPR is a draft paper prepared by EPA staff outlining all of the programs in the CAA they believe they can apply to greenhouse gases by virtue of EPA's existing authority. EPA requests comments on virtually every facet of these programs and their application.

The ANPR itself consists of two main parts:

1. Memoranda from eight federal agencies and executive offices, as well as a preamble by the Administrator of EPA himself, expressing strong disapproval of the use of the Clean Air Act to regulate greenhouse gas emissions; and
2. A draft paper prepared by EPA career staff containing:
  - a. A discussion of the endangerment issue and the scientific basis for making such a finding;
  - b. A discussion of the various CAA sections and programs EPA would use to regulate mobile sources; and
  - c. A discussion of the various CAA sections and programs EPA would use to regulate stationary sources.

For mobile sources, EPA sets forth a myriad of potential types of regulation, such as mandatory imposition of new technologies, mandatory obsolescence of existing technologies, and enforcement.

EPA also lists the specific *types* of actions it could take by sector, and its analysis is not limited to equipment but also to operation. For instance, EPA believes it could reduce emissions in the aviation sector by forcing carriers to: (1) redesign the weight and aerodynamics of their planes; (2) redesign the engines of their planes; (3) fly slower; (4) change their routes; (5) buy different fuels; and (6) alter their taxiing, air traffic controls and management.

No sector is left unharmed; for instance, EPA suggests it could force makers of lawn mowers and recreational vehicles to stop using two-stroke engines and instead convert to four-stroke engines.

For stationary sources, EPA considers three specific pathways: (1) setting National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS); (2) New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) for specific industries; (3) and regulation as Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAP).

All of these methods will result in significant pain for consumers. NAAQS may be the most unworkable, particularly because air quality standards are typically measured locally and mitigation strategies for are incorporated into individual state implementation plans. However, for greenhouse gases, EPA admits that it would likely have to assess air quality assessment on a national scale. Therefore, the entire U.S. would either be designated attainment or non-attainment depending solely on where the Administrator sets the NAAQS. Regulation of greenhouse gases as HAPs will force strict technological standards on anyone emitting more than 25 tons per year of CO<sub>2</sub>; even EPA admits that “if GHGs were listed as HAPs, EPA would be required to regulate a very large number of new and existing stationary sources, including smaller sources than if alternative CAA authorities were used to regulate GHG.”

If EPA finds endangerment and greenhouse gases are regulated by any provision of the CAA, Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permitting authority will be triggered for any source emitting more than 250 tons per year of CO<sub>2</sub>. This potentially exposes more than a million medium and large buildings in the United States to costly, permitting requirements anytime construction is undertaken that will result in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions over the 250-ton-per-year threshold. Covered buildings must then determine whether they must install Best Available Control Technologies to control emissions.

The ANPR is not a final rule, or even a proposed rule. At the close of the ANPR comment period, none of its contents will become binding law. The next step is for the EPA is to review the comments received on or before the November 28 deadline and then draft a proposed rule, after which a new comment period opens.

Comments are due to EPA on or before November 28, 2008. The full docket for the ANPR can found at [www.regulations.gov/](http://www.regulations.gov/) under the docket designation EPA-HQ-OAR-2008-0318. Comments may be submitted on at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov/); via email at [a-and-rDocket@epa.gov](mailto:a-and-rDocket@epa.gov); by fax at 202-566-9744 and by mail to:

**Air and Radiation Docket Information Center  
Environmental Protection Agency  
Mailcode: 2822T  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20460**