Table of Contents

[Cars Rhetoric / Reality 3](#_Toc11842186)

[Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Rollback Would Give Consumers Access to Safer Cars 3](#_Toc11842187)

[Reality: EPA’s Own Staff Challenged the Agency’s Safety Claims and Said Trump’s Plan Would Actually Increase Highway Deaths. 3](#_Toc11842188)

[Rhetoric: Trump’s Fuel Economy Plan Would Make Cars More Affordable 5](#_Toc11842189)

[Reality: Trump’s Rollback Plan Could Add Thousands to Consumers’ Fuel Bills 5](#_Toc11842190)

[Reality: Trump Administration Overstated the Benefits of Freezing CAFE Standards by at least $112 Billion. 6](#_Toc11842191)

[Rhetoric: EPA Claimed Proposed New Standards Based on “Best and Most Up-to-Date Information” 6](#_Toc11842192)

[Reality: Proposed New Rule Based on “Error-Ridden,” Cherry-Picked Data and Misleading Analysis. 7](#_Toc11842193)

[Rhetoric: Trump’s Rollback Proposal Would Continue to Protect the Environment 8](#_Toc11842194)

[Reality: Administration’s Own Analysis Showed That Air Pollutants Would Increase Under Rollback Plan 8](#_Toc11842195)

[Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Rules “Not Appropriate and Should Be Revised” 9](#_Toc11842196)

[Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Will Drastically Cut Oil Consumption and Global Warming Emissions, While Creating Hundreds of Thousands of Jobs 10](#_Toc11842197)

[Reality: Car Companies “Over-Complied” With the Most Stringent GHG Standards 10](#_Toc11842198)

[Reality: 18 States Sued the EPA for Rolling Back Fuel Economy Rules That They Affirmed Reduced Carbon Pollution and Saved Drivers Money. 11](#_Toc11842199)

[Rhetoric: Revisiting Fuel Economy Standards A “Win” For the Economy 11](#_Toc11842200)

[Reality: Weakening Fuel Economy Rules Would Put Manufacturing Jobs At Risk 11](#_Toc11842201)

[Reality: Manufacturers Could Lose Up to $1.4 Billion Under Weakened Standards 12](#_Toc11842202)

[Reality: Rollback Would Increase America’s Oil Dependence 12](#_Toc11842203)

[Reality: Rollback Would Threaten Automakers’ Global Competitiveness 13](#_Toc11842204)

[Rhetoric: Standards Were Not “Economically Feasible” 14](#_Toc11842205)

[Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Would Create An Estimated 650,000 Jobs By 2030 14](#_Toc11842206)

[Rhetoric: Re-Evaluation Would Ensure Fuel Standards Were Good For Consumers And The Environment 14](#_Toc11842207)

[Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Are Good for the Environment 15](#_Toc11842208)

[Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Are Good for Our Communities 15](#_Toc11842209)

[Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Are Important to Our Public Health 16](#_Toc11842210)

[Reality: Decision To Re-Examine Fuel Economy Rules Linked to Climate Denial 16](#_Toc11842211)

[Reality: Heidi King, Trump’s NHTSA Nominee, Refused to Acknowledge Human Impact on Climate Change 17](#_Toc11842212)

[Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Standards Would Pass Costs Onto Consumers 17](#_Toc11842213)

[Reality: CAFE Standards Would Save Consumers More Than $1.7 Trillion by MY 2025 17](#_Toc11842214)

[Reality: By 2030, Fuel Efficiency Standards Expected to Save American Drivers $50 Billion 19](#_Toc11842215)

[Reality: Cost Of Owning A Car Would Increase if Standards Were Rolled Back 20](#_Toc11842216)

[Reality: Rolling Back Standards Would Cost Drivers an Additional $193 Billion In Fuel Costs 20](#_Toc11842217)

[Reality: Rising Gas Prices Called Into Question Fuel Economy Rollback 20](#_Toc11842218)

[Reality: The Majority of Americans Supported Keeping Current Fuel Efficiency Standards In Place. 21](#_Toc11842219)

[Reality: Consumers Valued Fuel Economy Above Brand and Price 22](#_Toc11842220)

[Rhetoric: Cars will be too expensive Under Fuel Economy Standards 22](#_Toc11842221)

[Reality: Customer Would Save More Than $6,000 Over the Lifetime Of New Vehicles 23](#_Toc11842222)

[Rhetoric: Costs of Fuel Economy Standards Far Outweigh Benefits 23](#_Toc11842223)

[Reality: Consumers Would Save Money Under Current Standards and Costs of Complying With the Standards Were Lower Than Even the EPA Predicted 23](#_Toc11842224)

[Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Standards “Costly For Automakers” 24](#_Toc11842225)

[Reality: Automakers’ Sales Hit An All-Time High In 2016 24](#_Toc11842226)

[Reality: Car Companies “Over-Complied” With the Most Stringent GHG Standards 25](#_Toc11842227)

[Reality: Automakers Did Not Support the Trump Administration’s Plan to Freeze Fuel Economy Standards. 25](#_Toc11842228)

[Reality: Suppliers Want Fuel Economy Standards to Be Maintained Or Even Strengthened, Not Weakened 26](#_Toc11842229)

[Rhetoric: Renegotiating Fuel Rules Would Help Auto Workers 26](#_Toc11842230)

[Reality: Trump’s Proposal to Weaken Fuel Economy Standards Would Kill 60,000 Auto Jobs by 2030. 27](#_Toc11842231)

[Reality: Rolling Back the Standards Helps the Automakers, Not Workers 27](#_Toc11842232)

[Rhetoric: Under Trump, Automakers Are Bringing Jobs Back To America 28](#_Toc11842233)

[Reality: Automakers “Hard Pressed” And “Wary” About Creating More Jobs 28](#_Toc11842234)

[Reality: Automakers Disputed Trump’s Claim That He Persuaded Them To Keep US Jobs 28](#_Toc11842235)

[Rhetoric: Midterm Review Analysis was Pre-mature and Rushed 29](#_Toc11842236)

[Reality: EPA’s Midterm Review Was “Not Unexpected” And Accounted For Multiple Public Comment Opportunities, In Which Automakers Provided Feedback 29](#_Toc11842237)

[Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Rules Need to Be Harmonized 30](#_Toc11842238)

[Reality: CARB, EPA and NHTSA Have Harmonized Standards Through MY2025. 31](#_Toc11842239)

[Rhetoric: “A Lot Has Changed” On Electric Car Sales Since 2012 32](#_Toc11842240)

[Reality: Electric Vehicle Sales Skyrocketed in 2016; Will Make up 50% of All Light Vehicles by 2040. 32](#_Toc11842241)

[Rhetoric: Glider Emission Rules A “Regulatory Overreach” and Should Be Repealed 32](#_Toc11842242)

[Reality: EPA’s Own Report Found That Pollution from Glider Trucks Vastly Exceeded Emissions From New Trucks 33](#_Toc11842243)

[Reality: Pruitt Proposed Reversing Glider Truck Rule After Meeting With Executives of the Largest Glider Truck Manufacturer, Fitzgerald Glider Kits 34](#_Toc11842244)

[Reality: Pruitt Cited a Study Paid for By Glider Manufacturer, Fitzgerald In Its Repeal Announcement Even Though the Study Contradicted the EPA’s Own Findings 35](#_Toc11842245)

[Reality: Federal Court Blocked Pruitt’s Decision to Not to Enforce Glider Truck Emissions Cap 36](#_Toc11842246)

[Reality: After Pruitt Resigned, EPA’s New Acting Administrator Withdrew Pruitt’s Signoff On the Glider Truck Loophole 36](#_Toc11842247)

# Cars Rhetoric / Reality

## Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Rollback Would Give Consumers Access to Safer Cars

**August 2018: Trump Administration Announced Alternative to Fuel Economy and GHG Standards, “To Give Consumers Greater Access to Safer, More Affordable Vehicles[.]”** “During a visit to Detroit last year, President Trump announced his administration would assess and correct the current vehicle fuel-economy standards, which impose significant costs on American consumers and eliminate jobs. The administration is continuing to deliver on that promise. On Thursday the Transportation Department and Environmental Protection Agency are announcing a joint proposal to update the national automobile fuel-economy and greenhouse-gas standards to give consumers greater access to safer, more affordable vehicles, while continuing to protect the environment. […] The administration’s proposed option would lock in the 2020 standards until 2026, because the analysis of our agencies suggests that those standards strike the appropriate regulatory balance between vehicle improvements, environmental benefits and safety.” [White House, Press release, [8/02/18](https://www.whitehouse.gov/articles/make-cars-great/)]

**Trump Administration: “The Standards Implemented By The Previous Administration Raised The Cost And Decreased The Supply Of Newer, Safer Vehicles.”** “There are compelling reasons for a new rulemaking. The standards implemented by the previous administration raised the cost and decreased the supply of newer, safer vehicles. The government also previously failed to conduct a midterm review in the manner promised. Customers’ preferences have also changed since the current standards were introduced.” [White House, Press release, [8/02/18](https://www.whitehouse.gov/articles/make-cars-great/)]

### Reality: EPA’s Own Staff Challenged the Agency’s Safety Claims and Said Trump’s Plan Would Actually Increase Highway Deaths.

**AP: EPA Staff Privately Challenged Proposed Fuel Economy Rollback, Saying The Trump Administration’s Plan Would Actually Increase U.S. Highway Deaths.** “The Environmental Protection Agency privately challenged the Trump administration’s rationale for freezing Obama-era mileage standards, saying the proposal would actually increase U.S. highway deaths. In announcing the mileage proposal earlier this month, officials with the EPA and Department of Transportation contended the mileage freeze would save about 1,000 lives a year. But in a June email, senior EPA staffers told the Office of Management and Budget — the White House office charged with evaluating regulatory changes — that it would slightly increase highway deaths, by 17 annually.” [Associated Press, [8/14/18](https://apnews.com/1a7551fca3294ec49029b93e994cd7f9)]

**EPA Assessments and Standards Director William Charmley: The “Proposed Standards Are Detrimental To Safety, Rather Than Beneficial.”** “The ‘proposed standards are detrimental to safety, rather than beneficial,’ William Charmley, director of the assessments and standards division of the EPA’s office of transportation and air quality, said in a June 18 interagency email, released Tuesday.” [Associated Press, [8/14/18](https://apnews.com/1a7551fca3294ec49029b93e994cd7f9)]

**Senior EPA Officials Warned That The Administration Wildly Inflated Projections Of How Many More Miles People Would Drive, a Measure The Administration Argued Would Cause More Traffic Deaths.** “The senior EPA officials had also warned in June that the administration wildly inflated its projections of how many more miles people would drive as more efficient vehicles made driving cheaper. All those extra miles on the road, the administration plan argues, will mean more traffic deaths. But if the estimates in its plan are flawed, as the EPA officials warn, one of the administration’s major justifications for the rollback is called into question.” [Los Angeles Times, [8/14/18](http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-fuel-economy-warnings-20180814-story.html)]

**Politico: June Memo “That Showed Agency Staff Criticizing A Number Of “Unrealistic” Aspects Of NHTSA’s Modeling. They Disagreed With The Proposal’s Fatality Figures, With EPA Staff Estimating Deaths Would Increase Slightly Under The Freeze.”** “Another claim that the Trump rollback would save more than 1,000 lives per year — yielding benefits of $77 billion — has also drawn skepticism. On Tuesday, EPA released a June memo that showed agency staff criticizing a number of “unrealistic” aspects of NHTSA’s modeling. They disagreed with the proposal’s fatality figures, with EPA staff estimating deaths would increase slightly under the freeze. And they thought the rule overestimated compliance costs and the time needed to recoup those costs in fuel savings, all factors that boosted benefits and lowered costs for the proposed freeze. Both EPA and NHTSA dismissed the memo as only one part of a complex review process.” [POLITICO, [8/16/18](https://www.politico.com/story/2018/08/16/trump-climate-change-obama-cost-benefits-740455)]

**AP Fact Check: EPA’s Overstated Claims About Safety Benefits From Freezing Fuel Economy Standards.** “EPA, citing potential benefits from freezing mileage standards: ‘Increased vehicle affordability leading to increased driving of newer, safer, more efficient and cleaner vehicles ... Over 12,000 fewer crash fatalities over the lifetimes of all vehicles built through model year 2029. Up to 1,000 lives saved annually.’ - EPA fact sheet released Thursday. THE FACTS: These claims overstate the safety benefits. While newer vehicles are safer due to better engineering and safety features such as more air bags, automatic emergency braking and blind spot detection, auto safety experts say the difference between vehicles made 10 years ago and now isn't that huge, and the number of lives saved can't really be calculated. Decade-old vehicles have anti-lock brakes and electronic stability control which stop drivers from losing control, two major safety advances. And vehicles with reduced mass actually can be safer because newer metals can be stronger than heavier steel.” [Associated Press, [8/02/18](https://www.wsoctv.com/news/ap-fact-check-fed-govt-overstates-claims-of-auto-safety/804766655)]

**AP: “Experts Say The Logic That Heavier Vehicles Are Safer Doesn't Hold Up[.]”** “David Zuby, chief research officer at the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, said he's doubtful about the administration's estimate of lives saved because other factors could affect traffic deaths, such as automakers agreeing to make automatic emergency braking standard on all models before 2022. ‘They're making assumptions about stuff that may or may not be the same,’ he said. Experts say the logic that heavier vehicles are safer doesn't hold up because lighter, newer vehicles perform as well or better than older, heavier versions in crash tests, and because the weight difference between the Obama and Trump requirements would be minimal.” [Associated Press, [8/01/18](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/trump-administration-links-gas-mileage-to-risk-for-drivers/)]

**Washington Post: “…Safety Experts Cautioned That There Are Numerous Considerations That Affect The Nation’s Auto Fleet And Shape Consumer Purchasing Decisions[.]”** “Wheeler cited the potential for fewer traffic fatalities during his first appearance on Capitol Hill as acting EPA administrator. But safety experts cautioned that there are numerous considerations that affect the nation’s auto fleet and shape consumer purchasing decisions, including which cars and features motorists most want and when they decide to buy.” [The Washington Post, [8/01/18](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/trump-mileage-proposal-claims-to-cut-car-costs-and-road-deaths/2018/08/01/e5ee8bee-9590-11e8-810c-5fa705927d54_story.html?utm_term=.bad140c63093)]

**NYT: Some Economists Said Trump Admin’s s Claim That Fuel Economy Standards Would Cause Drivers to Purchase Older, Less Safe Vehicles Was Too Simplistic.** “The Trump administration also argues against the Obama-era fuel economy standards by estimating that they would add about $1,900 to the average cost of a new car. That, in turn, will deter people from buying newer vehicles with advanced safety features like automatic emergency braking systems and keep them in older, less-safe vehicles for longer. […]This line of reasoning is likely to receive pushback from a variety of fronts. Some economists called the analysis too simplistic, arguing that it did not properly consider key factors like age, gender and other driver characteristics that affect crashes. ‘I think they are substantially overestimating the impact here,’ Dr. Bento said. Other critics note that this particular safety argument is inconsistently deployed. For instance, President Trump is also considering tariffs on imported cars and car parts that, according to estimates by the Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers, could increase prices of American-produced vehicles by $2,000 and imported vehicles by up to $5,800.” [The New York Times, [8/02/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/02/climate/trump-fuel-economy.html)]

## Rhetoric: Trump’s Fuel Economy Plan Would Make Cars More Affordable

**August 2018: Trump Administration Announced Alternative to Fuel Economy and GHG Standards, “To Give Consumers Greater Access to Safer, More Affordable Vehicles[.]”** “During a visit to Detroit last year, President Trump announced his administration would assess and correct the current vehicle fuel-economy standards, which impose significant costs on American consumers and eliminate jobs. The administration is continuing to deliver on that promise. On Thursday the Transportation Department and Environmental Protection Agency are announcing a joint proposal to update the national automobile fuel-economy and greenhouse-gas standards to give consumers greater access to safer, more affordable vehicles, while continuing to protect the environment. […] The administration’s proposed option would lock in the 2020 standards until 2026, because the analysis of our agencies suggests that those standards strike the appropriate regulatory balance between vehicle improvements, environmental benefits and safety.” [White House, Press release, [8/02/18](https://www.whitehouse.gov/articles/make-cars-great/)]

**Trump Administration Said Freezing Standards Would Save Automakers Over $300 Million in Regulatory Costs and Reduce Projected Cost of a New Vehicle by $1,850.** “The Trump administration said in August that the freeze would save automakers more than $300 billion in regulatory costs and reduce the projected cost of a new vehicle by $1,850. It also said the measure would save lives because Americans would more quickly buy newer safer vehicles, a claim disputed by California and environmental groups.” [Reuters, [4/11/19](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-autos-emissions-epa/u-s-epa-to-revise-proposed-freeze-of-vehicle-fuel-economy-rules-idUSKCN1RN321)]

### Reality: Trump’s Rollback Plan Could Add Thousands to Consumers’ Fuel Bills

**Trump’s Rollback Proposal Would Reduce New Vehicle Ownership Costs by $2,340 but Could Add Thousands to Consumers Fuel Bills Over the Lifetime of a Car.** “The Trump administration proposes that a rollback on CAFE (corporate average fuel economy) standards will produce a $2,340 reduction in overall average vehicle ownership costs for new vehicles and save $500 billion in societal costs over the next 50 years. Yet, auto industry experts warn that the rollback could add thousands to consumers' fuel bills over the lifetime of a car. ‘Consumers are going to lose,’ said David Friedman, vice president of advocacy for Consumer Reports. ‘Consumers are going to end up with cars that they're spending $3,000 more over the lifetime of a car and $5,000 more for the lifetime of an SUV,’ he added, referring to greater fuel costs.” [CNBC, [8/21/18](https://www.cnbc.com/2018/08/21/how-trumps-plan-to-roll-back-fuel-emissions-could-affect-your-wallet.html)]

**Los Angeles Times: “Potential Savings In Fuel Costs From The Obama-Era Rules Eclipse The Costs[.]”** “Federal studies show the potential savings in fuel costs from the Obama-era rules eclipse the costs those rules add to the sticker prices of cars.” [Los Angeles Times, [8/14/18](http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-fuel-economy-warnings-20180814-story.html)]

**Consumer Federation of America Study Suggested That Even if the Costs of Fuel Economy Standards are Greater, the Savings in Fuel Will Offset Higher Prices.** “A recent report by the Consumer Federation of America found that nearly a fourth of "all new 2017 models" were less expensive than their counterparts in 2011, yet all vehicles saw a 1 mpg to 10 mpg increase. It also suggests what experts are arguing today: Even if the costs are greater, the savings in fuel will offset higher prices. The study concludes that rolling back the standards would not only "cause great harm" to consumers but also weaken auto sales because of consumer demand for greater efficiency.” [CNBC, [8/21/18](https://www.cnbc.com/2018/08/21/how-trumps-plan-to-roll-back-fuel-emissions-could-affect-your-wallet.html)]

### Reality: Trump Administration Overstated the Benefits of Freezing CAFE Standards by at least $112 Billion.

**Los Angeles Times: Independent Researchers Found That the Trump Administration’s Analysis Overstated the Benefits of Rolling Back Standards by at Least $112 Billion.** “The Trump administration's proposal to roll back fuel economy standards relies on an error-ridden and misleading analysis that overestimates the costs and understates the benefits of tighter regulation, an independent study by leading economists, engineers and other experts has found. Researchers quickly scrutinized the Trump administration's rationale and found it overstated the benefits of unraveling the rules by at least $112 billion. They came to the opposite conclusion: Weakening the rules would be more damaging than keeping them in place. ‘We see no economic justification to keep the standard flat,’ the study says. Antonio M. Bento, a USC professor of public policy and economics and the study's lead author, said, ‘It appears federal officials cherry-picked data to support a predetermined conclusion that the clean-car standards will lead to too many highway deaths. ‘But this is wrong, and for various reasons,’ Bento added. ‘And it was done in a very sloppy fashion, by inflating the costs and cutting the benefits in an almost embarrassing, dishonest way.’ The EPA did not respond to a request for comment on the findings. NHTSA said it could not comment on a study it has not yet read.” [Los Angeles Times, [12/06/18](https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-auto-emissions-20181206-story.html);

**American Honda Motor Co. Found That the Administration’s Model Improperly Boosted Benefits of Freezing the Standards by $390 Billion.** “Several groups, including American Honda Motor Co. Inc., found that the Obama-era standards are safer and cheaper when they adjusted the models. Honda found the administration’s model improperly boosted the benefits of freezing the standards by $390 billion. Turning off the flawed portion of the model yields $100 billion in net costs for the Trump agencies’ proposal, tipping the scales in favor of the current limits, Honda said in a supplemental analysis filed with its comments. ‘[W]e find the use of this previously untested model to be premature and ill-advised,’ Honda wrote in Oct. 26 comments on the agencies’ proposal. Some economists and technical experts say the models will have to be changed in order to hold up to any future court challenge.” [Bloomberg, [11/02/18](https://news.bloombergenvironment.com/environment-and-energy/trump-car-standards-rollback-knocked-for-faulty-analysis)]

## Rhetoric: EPA Claimed Proposed New Standards Based on “Best and Most Up-to-Date Information”

**Trump Administration: Proposed New Rule “Based On An Entirely New Analysis Reflecting The Best And Most Up-To-Date Information Available To The Agencies At The Time Of This Rulemaking.”** “Consistent with both agencies’ statutes, this proposal is entirely de novo, based on an entirely new analysis reflecting the best and most up-to-date information available to the agencies at the time of this rulemaking. The agencies worked together in 2012 to develop CAFE and CO2 standards for MYs 2017 and beyond; in that rulemaking action, EPA set CO2 standards for MYs 2017–2025, while NHTSA set final CAFE standards for MYs 2017–2021 and also put forth ‘‘augural’’ CAFE standards for MYs 2022–2025, consistent with EPA’s CO2 standards for those model years. EPA’s CO2 standards for MYs 2022–2025 were subject to a ‘‘mid-term evaluation,’’ by which EPA bound itself through regulation to re-evaluate the CO2 standards for those model years and to undertake to develop new CO2 standards through a regulatory process if it concluded that the previously finalized standards were no longer appropriate.” [Proposed Rule*: The Safer Affordable Fuel-Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule for Model Years 2021-2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks*, [8/24/18](https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2018-08-24/pdf/2018-16820.pdf)]

### Reality: Proposed New Rule Based on “Error-Ridden,” Cherry-Picked Data and Misleading Analysis.

**Los Angeles Times: “Trump Administration's Proposal To Roll Back Fuel Economy Standards Relies On An Error-Ridden And Misleading Analysis”.** “The Trump administration's proposal to roll back fuel economy standards relies on an error-ridden and misleading analysis that overestimates the costs and understates the benefits of tighter regulation, an independent study by leading economists, engineers and other experts has found. Findings published in the journal Science describe the Trump administration's cost-benefit analysis as marred by mistakes and miscalculations, based on cherry-picked data and faulty assumptions and skewed in its conclusions. The analysis ‘has fundamental flaws and inconsistencies, is at odds with basic economic theory and empirical studies, [and] is misleading,’ the researchers wrote. The blunt assessment from a team of 11 experts at UC Berkeley, MIT, Carnegie Mellon, Yale and other universities casts more doubt on the underpinnings of President Trump's plan to halt tough Obama-era rules requiring improvements in fuel economy. It lends support to California and other states fighting to hold on to the miles-per-gallon targets -- the single biggest federal action to fight climate change.” [Los Angeles Times, [12/06/18](https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-auto-emissions-20181206-story.html);

**Science Journal Assessment: Trump Administration’s 2018 Analysis “Has Fundamental Flaws And Inconsistences, Is At Odds With Basic Economic Theory And Empirical Studies, Is Misleading, And Does Not Improve Estimates Of Costs And Benefits Of Fuel Economy Standards Beyond Those In The 2016 Analysis.”** “Under the authority of the Energy Independence and Security Act, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) jointly set GHG and CAFE standards to reach 55 miles per gallon by 2025. A 2016 draft technical assessment report (TAR) affirmed by the EPA in January 2017 concluded that the 2022–2025 standards were technologically feasible and that benefits far exceeded costs. But under the current administration, those agencies are now challenging that conclusion in a 2018 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM), which proposes freezing standards at model year (MY) 2020 levels through 2025. Its analysis finds that the costs of the previous standards now exceed benefits. With the agencies currently in the process of determining whether the rule should be finalized, we describe how the 2018 analysis has fundamental flaws and inconsistences, is at odds with basic economic theory and empirical studies, is misleading, and does not improve estimates of costs and benefits of fuel economy standards beyond those in the 2016 analysis.” [Science, *Flawed analyses of U.S. auto fuel economy standards*, [12/07/18](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cnandi%5CDownloads%5CFlawed%20analyses%20of%20U.S.%20auto%20fuel%20economy%20standards)]

**Former EPA Senior Engineer Jeff Alson: “This Entire Analysis Is Based On A House Of Cards That Is Going To Collapse In Front Of Them.”** “Critical to the agencies’ justification for freezing the standards is the idea that stricter fuel-economy standards raise prices of new vehicles, decreasing sales and increasing the use of older cars, which are inherently less safe. But critics say the agencies’ methods for crunching the numbers are problematic. ‘This entire analysis is based on a house of cards that is going to collapse in front of them,’ Jeff Alson, a former senior engineer in the EPA’s Ann Arbor, Mich., vehicles lab, told Bloomberg Environment. Correcting the administration’s model would practically close the gap between the increased costs the Trump administration projects from Obama-era standards and the benefits it asserts from weaker limits. Several groups, including American Honda Motor Co. Inc., found that the Obama-era standards are safer and cheaper when they adjusted the models.” [Bloomberg, [11/02/18](https://news.bloombergenvironment.com/environment-and-energy/trump-car-standards-rollback-knocked-for-faulty-analysis)]

**American Honda Motor Co. Found That the Administration’s Model Improperly Boosted Benefits of Freezing the Standards by $390 Billion.** “Several groups, including American Honda Motor Co. Inc., found that the Obama-era standards are safer and cheaper when they adjusted the models. Honda found the administration’s model improperly boosted the benefits of freezing the standards by $390 billion. Turning off the flawed portion of the model yields $100 billion in net costs for the Trump agencies’ proposal, tipping the scales in favor of the current limits, Honda said in a supplemental analysis filed with its comments. ‘[W]e find the use of this previously untested model to be premature and ill-advised,’ Honda wrote in Oct. 26 comments on the agencies’ proposal. Some economists and technical experts say the models will have to be changed in order to hold up to any future court challenge.” [Bloomberg, [11/02/18](https://news.bloombergenvironment.com/environment-and-energy/trump-car-standards-rollback-knocked-for-faulty-analysis)]

## Rhetoric: Trump’s Rollback Proposal Would Continue to Protect the Environment

**August 2018: Trump Administration Announce Plan to Rollback Fuel Economy Standards, Claimed Proposal Would Continue To Protect the Environment.** “During a visit to Detroit last year, President Trump announced his administration would assess and correct the current vehicle fuel-economy standards, which impose significant costs on American consumers and eliminate jobs. The administration is continuing to deliver on that promise. On Thursday the Transportation Department and Environmental Protection Agency are announcing a joint proposal to update the national automobile fuel-economy and greenhouse-gas standards to give consumers greater access to safer, more affordable vehicles, while continuing to protect the environment. […] The administration’s proposed option would lock in the 2020 standards until 2026, because the analysis of our agencies suggests that those standards strike the appropriate regulatory balance between vehicle improvements, environmental benefits and safety.” [White House, Press release, [8/02/18](https://www.whitehouse.gov/articles/make-cars-great/)]

### Reality: Administration’s Own Analysis Showed That Air Pollutants Would Increase Under Rollback Plan

**NHTSA: Under Trump’s Rollback Proposal, “Emissions Of Criteria Air Pollutants Increase Across All Alternatives, With Some Exceptions.”** “The EIS provides findings for air quality impacts for 2025, 2035, and 2050. In general, emissions of criteria air pollutants increase across all alternatives, with some exceptions. The changes in emissions reflect the complex interactions among the tailpipe emissions rates of the various vehicle types, the technologies assumed to be incorporated by manufacturers in response to the CAFE standards, upstream emissions rates, the relative proportions of gasoline and diesel in total fuel consumption reductions, and changes in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from the rebound effect. In addition, the action alternatives would result in increased incidence of PM2.5-related adverse health impacts due to the emissions increases.” [NHTSA, *Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Safer Affordable Fuel Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Rule for Model Year 2021–2026 Passenger Cars and Light Trucks*, Pg. S-7, [July 2018](https://www.nhtsa.gov/sites/nhtsa.dot.gov/files/documents/ld_cafe_my2021-26_deis_0.pdf)]

**Rhodium “In 2025, US Energy-Related Carbon Dioxide (CO2) Will Be 16 To 37 Million Metric Tons (Mmt) Higher If CAFE Standards Are Frozen At 2020 Levels.”** “In 2025, US energy-related carbon dioxide (CO2) will be 16 to 37 million metric tons (MMt) higher if CAFE standards are frozen at 2020 levels. That translates into a 0.3% to 0.7% change in overall US GHG emissions that year based on projections in our Taking Stock report from last month. By 2030 this grows to 28 to 83 MMt, again assuming there are no post-2025 standards in place. By 2035 the gap widens to 32 to 114 million metric tons depending on oil prices. On a cumulative basis, the proposal would increase US CO2 emissions by 321 to 931 MMt between 2022 and 2035.” [Rhodium Group, [8/02/18](https://rhg.com/research/the-biggest-climate-rollback-yet/)]

## Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Rules “Not Appropriate and Should Be Revised”

**April 2018: EPA Announced Final Determination on Midterm Evaluation Process; Concluded that Current Fuel Economy Standards Were “Not Appropriate.”** “Today, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Scott Pruitt is announcing the completion of the Midterm Evaluation (MTE) process for the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions standards for cars and light trucks for model years 2022-2025, and his final determination that, in light of recent data, the current standards are not appropriate and should be revised.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, [4/02/18](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-administrator-pruitt-ghg-emissions-standards-cars-and-light-trucks-should-be)]

**Pruitt: “Obama Administration’s Determination Was Wrong.”** “Administrator Pruitt is also announcing the start of a joint process with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to develop a notice and comment rulemaking to set more appropriate GHG emissions standards and Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards. ‘The Obama Administration's determination was wrong,’ said EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt. ‘Obama’s EPA cut the Midterm Evaluation process short with politically charged expediency, made assumptions about the standards that didn’t comport with reality, and set the standards too high.’” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, [4/02/18](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-administrator-pruitt-ghg-emissions-standards-cars-and-light-trucks-should-be)]

**Pruitt: “Obama’s EPA Cut the Midterm Evaluation Process Short with Politically Charged Expediency, Made Assumptions about the Standards That Didn’t Comport with Reality, And Set the Standards Too High.”** “Administrator Pruitt is also announcing the start of a joint process with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) to develop a notice and comment rulemaking to set more appropriate GHG emissions standards and Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards. ‘The Obama Administration's determination was wrong,’ said EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt. ‘Obama’s EPA cut the Midterm Evaluation process short with politically charged expediency, made assumptions about the standards that didn’t comport with reality, and set the standards too high.’” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, [4/02/18](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-administrator-pruitt-ghg-emissions-standards-cars-and-light-trucks-should-be)]

**May 2018: EPA Sent Proposal to Rollback Fuel Economy Standards to the White House.** [Associated Press, [5/31/18](https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/washington-dc/articles/2018-05-31/epa-sends-fuel-economy-standards-rollback-to-white-house)]

### Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Will Drastically Cut Oil Consumption and Global Warming Emissions, While Creating Hundreds of Thousands of Jobs

**Union of Concerned Scientists: By 2030, Fuel Economy Standards Will Cut Oil Consumption by Nearly 1.5 Million Barrels Per Day – About 23 Billion Gallons of Gasoline Annually.** “The second round of fuel efficiency standards alone will cut oil consumption by nearly 1.5 million barrels per day—about 23 billion gallons of gasoline annually—by 2030. When combined with the first round of standards, Americans will see total oil savings in 2030 of 2.4 million barrels per day, which is roughly equal to the current imports from the Persian Gulf and Venezuela combined.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, *Fuel Economy and Emissions Standards for Cars and Trucks, Model Years 2017 to 2025*, [6/21/16](https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/06/Fuel-Economy-Standards-2017-2025-summary.pdf)]

**Union of Concerned Scientists: Fuel Economy Standards Would Reduce Global Warming Emission by 470 Million Metric Tons by 2030.** “For every gallon of gasoline saved as a result of the standards, approximately 24 pounds of global warming emissions are avoided. Drilling, refining, and distributing gasoline account for nearly 5 pounds of global warming emissions per gallon of gasoline, and burning gasoline during vehicle operation produces another 19 pounds of emissions per gallon. The MY 2017 to 2025 standards alone would reduce global warming emissions by 280 million metric tons in 2030. Combined with the first round of standards, that means 470 million metric tons of avoided emissions, equivalent to shutting down 136 typical coal-fired power plants for an entire year.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, *Fuel Economy and Emissions Standards for Cars and Trucks, Model Years 2017 to 2025*, [6/21/16](https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/06/Fuel-Economy-Standards-2017-2025-summary.pdf)]

**Union Of Concerned Scientists: Fuel Economy Standards Will Create Estimated 650,000 Jobs Throughout The U.S. Economy By 2030.** “The MY 2017 to 2025 standards will result in more jobs for Americans, both in the automotive sector and throughout the economy. Investments in technology to meet the new standards will create jobs in the auto-manufacturing sector as companies hire more workers to design and build more efficient vehicles. As Americans spend less money on gasoline, they will spend more in other, more productive, parts of the economy, generating new jobs in the service, sales, and manufacturing sectors. Analysis shows that these standards will create an estimated 650,000 jobs (full-time equivalent) throughout the U.S. economy by 2030, including 50,000 in light-duty vehicle manufacturing (parts and vehicle assembly).” [Union of Concerned Scientists, *Fuel Economy and Emissions Standards for Cars and Trucks, Model Years 2017 to 2025*, [June 2016](https://web.archive.org/web/20170316201354/http%3A/www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/06/Fuel-Economy-Standards-2017-2025-summary.pdf)]

### Reality: Car Companies “Over-Complied” With the Most Stringent GHG Standards

**EPA: In MY2015, Automakers Over-Complied With Greenhouse Gas Standards, “Notwithstanding That The MY2015 Standard Was The Most Stringent To Date.”** “The auto industry is thriving and meeting the standards more quickly than required. While the final determination focuses on the MY2022-2025 standards, we note that the auto industry, on average, has out-performed the first four years of the light-duty GHG standards (MY2012- 2015). This has occurred concurrently with a period during which the industry successfully rebounded after a period of economic distress. The recently released GHG Manufacturer 8 Performance Report for the 2015 Model Year shows that the National Program is working even at low fuel prices and automakers are over-complying with the standards, notwithstanding that the MY2015 standard was the most stringent to date, and that the increase in stringency from the previous model year was also the most pronounced to date.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Final Determination on the Appropriateness of the Model Year 2022-2025 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards under the Midterm Evaluation*, [January 2017](https://web.archive.org/web/20170113201942/https%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

* **EPA: Concurrently With Outperforming GHG Standards, Auto Sales “Increased For Seven Straight Years, For The First Time In 100 Years, To An All-Time Record High In 2016.”** “Further, concurrently with outperforming the GHG standards, sales have increased for seven straight years, for the first time in 100 years, to an all-time record high in 2016, reflecting positive consumer response to vehicles meeting the standards.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Final Determination on the Appropriateness of the Model Year 2022-2025 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards under the Midterm Evaluation*, [January 2017](https://web.archive.org/web/20170113201942/https%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

### Reality: 18 States Sued the EPA for Rolling Back Fuel Economy Rules That They Affirmed Reduced Carbon Pollution and Saved Drivers Money.

**2018: 18 States Filed Lawsuit Against the EPA to Preserve the U.S.’s Single Fuel Economy Standard.** “Moving to curb toxic air pollution and improve car gas mileage, California Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr., California Attorney General Xavier Becerra and the California Air Resources Board today announced California is leading an 18-state coalition to sue the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to preserve the nation’s single vehicle emission standard. ‘The states joining today’s lawsuit represent 140 million people who simply want cleaner and more efficient cars,’ said Governor Brown. ‘This phalanx of states will defend the nation’s clean car standards to boost gas mileage and curb toxic air pollution.’ […]The federal standard the states are suing to protect is estimated to reduce carbon pollution equivalent to 134 coal power plants burning for a year, and save drivers $1,650 per vehicle. The car industry is on track to meet or exceed these standards. The 18 jurisdictions joining today’s legal action represent approximately 43 percent of the U.S. automobile market and approximately 140 million people: California, Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia and Washington.” [Office of Governor Brown, Press release, [5/01/18](https://www.gov.ca.gov/2018/05/01/california-and-states-representing-over-40-percent-of-u-s-car-market-sue-to-defend-national-clean-car-rules/)]

## Rhetoric: Revisiting Fuel Economy Standards A “Win” For the Economy

**CHAO: Decision To Review Fuel Economy Standards A “Win For The American Economy.”** “Today, Department of Transportation Secretary (DOT) Elaine Chao and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Scott Pruitt will revisit the previous administration’s rule that finalized standards to increase fuel economy to the equivalent of 54.5 mpg for cars and light-duty trucks by Model Year 2025. ‘Today’s decision by the EPA is a win for the American economy,’ said U.S. Department of Transportation Secretary Elaine L. Chao. ‘The Department of Transportation will re-open the Mid-Term evaluation process and work with the EPA to complete the review in a transparent, data-driven manner.’” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, News release, [3/15/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-reexamine-emission-standards-cars-and-light-duty-trucks-model-years-2022-2025)]

### Reality: Weakening Fuel Economy Rules Would Put Manufacturing Jobs At Risk

**Baltimore Sun Editorial: Fuel Economy Standards Created Jobs “As Companies Re-Engineer Their Vehicles And Update Their Production Facilities.”** “Strengthening the standards, as was approved during the Obama administration, doesn't kill jobs, it creates them as companies re-engineer their vehicles and update their production facilities. Instead of reproducing older designs with more cup holders, companies are expected to slowly phase in higher efficiency standards by 2025 so that the average vehicle gets 36 miles per gallon compared to 25 mpg today. That comes with a cost (an estimated $240 per vehicle per year) but also comes with a savings as buyers spend less money on fuel. According to one estimate, truck buyers can save between $4,800 and $8,200 on gasoline over the life of a 2025 new model.” [Baltimore Sun Editorial, [4/16/17](http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/editorial/bs-ed-cafe-standards-20170416-story.html)]

**BlueGreen Alliance: Stepping Away From Fuel Economy Standards “Could Put Jobs In Manufacturing At Risk.”** “In a new policy brief done in collaboration with Baum and Associates and the Natural Resources Defense Council, the BlueGreen Alliance argues that fuel economy rules have been an integral part of the recovery of the automotive sector in the past decade, spurring investment in innovation in the U.S. auto parts supply chain. ‘Sound standards and a commitment to building this technology in the U.S. has been critical to continuing to build manufacturing jobs in this sector and to lead globally in a growing automotive sector,’ said Zoe Lipman, director of the vehicles and advanced transportation program at the BlueGreen Alliance. ‘By contrast, stepping away from this trajectory, stepping away from these sound and effective standards, could put jobs in manufacturing at risk.’” [E&E News, [12/22/16](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2016/12/22/stories/1060047625)]

### Reality: Manufacturers Could Lose Up to $1.4 Billion Under Weakened Standards

**Baltimore Sun Editorial: Companies That Supply Fuel Efficiency Vehicle Components Stand To Lose As Much As $1.4 Billion Should Trump Weaken Fuel Economy Standards.** “It's not just Tesla stock speculators who are expressing support for greater fuel economy standards. Companies that supply components to increase fuel efficiency in vehicles stand to lose ‘big league’ should President Trump succeed in his attack on CAFE — as much as $1.4 billion in fuel efficiency technologies, according to an analysis by the Ceres Business for Innovative Climate and Energy Policy, which represents the interests of companies worth a combined $400 billion in annual revenue. Those business losses translate to tens of thousands of jobs lost.” [Baltimore Sun Editorial, [4/16/17](http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/editorial/bs-ed-cafe-standards-20170416-story.html)]

* **BlueGreen Alliance Study Found That More Than 1,200 Facilities In 48 States Make Components And Materials That Improve Fuel Economy.** “More than 1,200 facilities in 48 states make components and materials that improve fuel economy, the analysis found. Michigan and California lead the pack with more than 180 facilities each, with hundreds more companies clustered in the industrial Midwest and Southeast. Lipman said the number of auto parts facilities has grown significantly since a similar study was released in 2011, although different methodologies make a direct comparison difficult. Over the past decade, the paper found, automakers and suppliers have invested more than $100 billion in growing and retooling U.S. factories. […]. The facilities are providing fuel-efficient technologies, including lightweight materials like carbon fiber and aluminum; start-stop components and systems; engines with gasoline direct injection; and electric components including motors, wiring and controllers.” [E&E News, [12/22/16](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2016/12/22/stories/1060047625)]

### Reality: Rollback Would Increase America’s Oil Dependence

**Economists Predicted Rolling Back Fuel Economy Standards Would Increase The U.S.’s Oil Dependence.** “Meanwhile, economists say, rolling back the standards would increase, rather than decrease, the nation’s oil dependence. The standards ‘affect U.S. oil dependence by reducing our oil consumption,’ said Richard Newell, president of Resources for the Future, a nonpartisan research organization in Washington focused on energy economics.” [New York Times, [3/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/15/us/politics/trump-obama-fuel-economy-standards.html)]

**Obama Administration: Fuel Economy Standards Will Reduce U.S. Oil Consumption By 12 Billion Barrels By MY 2025.** “The Obama Administration today finalized groundbreaking standards that will increase fuel economy to the equivalent of 54.5 mpg for cars and light-duty trucks by Model Year 2025. When combined with previous standards set by this Administration, this move will nearly double the fuel efficiency of those vehicles compared to new vehicles currently on our roads. In total, the Administration’s national program to improve fuel economy and reduce greenhouse gas emissions will save consumers more than $1.7 trillion at the gas pump and reduce U.S. oil consumption by 12 billion barrels.” [White House, Press release, [8/28/12](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2012/08/28/obama-administration-finalizes-historic-545-mpg-fuel-efficiency-standard)]

* **Fuel Standards Would Reduce Oil Consumption By 1.2 Billion Barrels From MY2022-2025.** “The Standards Will Achieve Significant CO2 and Oil Reductions. Based on various assumptions, including the U.S. Department of Energy's Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2016 reference case projections of the car/truck mix out to 2025, the footprint-based GHG standards curves for MY2022-2025 are projected to achieve an industry-wide fleet average carbon dioxide (CO2) target of 173 grams/mile (g/mi) in MY2025 (Table ES-2). […] EPA estimates that over the vehicle lifetimes the MY2022-2025 standards will reduce GHG emissions by 540 million metric tons and reduce oil consumption by 1.2 billion barrels, as shown in Table ES-3.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Final Determination on the Appropriateness of the Model Year 2022-2025 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards under the Midterm Evaluation*, [January 2017](https://web.archive.org/web/20170113201942/https%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]
* **Analysis: Freezing CAFE Standards at 2020 Levels Would Increase U.S. Oil Consumption by Between 126,000 and 283,000 Barrels Per Day in 2025.** “Freezing CAFE standards at 2020 levels would increase US oil consumption by between 126,000 and 283,000 barrels per day in 2025, depending on oil prices. By 2030 the impact grows to 221,000-644,000, assuming no change in post-2025 standards, as more of the vehicle fleet has been sold under the MY 2020-2025 rules. By 2035 US oil consumption is between 252,000 and 881,000 barrels per day higher.” [Rhodium Group, *Sizing Up a Potential Fuel Economy Standards Freeze*, [5/03/18](https://rhg.com/research/sizing-up-a-potential-fuel-economy-standards-freeze/)]

### Reality: Rollback Would Threaten Automakers’ Global Competitiveness

**Consumer Federation Of America Predicted Weakening Fuel Economy Rules Could Hurt American Automakers’ Competitiveness And Increase our Dependence On Foreign Oil.** “Finally, the Consumer Federation of America (CFA) says that weakened fuel-economy rules could hurt American automakers’ competitiveness and increase our dependency on foreign oil. ‘Standards are the only thing keeping us competitive with the high-performing Asian manufacturers,’ CFA vehicle expert Jack Gillis said recently. ‘If and when gas prices spike, American automakers will be caught flat-footed as consumers look to foreign brands to save money at the pump.’ Rolling back regulations would mean ‘the only winners will be the foreign oil importers,’ according to Gillis.” [TIME, [3/16/17](http://time.com/money/4702421/trump-fuel-economy-regulations-detroit-car-prices/)]

* **The Economist: Relaxing Fuel Economy Standards Would Boost Profits In The Short Term, But “To Compete In Europe And Asia, Manufacturers Have To Meet Local Standards...”** “A relaxation of standards would allow American carmakers to continue cashing in on trucks and SUVs, which now account for nearly two-thirds of sales, while putting off expensive investment in new technologies. This would boost profits in the short term. But to compete in Europe and Asia, manufacturers have to meet local standards which will continue to tighten in the years ahead.” [The Economist, [3/07/17](https://www.economist.com/blogs/graphicdetail/2017/03/daily-chart-4)]

## Rhetoric: Standards Were Not “Economically Feasible”

**WHITE HOUSE: Trump Administration Wanted To Set Standards That Were “Economically Feasible.”** “The Trump administration wants to set standards ‘that are technologically and economically feasible,’ according to the official who briefed reporters on condition he not be named. Some automakers argue that the tougher standards will mean consumers would have to pay thousands of dollars extra for a new car.” [Voice of America News, [3/16/17](https://www.voanews.com/a/on-michigan-trip-trump-to-hit-brakes-on-tougher-fuel-efficiency-standards/3766634.html)]

### Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Would Create An Estimated 650,000 Jobs By 2030

**Union Of Concerned Scientists: Fuel Economy Standards Will Create Estimated 650,000 Jobs Throughout The U.S. Economy By 2030.** “The MY 2017 to 2025 standards will result in more jobs for Americans, both in the automotive sector and throughout the economy. Investments in technology to meet the new standards will create jobs in the auto-manufacturing sector as companies hire more workers to design and build more efficient vehicles. As Americans spend less money on gasoline, they will spend more in other, more productive, parts of the economy, generating new jobs in the service, sales, and manufacturing sectors. Analysis shows that these standards will create an estimated 650,000 jobs (full-time equivalent) throughout the U.S. economy by 2030, including 50,000 in light-duty vehicle manufacturing (parts and vehicle assembly).” [Union of Concerned Scientists, *Fuel Economy and Emissions Standards for Cars and Trucks, Model Years 2017 to 2025*, [June 2016](https://web.archive.org/web/20170316201354/http%3A/www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/06/Fuel-Economy-Standards-2017-2025-summary.pdf)]

**Baltimore Sun Editorial: Fuel Economy Standards Created Jobs “As Companies Re-Engineer Their Vehicles And Update Their Production Facilities.”** “Strengthening the standards, as was approved during the Obama administration, doesn't kill jobs, it creates them as companies re-engineer their vehicles and update their production facilities. Instead of reproducing older designs with more cup holders, companies are expected to slowly phase in higher efficiency standards by 2025 so that the average vehicle gets 36 miles per gallon compared to 25 mpg today. That comes with a cost (an estimated $240 per vehicle per year) but also comes with a savings as buyers spend less money on fuel. According to one estimate, truck buyers can save between $4,800 and $8,200 on gasoline over the life of a 2025 new model.” [Baltimore Sun Editorial, [4/16/17](http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/editorial/bs-ed-cafe-standards-20170416-story.html)]

## Rhetoric: Re-Evaluation Would Ensure Fuel Standards Were Good For Consumers And The Environment

**PRUITT: Review Will Ensure That Fuel Standards Are Good For Consumers And Good For The Environment.** “Today, Department of Transportation Secretary (DOT) Elaine Chao and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Scott Pruitt will revisit the previous administration’s rule that finalized standards to increase fuel economy to the equivalent of 54.5 mpg for cars and light-duty trucks by Model Year 2025. […] ‘These standards are costly for automakers and the American people,’ said EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt. ‘We will work with our partners at DOT to take a fresh look to determine if this approach is realistic. This thorough review will help ensure that this national program is good for consumers and good for the environment.’” [Environmental Protection Agency, News release, [3/15/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-reexamine-emission-standards-cars-and-light-duty-trucks-model-years-2022-2025)]

### Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Are Good for the Environment

**EPA: Fuel Economy Standards Would Reduce Global Warming Emissions By 470 Million Metric Tons.** “For every gallon of gasoline saved as a result of the standards, approximately 24 pounds of global warming emissions are avoided. Drilling, refining, and distributing gasoline account for nearly 5 pounds of global warming emissions per gallon of gasoline, and burning gasoline during vehicle operation produces another 19 pounds of emissions per gallon. The MY 2017 to 2025 standards alone would reduce global warming emissions by 280 million metric tons in 2030. Combined with the first round of standards, that means 470 million metric tons of avoided emissions, equivalent to shutting down 136 typical coal-fired power plants for an entire year.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, *Fuel Economy and Emissions Standards for Cars and Trucks, Model Years 2017 to 2025*, [June 2016](https://web.archive.org/web/20170316201354/http%3A/www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/06/Fuel-Economy-Standards-2017-2025-summary.pdf)]

**Union of Concerned Scientists: Tailpipe Emissions One of the Largest Sources of Global Warming Pollution in the U.S.** “Tailpipe emissions are one of the largest sources of global warming pollution in the U.S. Transportation accounted for 27 percent of total U.S. greenhouse gas emissions in 2015, and contribute to local air quality pollution that has been linked to asthma, heart disease, and other public health problems.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, *Fuel Efficiency, Consumers, and Income*, [2017](https://www.ucsusa.org/clean-vehicles/electric-vehicles/fuel-economy-low-income#.Wwco-EgvxPY)]

**Air Quality Experts: Fuel Economy Rollback Could Threaten the Health and Clarity of Lake Tahoe.** “Rollbacks would have nationwide air quality ramifications at Lake Tahoe and beyond, according to leading national experts on air quality and people who study Lake Tahoe. The lake, in particular, could suffer from an increase in local pollutants that promote clarity-reducing algae growth and from the broader threats associated with global warming. ‘If you change these fuel economy standards, which means you are going to be burning more fuel, you are going to be creating more pollutants,’ said Alan Gertler, atmospheric sciences research professor at Desert Research Institute. ‘We were getting a benefit by having increased fuel economy. I don’t think people really understood that linkage.’” [Reno Gazette Journal, [6/12/18](https://www.rgj.com/story/news/2018/06/12/global-warming-and-pollution-cars-threat-lakes-clarity/679611002/)]

### Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Are Good for Our Communities

**EPA: Fuel Economy Standards Would Provide $230 Billion In Net Benefits To Society, Including Benefits To Our Climate.** “The final standards are expected to lower CO2 emissions by approximately 1.1 billion metric tons, save vehicle owners fuel costs of about $170 billion, and reduce oil consumption by up to two billion barrels over the lifetime of the vehicles sold under the program. Overall, the program will provide $230 billion in net benefits to society, including benefits to our climate and the public health of Americans. These benefits outweigh costs by about an 8-to-1 ratio.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, [8/16/16](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-and-dot-finalize-greenhouse-gas-and-fuel-efficiency-standards-heavy-duty-trucks-0)]

### Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Are Important to Our Public Health

**EPA: Fuel Economy Standards Will Significantly Reduce GHG Emissions, While Delivering “Significant Benefits To Public Health And Welfare.”** “In the Administrator's view, the record clearly establishes that, in light of technologies available today and improvements we project will occur between now and MY2022-2025, it will be practical and feasible for automakers to meet the MY2022-2025 standards at reasonable cost that will achieve the significant GHG emissions reduction goals of the program, while delivering significant reductions in oil consumption and associated fuel savings for consumers, significant benefits to public health and welfare, and without having material adverse impact on the industry, safety, or consumers.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Final Determination on the Appropriateness of the Model Year 2022-2025 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards under the Midterm Evaluation*, [January 2017](https://web.archive.org/web/20170113201942/https%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

**American Lung Association: Every Year, Pollution From Passenger Vehicles Costs 10 States $24 Billion In Health Costs, 109,000 Asthma Exacerbations, Hundreds Of Thousands Of Other Respiratory Health Impacts, And 2,580 Premature Deaths.** “Clean Air Future looks at data for California and nine other states that have adopted the California Zero Emission Vehicle (ZEV) program: Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island and Vermont. The report analyzes current and projected emissions while looking at the societal benefits of policies designed to transition to a zero-emission fleet over the coming decades – benefits often overlooked in debates over ZEV policy. Every year, pollution from passenger vehicles costs the 10 ZEV states about $24 billion in health costs. That includes: 220,000 lost work days, 109,000 asthma exacerbations, Hundreds of thousands of other respiratory health impacts, and 2,580 premature deaths.” [American Lung Association, [10/27/16](http://www.lung.org/local-content/_content-items/about-us/media/press-releases/ca-report-zero-emission-2016.html)]

**American Public Health Association Executive Director Georges Benjamin: Smog, Fueled by Exhaust from Cars, Can Raise the Risk of Mortality Risk for People with Asthma, Diabetes, and Heart Disease.** In an op-ed, American Public Health Association Executive Director Georges Benjamin wrote, “Cars emit toxic air pollution that has made the air unhealthy to breathe for millions of Americans. In fact, nearly 40 percent of Americans live in areas with unhealthy levels of smog pollution and a new study from the American Lung Association finds that smog is increasing in the U.S. Smog, fueled by exhaust from cars, can hurt people’s eyes and burn their throat. Even worse, it can exacerbate cardiorespiratory ailments and raise the mortality risk for Americans with asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, cardiovascular disease and diabetes. Evidence shows that short- and long-term exposure to vehicle pollutants and other particulate matter decreases life expectancy by months or years. Our most vulnerable Americans, including seniors, children and those living in low-income communities and in close proximity to roadways, are at greatest risk.” [The Hill, Georges Benjamin Op-ed, [5/20/18](http://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/388515-trumps-auto-rollback-is-an-attack-on-public-health)]

### Reality: Decision To Re-Examine Fuel Economy Rules Linked to Climate Denial

**Associated Press: “The Rollback Underscores The Trump Administration’s Rejection Of Mainstream Climate Science In An Effort To Boost Economic Growth.”** “Moving forcefully against Obama-era environmental rules, President Donald Trump is set to announce in Michigan plans to re-examine federal requirements that regulate the fuel efficiency of new cars and trucks. Trump is expected to reveal his plans during an appearance Wednesday at the American Center for Mobility in Detroit where he’ll challenge the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) emissions targets that were a centerpiece of former President Barack Obama’s strategy to combat global warming. The rollback underscores the Trump administration’s rejection of mainstream climate science in an effort to boost economic growth.” [Associated Press, [3/15/17](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/trump-set-challenge-obama-era-fuel-standards-detroit/)]

**New York Times: Trump’s Decision “Aimed At Undercutting Mr. Obama’s Climate Change Policies.”** “The Motor City announcement is the first of an expected one-two punch from Mr. Trump aimed at undercutting Mr. Obama’s climate change policies. Mr. Trump is also expected to announce in the coming weeks that he intends to direct the E.P.A. to dismantle Mr. Obama’s regulations on planet-warming pollution from coal-fired power plants. The announcements follow public remarks last week by the E.P.A. administrator, Scott Pruitt, that he does not believe carbon dioxide is a primary driver of global warming, a statement at odds with the global scientific consensus on climate change.” [New York Times, [3/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/15/us/politics/trump-obama-fuel-economy-standards.html)]

### Reality: Heidi King, Trump’s NHTSA Nominee, Refused to Acknowledge Human Impact on Climate Change

**Trump’s Nominee To Lead NHTSA, Heidi King, Refused to Say Whether Climate Change Was Caused by Humans.** “During a hearing on her nomination to head the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Heidi King, the agency’s deputy chief, was asked whether climate change is caused by humans. She wouldn’t say. While NHTSA is largely a safety agency, it also has a major role in setting policy on Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards. The Trump administration is pushing to lower Barack Obama-era tailpipe requirements for cars and light trucks, which are a major source of greenhouse gas emissions.” [The Washington Post, [5/16/18](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/dr-gridlock/wp/2018/05/16/trump-nominee-to-head-agency-overseeing-tailpipe-rules-wont-say-if-humans-cause-climate-change/?utm_term=.0587b1d212ba)]

## Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Standards Would Pass Costs Onto Consumers

**PRUITT: Called Fuel Efficiency Standards “Costly For Automakers And The American People.”** “Trump announces a review of vehicle fuel efficiency standards that are designed to push down greenhouse gases and other pollutants. More than a dozen car company chief executives asked the president to revisit an Obama-era decision to mandate improved fuel economy by 2025. Pruitt calls the standards ‘costly for automakers and the American people.’” [The Guardian, [7/04/17](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/jul/04/trump-emvironmental-rollback-epa-scrap-regulations)]

**WHITE HOUSE: It Would Cost $200 Billion To Comply With CAFÉ-GHG Standards From 2012-2025; Fuel Economy Standards Passed Costs Onto Consumers.** “Today, President Donald J. Trump announced that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) are reinstating the Midterm Evaluation of the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) standards for the automotive industry. […] The Obama Administration broke its promise to automakers and rushed the Midterm Evaluation to a premature conclusion earlier this year. Reinstating the Midterm Evaluation ensures that regulators will rely on the best available data and information, which the previous administration ignored. By reinstating the Midterm Evaluation, the Trump Administration will examine, and if necessary, revise, the regulations on auto manufacturers and the attendant costs passed on to consumers. Last year, the EPA estimated it would cost $200 billion to comply with CAFE-GHG standards from 2012-2025.” [White House, Press Release, [3/15/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/15/president-donald-j-trump-buy-american-and-hire-american-united-states)]

### Reality: CAFE Standards Would Save Consumers More Than $1.7 Trillion by MY 2025

**Under Fuel Economy Standards Buyers Of MY2025 Vehicles Who Paid Cash Would Fully Recoup Their Investment By The Third Year Of Ownership.** “Under the fuel economy standards presently in place, buyers of model year 2025 vehicles who pay cash will fully recoup their investment in the third year of ownership. Those who finance their vehicles will see a net positive cash flow starting immediately. Moreover, the standards will net consumers thousands of dollars over the lifetime of the vehicle. Under reference fuel prices in future years, the consumer benefits would be more than three times the costs of the regulation. These findings are robust to changes in market conditions: fuel savings are 2.4 times the costs if fuel prices stay low for the next several decades.” [International Council on Clean Transportation, [6/21/17](http://www.theicct.org/consumer-benefits-ldv-efficiency-us-2030)]

**Consumers Union: Under Current Fuel Economy Standards, Consumers Would Save Enough Money On Gasoline To More Than Offset Any Price Increases Due To New Technology.** “The research group Consumers Union has found that the current standards for 2025 will allow consumers to save enough money on gasoline to more than offset any price increases for new technology. ‘Fuel efficiency technology pays for itself and is a boon to car and truck buyers that benefit from the savings greater efficiency offers,’ said Shannon Baker-Branstetter, policy counsel for Consumers Union. Meanwhile, economists say, rolling back the standards would increase, rather than decrease, the nation’s oil dependence.” [New York Times, [3/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/15/us/politics/trump-obama-fuel-economy-standards.html)]

* **Washington Post Editorial Board: “Exhaustive Studies” Concluded That Fuel Efficiency Rule “Technically Feasible And That Its Benefits, Particularly In Gas Savings, Would Far Outweigh Its Costs.”** “Promising a Detroit crowd that he would ‘protect and defend your jobs, your factories,’ the president failed to mention the rule’s benefits: curbing the country’s gasoline addiction would shrink fuel bills and reduce the country’s carbon footprint. Nor did he mention the EPA and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration’s exhaustive studies finding that the rule is technically feasible and that its benefits, particularly in gas savings, would far outweigh its costs.” [Washington Post Editorial Board, [3/25/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/trumps-auto-regulations-rollback-will-end-up-costing-americans/2017/03/25/85eb1c42-09ca-11e7-93dc-00f9bdd74ed1_story.html?utm_term=.c7d02d300220)]

**Obama Administration: Fuel Economy Standards Will Save Consumers More Than $1.7 Trillion At The Gas Pump And Reduce U.S. Oil Consumption By 12 Billion Barrels By MY 2025.** “The Obama Administration today finalized groundbreaking standards that will increase fuel economy to the equivalent of 54.5 mpg for cars and light-duty trucks by Model Year 2025. When combined with previous standards set by this Administration, this move will nearly double the fuel efficiency of those vehicles compared to new vehicles currently on our roads. In total, the Administration’s national program to improve fuel economy and reduce greenhouse gas emissions will save consumers more than $1.7 trillion at the gas pump and reduce U.S. oil consumption by 12 billion barrels.” [White House, Press release, [8/28/12](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2012/08/28/obama-administration-finalizes-historic-545-mpg-fuel-efficiency-standard)]

**Fuel Economy Standards Would Save Consumers $2,300-$2,600 In Fuel Costs Over The Lifetime of the Vehicle; Truck Divers Would Save $3,900-$4,000 On Fuel Costs Per Vehicle.** “The size-indexed standards ensure that all vehicle types see more high-efficiency vehicle options over time and allow the fleet to naturally shift with gasoline prices and broader economic trends. The average new car fuel economy label would increase from 35 mpg in 2021 to 41 mpg in 2025 under the adopted standards, and to 52 mpg in 2030 assuming improvements of 5%/year—each of these steps would save consumers $2,300–$2,600 in fuel costs over the lifetime of the vehicle. For trucks, the average fuel economy would increase from 25 mpg in 2021, to 30 mpg in 2025, to 38 mpg in 2030—each step would save consumers $3,900–$4,000 in fuel costs per vehicle.” [International Council on Clean Transportation, [6/21/17](http://www.theicct.org/consumer-benefits-ldv-efficiency-us-2030)]

* **EPA: “Net Benefits Far Exceed The Costs” Of CAFE Standards And Consumers Would Save Nearly $100 Billion From MY2022-2025.** “The Standards Will Provide Significant Benefits to Consumers and to the Public. The net benefits of the MY2022-2025 standards are nearly $100 billion (at 3 percent discount rate). Table ES-4 presents the societal monetized benefits associated with meeting the MY2022-2025 standards. The EPA also evaluated the benefit-costs of additional scenarios (AEO 2016 high and low fuel price scenarios). See Proposed Determination Section IV.A. In all cases, the net benefits far exceed the costs of the program. It is also notable that in all cases, the benefits (excluding fuel savings) and the fuel savings, each independently, exceed the costs. That is, the 7 benefits exceed the costs without considering any fuel savings, and likewise fuel savings exceed the costs even without considering any other benefits.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Final Determination on the Appropriateness of the Model Year 2022-2025 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards under the Midterm Evaluation*, [January 2017](https://web.archive.org/web/20170113201942/https%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

**ICCT: Consumer Savings Alone Justify Fuel Economy Standards.** “Consumers directly benefit from the 2025 standards with thousands of dollars in fuel savings per vehicle. These consumer savings alone justify the efficiency standards. If the public benefits of the standards for energy security, climate change mitigation, and air quality were also included, the efficiency standards would make for an even bigger public policy win. Continuing these vehicle efficiency improvements to 2030 will continue to provide consumer benefits that exceed the costs—by a factor of 2 to 3 times under reference fuel prices. For a typical car loan, each of these 2030 standards would result in off-the-lot savings.” [International Council on Clean Transportation, [6/21/17](http://www.theicct.org/consumer-benefits-ldv-efficiency-us-2030)]

### Reality: By 2030, Fuel Efficiency Standards Expected to Save American Drivers $50 Billion

**Union of Concerned Scientists: By 2030, Fuel Efficiency Standards Expected to Collectively Save Americans $50 Billion.** “The 2017 – 2025 fuel efficiency and global warming emission standards are on track to save the average new car buyer about $6,000 over the life of a new 2025 vehicle. Improved fuel efficiency is forecast to collectively save Americans $50 billion by 2030, money that can be spent locally instead of profiting multinational oil companies.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, *Fuel Efficiency, Consumers, and Income*, [2017](https://www.ucsusa.org/clean-vehicles/electric-vehicles/fuel-economy-low-income#.Wwco-EgvxPY)]

**Union of Concerned Scientists: From 1980 to 2014, Fuel Efficiency Improvements Saved the Average Middle-Income Household as Much as $17,000.** “From 1980 to 2014, improvements in vehicle efficiency saved low- to middle-income households up to an average of 2 percent of their income and saved the average middle-income household as much as $17,000. These savings provide money that could be used for other essentials, from food and clothing to education, health care, and family savings.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, *Fuel Efficiency, Consumers, and Income*, [2017](https://www.ucsusa.org/clean-vehicles/electric-vehicles/fuel-economy-low-income#.Wwco-EgvxPY)]

**Senator Chuck Schumer: “The Rule that the EPA is Working to Undermine Hurts Our Pockets and Our Planet.”** “Sen. Chuck Schumer blasted a Trump administration plan to nix stricter gas mileage standards for cars — saying besides hurting the environment, it will hit drivers in the wallet. […] ‘You don’t have to be an economist to understand that scrapping plans to increase the fuel efficiency of our cars will force us all to shell out even more and more money for gas down the road,’ Schumer said Sunday. ‘The rule that the EPA is working to undermine hurts our pockets and our planet.’” [New York Daily News, [7/03/18](http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/ny-pol-gas-20180603-story.html)]

### Reality: Cost Of Owning A Car Would Increase if Standards Were Rolled Back

**Long Term Cost Of Owning A Car Would Increase Under Rollback Of Fuel Economy Standards.** “Putting the very serious environmental concerns aside, what are the likely effects of a rollback of fuel economy standards, and of Trump policies in general? It appears that owning a car will be more expensive over the long haul. […] By 2025, the average price of a new car will cost roughly $3,000 to $4,000 more because of fuel economy and emissions regulations passed under Obama. It would seem, then, that repealing the rules would save car buyers money, right? Actually, no. While sticker prices for cars would likely decrease or level off if the fuel economy standards disappeared, studies show that the long-term cost of owning a car would increase.” [TIME, [3/16/17](http://time.com/money/4702421/trump-fuel-economy-regulations-detroit-car-prices/)]

### Reality: Rolling Back Standards Would Cost Drivers an Additional $193 Billion In Fuel Costs

**Analysis: Freezing CAFE Standards at 2020 Levels Would Cost Drivers an Additional $193 Billion - $236 Billion Cumulatively Between 2018 and 2035.** “Freezing CAFE standards at 2020 levels would increase US oil consumption by between 126,000 and 283,000 barrels per day in 2025, depending on oil prices. By 2030 the impact grows to 221,000-644,000, assuming no change in post-2025 standards, as more of the vehicle fleet has been sold under the MY 2020-2025 rules. By 2035 US oil consumption is between 252,000 and 881,000 barrels per day higher. The upper end of the range equates to more transportation oil consumption than currently occurs in any state other than California and Texas, and more than total annual oil production in Alaska. Purchasing this oil would cost drivers an additional $193 to $236 billion cumulatively between now and 2035, again depending on oil prices.” [Rhodium Group, *Sizing Up a Potential Fuel Economy Standards Freeze*, [5/03/18](https://rhg.com/research/sizing-up-a-potential-fuel-economy-standards-freeze/)]

### Reality: Rising Gas Prices Called Into Question Fuel Economy Rollback

**Headline: Rising fuel prices bring into question EPA efforts to reduce fuel economy standards** [USA Today, [5/17/18](https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/energy/2018/05/17/fuel-price-jump-offset-tax-cuts-fuel-economy-review-questioned/618399002/)]

**Securing America’s Future Energy (SAFE) Urged the EPA to Maintain Fuel Economy Standards Amid Rising Gas Prices.** “Amid this debate and the rising oil prices that led to continuously rising gasoline prices for American consumers at the start of the peak summer driving season, Securing America’s Future Energy (SAFE) — an organization which advocates for policies to boost U.S. energy security by significantly reducing dependence on oil and promoting responsible use of domestic energy resources — is calling on EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt to seize the fuel standard revision opportunity ‘to protect American businesses and consumers by optimizing, not weakening, fuel economy standards.’ Rising gas prices at the pump as we enter the summer driving season threaten to offset the benefits of President Trump’s tax cuts, John W. Handy and Michael Johnson — members of SAFE’s Energy Security Leadership Council (ESLC) — argue in an article published in The Hill.” [USA Today, [5/17/18](https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/energy/2018/05/17/fuel-price-jump-offset-tax-cuts-fuel-economy-review-questioned/618399002/)]

**From 1975-2015, Drivers Saved Up to $3.8 Trillion in Gasoline Costs Because of Fuel Economy Improvements.** “Summing over the years 1975 to 2015, the total savings estimated this way comes to almost 2 trillion gallons (1.96 trillion). But economists have long recognized that improving fuel economy reduces the fuel cost per mile of driving, which encourages more driving (Greening et al., 2000). This driving “rebound” due to fuel economy improvement has been extensively studied leading to a near consensus that a 10% increase in fuel economy will result in about a 2% increase in vehicle miles traveled. […] Taking the rebound effect into account, the sum of gallons saved from 1975 to 2015 comes to 1.50 trillion gallons. Gasoline savings in 2016 will be at least as great as in 2015, so savings through the end of last year exceed 1.5 trillion gallons and are still growing. Valuing the savings at the price of gasoline (including taxes) in each year (in 2015 $), the total dollar savings to motorists add up to $3.8 trillion dollars.” [Howard H. Backer Jr. Center for Public Policy, *A Trillion Gallons of Gasoline*, [August 2017](http://bakercenter.utk.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/OnPoint-5-2017.pdf)]

### Reality: The Majority of Americans Supported Keeping Current Fuel Efficiency Standards In Place.

**American Lung Association Poll: Nearly 7 in 10 Voters Wanted the EPA to Leave Current Fuel Efficiency Standards in Place.** “Today, the American Lung Association released new poll results showing that voters overwhelmingly support the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) current fuel efficiency standards for cars, SUVs and light trucks in model years 2022 to 2025, put in place by the previous Administration. […] Nearly 7 in 10 voters want EPA to leave current fuel efficiency standards in place, outnumbering those who think the standards should be weakened[.]” [American Lung Association, Press release, [3/27/18](http://www.lung.org/about-us/media/press-releases/new-poll-voters-support-fuel-efficiency.html)]

**2018: More than 250,000 Petition Signatures Delivered to Ford’s Headquarters, Calling on Automakers to Stop Efforts to Reverse Fuel Economy Standards.** “A coalition of environmental and consumer advocates says Ford Motor Company and other automakers are lobbying the Trump administration to roll back fuel economy and greenhouse gas emissions standards known as clean car standards, and they should stop. The coalition includes Public Citizen, Sierra Club, and Greenpeace USA. The groups said they are delivering more than a quarter-million petition signatures today to Ford at its world headquarters in Dearborn, calling on Ford and other automakers to stop efforts they say the companies are making to reverse the clean car standards the companies had previously supported.” [Michigan Public Radio, [5/08/18](http://michiganradio.org/post/activists-ford-motor-company-stop-undermining-clean-car-standards)]

**Consumers Union: Nearly 9 in 10 Consumers Wanted Automakers to Increase Fuel Economy Standards.** “Fuel economy remains the top vehicle attribute that has the most room for improvement, according to a nationally representative survey of Americans by Consumers Union, the policy and mobilization division of Consumer Reports. Even as gas prices remain low, consumers want to decrease spending on fuel. While nearly 9 in 10 consumers agree that automakers should continue to improve the fuel efficiency for all vehicles, only 30% of Americans believe automakers care about lowering fuel costs for their customers. ‘Consumers see the value in fuel efficiency, and the technology more than pays for itself through fuel savings,’ said Shannon Baker-Branstetter, policy counsel for Consumers Union. ‘As automakers increase vehicle efficiency, consumers benefit from greater savings.’” [Consumers Union, [6/29/17](https://consumersunion.org/news/2017-fuel-economy-survey/)]

**Poll: Nearly Half of Voters Opposed Trump’s Proposed Rollback Plan.** “A large number of voters are opposed to the Trump administration's plan to weaken vehicle emissions standards, a new poll released Thursday found. Nearly half of voters polled, 49 percent, in the Politico–Morning Consult survey said they were either strongly against or somewhat against the plan to roll back the Obama-era national standards. In contrast, 15 percent of voters said they strongly supported the plan, with a total of 32 percent polled supporting the idea. The Trump administration formally announced a proposed rule at the end of July.” [The Hill, [8/09/18](https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/401101-almost-half-of-voters-oppose-trumps-vehicle-emissions-plan-poll)]

### Reality: Consumers Valued Fuel Economy Above Brand and Price

**Study: Car Buyers Said They Would Be Willing to Pay More for a New Vehicle That Saved Them Fuel Costs.** “Car buyers say they’re willing to pay extra for better fuel economy, even if the initial cost exceeds whatever savings they get at the gas pump, a new study suggests. The research was conducted by the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE) and researchers from Simon Fraser University in British Columbia, and was commissioned by Consumers Union, the advocacy division of Consumer Reports. It showed that respondents valued fuel economy less than safety and reliability but more than acceleration or premium features. Respondents indicated that they would be willing to pay $10,730 more for a new vehicle to save $1,000 in fuel costs per year—a decision that might not have an immediate payoff at the pump but might help with the vehicle’s long-term value.” [Consumer Reports, [6/12/18](https://www.consumerreports.org/fuel-economy-efficiency/car-buyers-say-they-would-pay-for-better-fuel-economy-survey/)]

**Poll: U.S. Drivers Value Fuel Economy Over Brand.** “U.S. consumers put a high value on fuel economy when buying a new vehicle, according to a Reuters/Ipsos opinion poll, as automakers lobby the administration of President Donald Trump for relief from mileage requirements enacted by his predecessor. In a Reuters/Ipsos poll taken May 31 to June 15, 41 percent of respondents said mileage was most important to them when buying a new vehicle, after cost and safety but before warranty, brand, design and high-tech features like navigation. This is roughly the same set of priorities that U.S. adults set in a similar poll taken in July 2017. Among respondents who identified as Trump voters, 34 percent said they wanted automakers to focus on improving fuel efficiency - a higher share than respondents who identified as Democrats or Hillary Clinton voters.” [Reuters, [7/03/18](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-poll-fueleconomy/u-s-drivers-value-fuel-economy-over-brand-as-pump-prices-rise-poll-idUSKBN1JT2DR)]

## Rhetoric: Cars will be too expensive Under Fuel Economy Standards

**Heritage Foundation: Fuel Economy Standards Are Adding Thousands Of Dollars To the Prices Of New Cars.** “The Obama Administration’s regulations intended to force very rapid increases in vehicle fuel economy are adding thousands of dollars to the prices of new cars. Vehicle prices are rising in ways that are consistent with the predictions of studies undertaken several years ago. It is likely that the regulations are adding at least $3,800 (perhaps much more) to the average price of new vehicles, thus pricing many Americans out of the new car market altogether. The Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards were originally put in place in order to reduce America’s dependence on foreign oil. Economists have roundly rejected the wisdom of that goal. Under the Obama Administration, CAFE standards have become a tool for combatting global warming, at which they are utterly ineffective. Americans are paying excessively for regulations that fail any reasonable cost-benefit test. The CAFE standards should be scrapped.” [Heritage Foundation, *Fuel Economy Standards Are a Costly Mistake*, [3/04/16](http://www.heritage.org/government-regulation/report/fuel-economy-standards-are-costly-mistake)]

### Reality: Customer Would Save More Than $6,000 Over the Lifetime Of New Vehicles

**Union of Concerned Scientists: 2017-2025 Fuel Economy and GHG Standards On Track to Save the Average New Car Buyer About $6,000 Over the Life of a New 2025 Vehicle.** “The 2017 – 2025 fuel efficiency and global warming emission standards are on track to save the average new car buyer about $6,000 over the life of a new 2025 vehicle. Improved fuel efficiency is forecast to collectively save Americans $50 billion by 2030, money that can be spent locally instead of profiting multinational oil companies.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, *Fuel Efficiency, Consumers, and Income*, [2017](https://www.ucsusa.org/clean-vehicles/electric-vehicles/fuel-economy-low-income#.Wwco-EgvxPY)]

**Industry Experts Alan Baum and Dan Luria: “Fuel Economy Standards Are Not Free, But They Are Hardly A Primary Driver Of Why New Vehicle Prices Have Outpaced Median Income.”** Industry experts Alan Baum and Dan Luria wrote, “Are today’s new cars and trucks less affordable for households at, near, and below the median income? Absolutely. But that reflects changes in the U.S. income distribution and the profit maximization strategies of the automakers, which have chosen to restrict production capacity and drive the market toward higher-margin, higher-trim level models. That strategy has resulted in record industry profits, and in substantial job growth at both automakers and suppliers. Fuel economy standards are not free, but they are hardly a primary driver of why new vehicle prices have outpaced median income.” [Alan Baum and Dan Luria op-ed, The Hill, [12/21/16](http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/energy-environment/311281-fuel-economy-rules-a-bogeyman-for-long-term-trends-in)]

## Rhetoric: Costs of Fuel Economy Standards Far Outweigh Benefits

**Reason Foundation: “Unlikely” That The Benefits of the MY 2017-2025 CAFE and GHG Standards “Come Anywhere Close” To the “Extremely Expensive” Costs.** While the CAFE and GHG emission standards for model years 2017–2025 likely would reduce fuel consumption and GHG emissions, they would do so at extremely high cost. It is very unlikely that the benefits of such reductions come anywhere close to those costs. Moreover, the imposition of such costs on automobile manufacturers and ultimately consumers reduces the availability of resources to spend on environmental amenities that would have greater benefits. If society values reductions in fuel use and GHG emissions, there are other, far more effective and efficient means of achieving those goals, including fuel taxes or mileage based user fees. Policymakers should consider eliminating CAFE standards and switching to one of these more cost-effective alternatives.” [Reason Foundation, *CAFE and ZEV Standards: Environmental Effects and Alternatives*, [August 2017](http://reason.org/files/cafe_zev_standards_environment_alternatives.pdf)]

### Reality: Consumers Would Save Money Under Current Standards and Costs of Complying With the Standards Were Lower Than Even the EPA Predicted

**Consumers Union: Under Current Fuel Economy Standards, Consumers Would Save Enough Money On Gasoline To More Than Offset Any Price Increases Due To New Technology.** “The research group Consumers Union has found that the current standards for 2025 will allow consumers to save enough money on gasoline to more than offset any price increases for new technology. ‘Fuel efficiency technology pays for itself and is a boon to car and truck buyers that benefit from the savings greater efficiency offers,’ said Shannon Baker-Branstetter, policy counsel for Consumers Union. Meanwhile, economists say, rolling back the standards would increase, rather than decrease, the nation’s oil dependence.” [New York Times, [3/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/15/us/politics/trump-obama-fuel-economy-standards.html)]

**ICCT: Costs To Comply With MY 2025 Fuel Economy Standards “Will Be Substantially Lower Than The EPA Projection;” Updated Technologies Reduced 2025 Fleet Costs By 36 Percent.** “The fleet modeling cost results with ICCT’s updated technology assumptions are also shown side-by-side with U.S. EPA’s similar analysis from its final determination in Table 2. The U.S. EPA analysis indicates a total cost of $1,378 above reference 2015 costs to comply with the 2025 standards. Due to the combination of greater technology CO2-reduction effectiveness and lower costs of technologies like direct injection and cooled exhaust gas recirculation, our analysis indicates the costs to comply with the 2025 standards will be substantially lower than the U.S. EPA projection. Our updated technology inputs reduce the 2025 fleet average technology cost to $886 per vehicle, 36% lower than the agency projection.” [ICCT, *Efficiency Technology and Costs Assessment for U.S. 2025-2030 Light Duty Vehicles*, [March 2017](http://theicct.org/sites/default/files/publications/US-LDV-tech-potential_ICCT_white-paper_22032017.pdf)]

## Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Standards “Costly For Automakers”

**PRUITT: Called Fuel Efficiency Standards “Costly For Automakers And The American People.”** “Trump announces a review of vehicle fuel efficiency standards that are designed to push down greenhouse gases and other pollutants. More than a dozen car company chief executives asked the president to revisit an Obama-era decision to mandate improved fuel economy by 2025. Pruitt calls the standards ‘costly for automakers and the American people.’” [The Guardian, [7/04/17](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2017/jul/04/trump-emvironmental-rollback-epa-scrap-regulations)]

**WHITE HOUSE: It Would Cost $200 Billion To Comply With CAFÉ-GHG Standards From 2012-2025; Fuel Economy Standards Passed Costs Onto Consumers.** “Today, President Donald J. Trump announced that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) are reinstating the Midterm Evaluation of the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) standards for the automotive industry. […] The Obama Administration broke its promise to automakers and rushed the Midterm Evaluation to a premature conclusion earlier this year. Reinstating the Midterm Evaluation ensures that regulators will rely on the best available data and information, which the previous administration ignored. By reinstating the Midterm Evaluation, the Trump Administration will examine, and if necessary, revise, the regulations on auto manufacturers and the attendant costs passed on to consumers. Last year, the EPA estimated it would cost $200 billion to comply with CAFE-GHG standards from 2012-2025.” [White House, Press Release, [3/15/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/15/president-donald-j-trump-buy-american-and-hire-american-united-states)]

### Reality: Automakers’ Sales Hit An All-Time High In 2016

**New York Times: “Car Companies Are Making Big Profits In The North American Market,” And Set A Sales Record In The U.S. With Nearly 17.5 Million New Vehicles Sold.** “Car companies are making big profits in the North American market, and their plants are running at near-capacity levels. Last year, auto companies set a second consecutive annual sales record in the United States with about 17.5 million new vehicles sold. The growth in sales, however, has begun to level off. And automakers are wary of expanding production beyond the current level of demand.” [New York Times, [3/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/15/us/politics/trump-obama-fuel-economy-standards.html)]

* **New York Times: The Auto Industry Is Coming Off “Two Straight Years Of Record Sales In The United States And Automakers Are Flush With Profits.”** “His policies will get their initial test with an auto industry that was was brought to its knees by the recession eight years ago and required an $80 billion taxpayer bailout, including the government-sponsored bankruptcies of General Motors and Chrysler. But now the industry is coming off two straight years of record sales in the United States, and automakers are flush with profits.” [New York Times, [3/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/15/us/politics/trump-obama-fuel-economy-standards.html)]

### Reality: Car Companies “Over-Complied” With the Most Stringent GHG Standards

**EPA: In MY2015, Automakers Over-Complied With Greenhouse Gas Standards, “Notwithstanding That The MY2015 Standard Was The Most Stringent To Date.”** “The auto industry is thriving and meeting the standards more quickly than required. While the final determination focuses on the MY2022-2025 standards, we note that the auto industry, on average, has out-performed the first four years of the light-duty GHG standards (MY2012- 2015). This has occurred concurrently with a period during which the industry successfully rebounded after a period of economic distress. The recently released GHG Manufacturer 8 Performance Report for the 2015 Model Year shows that the National Program is working even at low fuel prices and automakers are over-complying with the standards, notwithstanding that the MY2015 standard was the most stringent to date, and that the increase in stringency from the previous model year was also the most pronounced to date.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Final Determination on the Appropriateness of the Model Year 2022-2025 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards under the Midterm Evaluation*, [January 2017](https://web.archive.org/web/20170113201942/https%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

* **EPA: Concurrently With Outperforming GHG Standards, Auto Sales “Increased For Seven Straight Years, For The First Time In 100 Years, To An All-Time Record High In 2016.”** “Further, concurrently with outperforming the GHG standards, sales have increased for seven straight years, for the first time in 100 years, to an all-time record high in 2016, reflecting positive consumer response to vehicles meeting the standards.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Final Determination on the Appropriateness of the Model Year 2022-2025 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards under the Midterm Evaluation*, [January 2017](https://web.archive.org/web/20170113201942/https%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

### Reality: Automakers Did Not Support the Trump Administration’s Plan to Freeze Fuel Economy Standards.

**Ford Chairman Bill Ford: “We Are Not Asking the Administration for a Rollback… We Want California at the Table and We Want One National Standard.”** “The automakers went into the meeting hoping to persuade Trump to cooperate with Jerry Brown, the Democratic governor of California, who invoked biblical references when calling the Trump administration’s proposal to roll back auto efficiency regulations ‘profoundly dangerous.’ They wanted to emphasize their support for easing the Obama-era standards, but not so much that it triggers a conflict with California and results in a split market of environmental regulations set by Washington and Sacramento. ‘We are not asking the administration for a rollback,’ Ford Chairman Bill Ford said Thursday during the automaker’s annual meeting. ‘We want California at the table and we want one national standard.’” [Bloomberg, [5/11/18](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-05-11/automakers-seek-to-use-trump-summit-to-avert-war-with-california)]

* **Ford Statement: “We Support Increasing Clean Car Standards Through 2025 and Are Not Asking for a Rollback.”** “Ford officials have been trying to reposition the company’s stance, with Executive Chairman Bill Ford and president and CEO Jim Hackett last week issuing a statement declaring, ‘We support increasing clean car standards through 2025 and are not asking for a rollback.’” [NBC News, [5/08/18](https://www.nbcnews.com/business/autos/epa-automakers-head-showdown-obama-era-mileage-rules-n872266)]

**Honda Supports Maintaining Stringency Of Clean Car Standards.** According To The Detroit Free Press, Honda stated,“’Honda supports maintaining the stringency of the standards, which will help maintain one national program, but doing so in a way that provides flexibility for manufacturers in achieving compliance and promotes advanced technologies.’” [Detroit Free Press, [4/03/18](https://www.freep.com/story/money/cars/mark-phelan/2018/04/03/epa-fuel-economy/482871002/)]

**2018: Auto Alliance Told Lawmakers They Did Not Support Freeing Mileage Targets at Their 2020 Levels.** “The Auto Alliance and Global Automakers, the leading auto industry groups, said in a statement after the White House meeting that they expect the administration to issue ‘a range of proposals for future fuel economy and greenhouse gas regulations’ for consideration by industry, the states, environmentalists and others. They also signaled that the administration would be engaging in a ‘discussion with California on an expedited basis.’ In congressional testimony this week, the head of the alliance told lawmakers that the group did not support freezing mileage targets at their 2020 levels. But the group has been unclear about exactly what the automakers are seeking, and whether it is a major rewrite to the program or the kind of modest tweaks that California would consider.” [Chicago Tribune, [5/11/18](http://www.chicagotribune.com/la-na-pol-auto-trump-20180511-story.html)]

**Bloomberg: EPA’s Proposed Rollback Showed the Administration Had “Something Far More Aggressive in Mind Than What Carmakers Expected, Or Wanted.”** “Trump granted automakers their wish in March 2017 while laying out an explicit quid pro quo: a promise to cut them a break on environmental regulations in exchange for more hiring in the U.S. Within days, two of the industry’s major trade groups published a full-page newspaper advertisement thanking Trump for reinstating a review of the rules. The EPA completed that review last month and found that fuel-efficiency regulations for cars and light trucks are too stringent and must be revised. Yet a draft that recommended freezing the standards in 2020 showed the administration had something far more aggressive in mind than what carmakers expected, or wanted.” [Bloomberg, [5/11/18](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-05-11/automakers-seek-to-use-trump-summit-to-avert-war-with-california)]

### Reality: Suppliers Want Fuel Economy Standards to Be Maintained Or Even Strengthened, Not Weakened

**Calstart Survey: Four out of Five Auto Suppliers Said Current Fuel Economy Standards Should be Maintained or Even Strengthened.** In an op-ed, CalStart President and CEO John Boesel wrote, “At Calstart, our 185 member companies include fuel providers, vehicle manufacturers, suppliers and investors, all of whom understand the large and growing global opportunity that clean transportation technology represents. In our recent semiannual survey, we asked major automotive suppliers about the existing national fuel economy standards. According to our confidential survey, four out of five suppliers say the current robust fuel economy standards should be maintained, or even strengthened. They do not want to see miles-per-gallon standards rolled back. Rather, they see strong, consistent fuel economy standards as a boon for company job growth and industry investment.” [Automotive News, John Boesel Op-ed, [7/04/18](http://www.autonews.com/article/20180604/OEM10/180609996/)]

## Rhetoric: Renegotiating Fuel Rules Would Help Auto Workers

**TRUMP: We’re Going To Help The Companies, And They’re Going To Help You.”** In remarks at the American Center for Mobility in Detroit, Trump said, “We have so many leaders that we just met, all of the leaders of the major car companies and really the automobile business. It’s a great business, it’s a wonderful business, but it’s been pretty much hurt here. But it’s not going to be hurt for long, that I can tell you. (Applause.) That I can tell you. I’m sure you’ve all heard the big news that we’re going to work on the CAFE standards, so you can make cars in America again. (Applause.) We’re going to help the companies, and they’re going to help you.” [White House, Remarks by President Trump at American Center for Mobility | Detroit, MI, [3/15/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/15/remarks-president-trump-american-center-mobility-detroit-mi)]

### Reality: Trump’s Proposal to Weaken Fuel Economy Standards Would Kill 60,000 Auto Jobs by 2030.

**AP: Trump’s Proposal to Freeze Fuel Economy Standards “Would Mean 60,000 Fewer Auto Jobs by 2030.”** “The Trump administration’s proposal for freezing U.S. mileage standards estimates that its action could cost tens of thousands of U.S. auto jobs. The administration’s report projects that relaxing auto standards would mean 60,000 fewer auto jobs by 2030. Vehicle expert Simon Mui at the Natural Resources Defense Council says those losses would hit the estimated 200,000 U.S. auto-industry jobs that deal with making vehicles more fuel efficient. President Donald Trump had called last year for a review of mileage standards, expressing concern they were hurting employment in the U.S. auto industry. A U.S. Department of Transportation spokesperson calls the government’s estimate of job losses “rough approximations.” The government says it will seek public comment for a broader picture of the impact of any mileage freeze.” [Associated Press, [8/03/18](https://www.apnews.com/9d6c9120cfc54387896d0b3f8c4616d2)]

### Reality: Rolling Back the Standards Helps the Automakers, Not Workers

**Washington Post Editorial Board: “The Auto Industry Pushed The Trump Administration Hard To Revisit The Rule. The Nation As A Whole Will Pay The Price.”** “The auto industry pushed the Trump administration hard to revisit the rule. The nation as a whole will pay the price. The Obama administration’s fuel-efficiency regulations will stay in place through 2022. But the standards in question, for model years 2022 through 2025, are much more ambitious. Set in 2012 and formally reviewed just before Mr. Trump’s inauguration, the industry’s efficiency target is a fleetwide 54.4 mpg. ‘Automakers have a wide range of technology pathways available to meet the MY2022-2025 standards, at slightly lower per-vehicle costs than previously predicted,’ the EPA concluded as it reaffirmed the rule in January.” [Washington Post Editorial Board, [3/25/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/trumps-auto-regulations-rollback-will-end-up-costing-americans/2017/03/25/85eb1c42-09ca-11e7-93dc-00f9bdd74ed1_story.html?utm_term=.c7d02d300220)]

**New York Times: “Granting The Automakers Their Top Wish,” Trump Halted Fuel Economy Standards.** “Granting the automakers their top wish, Mr. Trump halted an initiative by the Obama administration to impose stringent fuel-economy standards by 2025 — rules meant to cut carbon emissions and meet international commitments to address climate change. Instead, Mr. Trump vowed to keep cutting regulations as a means to accelerate economic growth and add new jobs. ‘The assault on the American auto industry is over,’ he declared.” [New York Times, [3/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/15/business/trump-auto-industry-emissions-rules.html)]

**Detroit News: “The Trump Administration’s Rollback Of The EPA’s Decision Was A Victory For Automakers.”** “The Trump administration’s rollback of the EPA’s decision was a victory for automakers. Bainwol says that while there may be voices in the administration that favor further steps to review the EPA’s authority to regulate greenhouse gasses, the political reality is that Senate Republicans do not have 60 votes to enact a change in legislation. As a result, the panel agreed that the Trump administration’s focus will be on crafting one set of mpg rules that automakers can meet nationwide. Once the midterm review data is in, the panel expects new rules by April of next year.” [Detroit News, [4/11/17](http://www.detroitnews.com/story/business/autos/2017/04/11/auto-industry-trump-will-mend-end-mpg-mandate/100352064/)]

**Auto Efficiency Standards Were Structured With American Workers in Mind; New Standards Would Create Jobs For Engineers.** “Auto efficiency standards have always been structured with American workers in mind. The current standards include multiple levels of flexibility that accommodate market shifts due to fluctuating fuel prices; the rules also defer to the dubious proposition that more lenient regulations for top-selling light trucks would help protect union jobs. What the regulations do is shape how automakers allocate their budgets. Trimming a vehicle’s CO2 emission rate may involve, for example, developing a new transmission. (Transmissions have, in fact, seen a lot of innovation in recent years in response to the need for higher fuel efficiency.) Those development costs mean jobs for engineers. Building the redesigned transmissions then creates jobs for assembly workers. So whatever additional costs are incurred go right back into materials and labor, including jobs for steelworkers and others involved in supplying parts and materials to the auto industry. Studies that falsely claim job losses due to regulation assume that the cost of improved technology somehow falls into a “black hole” and disappears from the economy, taking jobs with it. But that’s just not true.” [Yale Environment 360, [3/20/17](http://e360.yale.edu/features/trump-fuel-economy-cafe-standards-decicco)]

## Rhetoric: Under Trump, Automakers Are Bringing Jobs Back To America

**WHITE HOUSE: “Under President Trump, Automakers Are Bringing Jobs Back To America.”** “Under President Trump, automakers are bringing jobs back to America. Ford announced it was canceling a plant in Mexico, while adding 700 jobs in Michigan. General Motors announced it plans to invest $1 billion in the United States, creating over 1,000 new jobs. Fiat Chrysler announced it was investing $1 billion to modernize two plants in the United States, creating 2,000 jobs.” [White House, Press Release, [3/15/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/15/president-donald-j-trump-buy-american-and-hire-american-united-states)]

### Reality: Automakers “Hard Pressed” And “Wary” About Creating More Jobs

**New York Times: Automakers “May Be Hard Pressed To Meet Mr. Trump’s Expectations” That Auto Companies Create More Jobs.** “And just hours before Mr. Trump’s speech on Wednesday, G.M. said it would create 220 additional jobs in a Michigan transmission plant and retain 680 workers who were facing layoffs at another factory. […] Mr. Trump called G.M.’s move ‘just the beginning’ of a new era of job growth in the industry. ‘That’s peanuts,’ he said. ‘We’re going to have a lot more. They’re going to be building new plants, expanding their plants.’ But automakers may be hard-pressed to meet Mr. Trump’s expectations. The financial collapse of the industry during the recession is still a fresh memory, and companies have streamlined their manufacturing operations to eliminate costly excess capacity. Adding new plants in a market at its peak could upset the industry’s steady recovery and jeopardize the big profits earned in recent years on larger vehicles like pickups and sport utility vehicles.” [New York Times, [3/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/15/us/politics/trump-obama-fuel-economy-standards.html)]

* **New York Times: “Automakers Are Wary Of Expanding Production Beyond The Current Level Of Demand.”** “Car companies are making big profits in the North American market, and their plants are running at near-capacity levels. Last year, auto companies set a second consecutive annual sales record in the United States with about 17.5 million new vehicles sold. The growth in sales, however, has begun to level off. And automakers are wary of expanding production beyond the current level of demand.” [New York Times, [3/15/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/15/us/politics/trump-obama-fuel-economy-standards.html)]

### Reality: Automakers Disputed Trump’s Claim That He Persuaded Them To Keep US Jobs

**Auto Companies Disputed Trump’s Claim That He Persuaded Them To Keep Jobs In The U.S.** “Trump also signaled his intention to roll back fuel efficiency standards put in place under former president Barack Obama, environmental rules he has described as a threat to auto jobs. Over the last three months, Trump has taken credit for persuading Ford and Chrysler Fiat to keep jobs on American soil — claims both companies have disputed. GM’s hiring decision, too, has more to do with the company’s long-term strategy than any presidential pressure or imminent policy changes. When asked if the administration influenced the automaker’s move, GM spokesman Pat Morrissey did not give Trump credit. ‘We haven’t fundamentally changed any of our plans,’ he said Wednesday in a statement. ‘But we continue to look for ways to improve our operations and find ways to help the country, grow jobs and support economic growth.’” [Washington Post, [3/15/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2017/03/15/president-trump-took-credit-for-jobs-he-didnt-create-again/?utm_term=.117bf979802a)]

## Rhetoric: Midterm Review Analysis was Pre-mature and Rushed

**Trump: ‘The Obama Administration Broke Its Promise To Automakers And Rushed The Midterm Evaluation To A Premature Conclusion Earlier This Year.”** “Today, President Donald J. Trump announced that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) are reinstating the Midterm Evaluation of the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) and greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) standards for the automotive industry. […] The Obama Administration broke its promise to automakers and rushed the Midterm Evaluation to a premature conclusion earlier this year. Reinstating the Midterm Evaluation ensures that regulators will rely on the best available data and information, which the previous administration ignored. By reinstating the Midterm Evaluation, the Trump Administration will examine, and if necessary, revise, the regulations on auto manufacturers and the attendant costs passed on to consumers. Last year, the EPA estimated it would cost $200 billion to comply with CAFE-GHG standards from 2012-2025.” [White House, Press Release, [3/15/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/15/president-donald-j-trump-buy-american-and-hire-american-united-states)]

### Reality: EPA’s Midterm Review Was “Not Unexpected” And Accounted For Multiple Public Comment Opportunities, In Which Automakers Provided Feedback

**New York Times: EPA’s Final Determination On Fuel Economy Standards “Was Not Unexpected.”** “Federal regulators on Friday affirmed long-term fuel-economy goals central to the Obama administration’s efforts to reduce harmful emissions from cars and trucks sold in the United States. The decision by the Environmental Protection Agency was not unexpected. But the move frustrated some automakers that had asked for more time to contest the government’s target for fuel economy in 2025, and it will most likely make it more difficult for a Trump administration to dial it back. In a statement, the departing administrator of the E.P.A. said the industry had proven it could consistently improve fuel economy and reduce greenhouse gases since the current rules were adopted five years ago.” [New York Times, [1/13/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/13/business/fuel-economy-standards.html?mcubz=0)]

**First Formal Step In Midterm Evaluation Process Began In July 2016 After The EPA, NHTSA And CARB Jointly Issued For Public Comment.** “In July 2016, EPA, NHTSA, and CARB jointly issued for public comment a Draft Technical Assessment Report (TAR) examining a wide range of issues relevant to the MY2022-2025 standards. For the EPA, the Draft TAR was the first formal step in the MTE process as required under EPA’s regulations. The Draft TAR was a technical report, not a decision document. It was an opportunity for all three agencies to share with the public their technical analyses relating to the appropriateness of the MY2022-2025 standards.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Final Determination on the Appropriateness of the Model Year 2022-2025 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards under the Midterm Evaluation*, [January 2017](https://web.archive.org/web/20170113201942/https%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

**In First Step Of Midterm Evaluation Process, EPA Received 90 Public Comments, Including From Auto Manufacturers And Suppliers, Consumer Groups, And Fuel and Energy Providers.** “The EPA received over 200,000 public comments on the Draft TAR, including about 90 comments from organizations and the rest from individuals. The organization commenters included auto manufacturers and suppliers, environmental and other non-governmental organizations (NGOs), consumer groups, state and local governments and their associations, labor unions, fuels and energy providers, auto dealers, academics, national security experts, veteran’s groups, and others. These comments presented a range of views on whether the standards should be retained, or made more or less stringent, and, in some cases, provided additional factual information that EPA considered in updating its analyses in support of the Administrator’s Proposed Determination. The EPA also considered the few additional comments received after the close of the comment period on the Draft TAR.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Final Determination on the Appropriateness of the Model Year 2022-2025 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards under the Midterm Evaluation*, [January 2017](https://web.archive.org/web/20170113201942/https%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

**EPA: Final Determination Based On An Extensive Technical Record, Created Over 8 Years Of Research, Reviewed Several Hundred Published Reports, Hundreds Of Stakeholder Meetings And Provided Multiple Public Comment Opportunities.** “On January 12, 2017, Administrator Gina McCarthy signed her determination to maintain the current GHG emissions standards for model year (MY) 2022-2025 vehicles. Her final determination found that automakers are well positioned to meet the standards at lower costs than previously estimated. […] Administrator McCarty's determination was based on an extensive technical record, created over 8 years of research, review of several hundred published reports, hundreds of stakeholder meetings, and multiple opportunities for the public to provide input. This Final Determination follows the November 2016 release of EPA’s Proposed Determination and the July 2016 release of a Draft Technical Assessment Report (TAR), issued jointly by the EPA, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), and the California Air Resources Board (CARB). EPA provided opportunities for public comment for both the Draft TAR and the Proposed Determination.” [EPA website, *Regulations for Emissions from Vehicles and Engines*, accessed [7/14/17](https://www.epa.gov/regulations-emissions-vehicles-and-engines/midterm-evaluation-light-duty-vehicle-greenhouse-gas-ghg)]

## Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Rules Need to Be Harmonized

**Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers: Inconsistencies Between EPA And NHTSA Regulations “Driving Up Vehicle Costs” And Could Mean “Billions Of Dollars In Fines.”** “When the EPA, NHTSA and CARB established the 2012 Joint Final Rule creating ‘One National Program,’ one primary aspect was to ‘harmonize’ the three sets of fuel economy regulations at the federal and state level as fully as possible to provide greater consistency and certainty for automakers as they develop their products for sale across the U.S. The Administration’s 2012 Regulatory Announcement highlighted the value of harmonization: ‘Continuing the National Program ensures that auto manufacturers can build a single fleet of U.S. vehicles that satisfy requirements of both federal programs as well as California’s program.’ But significant inconsistencies continue to exist. Since 2012, it has become increasingly clear that many automakers may be in compliance with the EPA program, yet subject to fines in the NHTSA program. This regulatory friction is already occurring, driving up vehicle costs, and will become even more counterproductive as the regulatory requirements become more stringent in future Model Years. Potentially billions of dollars in fines under the NHTSA CAFE program are anticipated.” [Letter from Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers CEO Mitch Bainwol, [11/10/16](https://www.autonews.com/assets/PDF/CA1078111110.PDF)]

### Reality: CARB, EPA and NHTSA Have Harmonized Standards Through MY2025.

**Center for Automotive Research: “CARB, EPA, AND NHTSA Have Collaborated To Harmonize Their Standards Through Model Year 2025.”** “Before proceeding to CAR’s estimation of the effect of the national standards on the U.S. economy, it should prove useful to describe the history of vehicle fuel economy regulation in the United States through the Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards set by National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA), a division of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT). This description also covers the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions by EPA and the California Air Resources Board (CARB). These three agencies, CARB, EPA, and NHTSA have collaborated to harmonize their standards through model year 2025.” [Center for Automotive Research, [September 2016](http://www.cargroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/The-Potential-Effects-of-the-2017_2025-EPANHTSA-GHGFuel-Economy-Mandates-on-the-US-Economy.pdf)]

**Center for Automotive Research: While EPA Emissions Standards And NHTSA’s Fuel Economy Standards Are Harmonized, They Are Not In Complete Alignment, “Due To The Differing Missions Of Each Agency- The EPA Focusing On Emissions, And NHTSA On Fuel Economy.”** “Federal regulatory standards for fuel economy and emissions in the United States are administered by two agencies: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration (NHTSA). While the standards are to a certain extent harmonized, they are not necessarily in complete alignment. This divergence is due to the differing missions of each agency—the EPA focusing on emissions, and NHTSA on fuel economy. Powertrain technology and alternative fuels have a direct impact on fuel economy and emissions—and the overall compliance strategy for a manufacturer. Certain fuels are more likely to reduce greenhouse and smog-forming emissions as well as petroleum use.” [Center for Automotive Research, [August 2015](http://www.cargroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/CRUCIAL-GREENHOUSE-GAS-AND-CORPORATE-AVERAGE-FUEL-ECONOMY-CAFE-REGULATION-DIFFERENCES-IN-THE-UNITED-STATES.pdf)]

**EPA: EPA’s GHG Standards And NHTSA’s CAFE Standards “Represent A Harmonized And Consistent National Program.”** “The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) are issuing a joint final rule to establish new standards for light-duty highway vehicles that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve fuel economy. […] EPA is regulating greenhouse gas emissions standards under the Clean Air Act, and NHTSA is regulating Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act, as amended. These standards apply to passenger cars, light-duty trucks, and medium-duty passenger vehicles, covering model years 2017 through 2025. They require these vehicles to meet an estimated combined average emissions level of 163 grams of CO2 per mile in MY 2025 under EPA’s GHG program, and 49.6 mpg in MY 2025 under NHTSA’s CAFE program and represent a harmonized and consistent national program (National Program). These standards are designed such that compliance can be achieved with a single national vehicle fleet whose emissions and fuel economy performance improves each year from MY2017 to 2025.” [EPA, *Final Rulemaking for 2017-2025 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emission Standards and Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards*, [August 2012](https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/P100F1E5.PDF?Dockey=P100F1E5.PDF)]

## Rhetoric: “A Lot Has Changed” On Electric Car Sales Since 2012

**Global Automakers Director Julia Rege: “A Lot Has Changed” On Electric Car Sales Since 2012.** “Auto makers, which lobbied the Trump administration to reopen a so-called midterm evaluation of standards, contend future targets are lofty amid cheap gasoline that is spurring demand for pickup trucks and sport-utility vehicles. Sales of electric cars are less than 1% of total U.S. industry sales. ‘A lot has changed since 2012,’ said Julia Rege, environment and energy director at Global Automakers, a Washington lobbying group representing foreign auto makers with U.S. operations, during an EPA hearing this month. California and other states, meanwhile, want to keep the current targets, which the EPA previously said would cut oil consumption and greenhouse-gas emissions while saving consumers $92 billion at the fuel pump.” [Wall Street Journal, [9/12/17](https://www.wsj.com/articles/as-trump-auto-makers-talk-new-mileage-rules-california-wants-a-say-1505214002)]

### Reality: Electric Vehicle Sales Skyrocketed in 2016; Will Make up 50% of All Light Vehicles by 2040.

**Bloomberg: “The Number Of Electric Vehicles On The Road Rocketed To 2 Million In 2016[.]”** “The number of electric vehicles on the road rocketed to 2 million in 2016 after being virtually non-existent just five years ago, according to the International Energy Agency. Registered plug-in and battery-powered vehicles on roads worldwide rose 60 percent from the year before, according to the Global EV Outlook 2017 report from the Paris-based IEA. Despite the rapid growth, electric vehicles still represent just 0.2 percent of total light-duty vehicles. ‘China was by far the largest electric car market, accounting for more than 40 percent of the electric cars sold in the world and more than double the amount sold in the United States,’ the IEA wrote in the report published Wednesday. ‘It is undeniable that the current electric car market uptake is largely influenced by the policy environment.’” [Bloomberg, [6/07/17](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-06-07/electric-car-market-goes-zero-to-2-million-in-five-years)]

**CNBC: “Electric Vehicles Will Make Up 50 Percent To 60 Percent Of All Light Vehicles Sold Around The World By 2040.”** “Global demand for electric vehicles will surge during the next few decades, but gasoline is probably not going away soon, said a new research note from Morgan Stanley analyst Adam Jonas. Jonas said in a note Tuesday that electric vehicles will make up 50 percent to 60 percent of all light vehicles sold around the world by 2040. But he does not expect that rise to coincide with a precipitous decline in global demand for gasoline, contrary to more bearish views. That’s because while electric car sales will grow, the impact from developments in the areas of shared and autonomous driving will reduce the cost of transportation around the world at a much faster pace. This will lead to an explosion of driving around the world that will continue to keep internal combustion engines relevant for the next two decades.” [CNBC, [5/30/17](https://www.cnbc.com/2017/05/30/electric-vehicle-demand-to-skyrocket-but-wont-kill-gasoline-just-yet.html)]

## Rhetoric: Glider Emission Rules A “Regulatory Overreach” and Should Be Repealed

**November 2017: EPA Proposed Repealing Tighter Emissions Standards on Heavy-Duty Glider Trucks.** “The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to undo the regulatory overreach of the prior administration by repealing application of the Medium- and Heavy-Duty Truck Phase II Greenhouse Gas Emission and Fuel Efficiency Standards for the glider industry. Gliders are a specially manufactured type of heavy duty highway vehicle assembled from newly manufactured kits that include the vehicle’s frame and cab, to which a used engine, transmission and axles are added. ‘The previous administration attempted to bend the rule of law and expand the reach of the federal government in a way that threatened to put an entire industry of specialized truck manufacturers out of business,’ said EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt. ‘Accordingly, the Agency is taking comment on an interpretation of the Clean Air Act that recognizes the unique nature of a vehicle made up of both new and used component parts. Gliders not only provide a more affordable option for smaller owners and operators, but also serve as a key economic driver to numerous rural communities.’” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, [11/09/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/administrator-pruitt-advances-effort-keep-epa-within-regulatory-lane-proposed-repeal)]

**July 2018: Before Resigning, Pruitt Granted Glider Trucks Loophole.** “In the final hours of Scott Pruitt’s tenure as administrator, the Environmental Protection Agency moved on Friday to effectively grant a loophole that will allow a major increase in the manufacturing of a diesel freight truck that produces as much as 55 times the air pollution as trucks that have modern emissions controls. The move by the E.P.A. came after intense lobbying by a small set of manufacturers that sell glider trucks, which use old engines built before new technologies significantly reduced emissions of particulates and nitrogen oxide that are blamed for asthma, lung cancer and other ailments.” [The New York Times, [7/06/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/06/us/glider-trucks-loophole-pruitt.html)]

### Reality: EPA’s Own Report Found That Pollution from Glider Trucks Vastly Exceeded Emissions From New Trucks

**EPA Study Found Major Pollution From “Glider” Trucks; Findings Showed Glider Trucks Produced Emissions of Some Pollutants That Could Be 450 Times Higher That Emissions From New Trucks.** According to Inside EPA, “A new EPA report shows that criteria pollution from a popular configuration of ‘glider’ trucks -- which combine a new heavy-duty chassis with used engines -- can vastly exceed emissions from new trucks, contrasting with industry and agency suggestions that its plan to repeal glider vehicle greenhouse gas limits would result in minimal pollution increases. The findings, contained in a Nov. 20 report summarizing emissions testing of two recent model year glider vehicles, show that emissions of some pollutants can be as much as 450 times higher in extreme cases than emissions from new trucks. Such findings appear to confirm fears from some state regulators, environmentalists and new truck makers that the Trump administration’s proposed repeal of GHG limits for the trucks would open a major pollution loophole that could boost emissions of non-GHG pollution, particularly the ozone precursor nitrogen oxides (NOx) and particulate matter (PM).” [Inside EPA, [11/27/17](https://insideepaclimate.com/daily-news/epa-study-finds-major-pollution-glider-trucks-despite-repeal-plan) (=)]

**Union of Concerned Scientists’ Dave Cooke: “The EPA’s Own Research Indicates That The Particulate Matter Pollution From Just One Year’s Production Of Glider Trucks Could Cause 1,600 Premature Deaths.”** “Below is a statement by Dave Cooke, senior analyst in the Clean Vehicles program at UCS. ‘It’s unacceptable for the EPA to expose families across the country to dangerous pollution levels, but that’s exactly what Administrator Pruitt is doing with this decision. Glider vehicles that are simply new truck bodies containing outdated engines emit 20 to 40 times more pollution than other new trucks, causing smog and contributing to heart disease and respiratory disease. These trucks endanger people’s health—especially for low-income neighborhoods and communities of color who often live closer to major highways. The EPA’s own research indicates that the particulate matter pollution from just one year’s production of glider trucks could cause 1,600 premature deaths. If the EPA is going to do its job and protect public health, glider vehicles need to be held to a strong standard just like vehicles with newer engines.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, Statement by Dave Cooke, [11/09/17](https://www.ucsusa.org/news/press-release/glider-truck-rule#.WwdAREgvxPY)]

**New York Times: Glider Trucks “Spew 40 to 55 Times the Air Pollution of Other New Trucks… Including Toxins Blamed for Asthma, Lung Cancer, and a Range of Other Ailments.”** “The gravel parking lot at the Fitzgerald family’s truck dealership here in central Tennessee was packed last week with shiny new Peterbilt and Freightliner trucks, as well as a steady stream of buyers from across the country. But there is something unusual about the big rigs sold by the Fitzgeralds: They are equipped with rebuilt diesel engines that do not need to comply with rules on modern emissions controls. That makes them cheaper to operate, but means that they spew 40 to 55 times the air pollution of other new trucks, according to federal estimates, including toxins blamed for asthma, lung cancer and a range of other ailments. […] The trucks sold by Fitzgerald are known as “gliders” because they are manufactured without engines and are later retrofitted with the rebuilt ones. Gliders are popular among small trucking companies and individual truck owners, who say they cannot afford to buy or operate vehicles with new engines and modern emissions controls.” [New York Times, [2/15/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/15/us/politics/epa-pollution-loophole-glider-trucks.html)]

### Reality: Pruitt Proposed Reversing Glider Truck Rule After Meeting With Executives of the Largest Glider Truck Manufacturer, Fitzgerald Glider Kits

**Union of Concerned Scientists’ Dave Cooke: EPA Rollback of Glider Truck Rule Would Expose People to Dangerous Pollution Levels For a Single Company’s Gain, Fitzgerald Glider Kits, Whose CEO Pushed Pruitt to Repeal the Rule.** “Below is a statement by Dave Cooke, senior analyst in the Clean Vehicles program at UCS. ‘It’s unacceptable for the EPA to expose families across the country to dangerous pollution levels, but that’s exactly what Administrator Pruitt is doing with this decision. Glider vehicles that are simply new truck bodies containing outdated engines emit 20 to 40 times more pollution than other new trucks, causing smog and contributing to heart disease and respiratory disease. […] ‘The health impacts are even more galling when you consider that this is essentially just a handout to one company, Fitzgerald Glider Kits, which manufactures the largest share of glider vehicles. Fitzgerald’s CEO met with Administrator Pruitt in May to push him to reverse this rule. It looks like Administrator Pruitt listened, and he’s willing to do one company a huge favor, protecting a polluter at the cost of our health. It’s a betrayal of the thousands of people who could face hospitalization or premature death from pollution.’” [Union of Concerned Scientists, Statement by Dave Cooke, [11/09/17](https://www.ucsusa.org/news/press-release/glider-truck-rule#.WwdAREgvxPY)]

**New York Times: In May 2017, Pruitt Met With Fitzgerald Executives.** “The push by Fitzgerald had started by May, according to a calendar of Mr. Pruitt’s visitors, when Mr. Pruitt and his chief of staff met with executives from Fitzgerald and Donald Shandy, an Oklahoma lawyer who knows Mr. Pruitt from his tenure as Oklahoma’s attorney general. By September, to keep the momentum going, Fitzgerald had hired its first full-time federal lobbyist — a former aide to Ms. Black.” [New York Times, [2/15/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/15/us/politics/epa-pollution-loophole-glider-trucks.html)]

* **November 2017: EPA Proposed Repealing Tighter Emissions Standards on Heavy-Duty Glider Trucks.** “The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to undo the regulatory overreach of the prior administration by repealing application of the Medium- and Heavy-Duty Truck Phase II Greenhouse Gas Emission and Fuel Efficiency Standards for the glider industry.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, [11/09/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/administrator-pruitt-advances-effort-keep-epa-within-regulatory-lane-proposed-repeal)]

**Fitzgerald Contributed At Least $225,000 to the Campaign of Congresswoman Diane Black, Who Had Lobbied Pruitt To Protect the Glider Loophole.** “And in the six weeks before Mr. Pruitt announced in November that he would grant the exemption, Fitzgerald business entities, executives and family members contributed at least $225,000 to Ms. Black’s campaign for governor, campaign disclosure records show. […]Ms. Black introduced legislation in 2015 to protect the loophole when it was first in line to be eliminated by a stricter diesel emissions rule under the Obama administration. That bill failed, but after the election of Mr. Trump, she turned to Mr. Pruitt to carve out an exemption to the new rule — scheduled to take effect last month — and presented him with the study from Tennessee Tech.” [New York Times, [2/15/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/15/us/politics/epa-pollution-loophole-glider-trucks.html)]

### Reality: Pruitt Cited a Study Paid for By Glider Manufacturer, Fitzgerald In Its Repeal Announcement Even Though the Study Contradicted the EPA’s Own Findings

**Fitzgerald Glider Kits Paid for Study From Tennessee Tech That Minimized Pollution Problems Caused by Glider Trucks.** “The loophole has been condemned in recent weeks by an array of businesses and environmentalists […] But the Fitzgerald family has had influential allies. In addition to Mr. Pruitt, they include Representative Diane Black, a Republican who is a candidate for Tennessee governor, and Tennessee Technological University, a state university that produced a study minimizing pollution problems associated with the trucks. Ms. Black introduced legislation in 2015 to protect the loophole when it was first in line to be eliminated by a stricter diesel emissions rule under the Obama administration. That bill failed, but after the election of Mr. Trump, she turned to Mr. Pruitt to carve out an exemption to the new rule — scheduled to take effect last month — and presented him with the study from Tennessee Tech. Fitzgerald had not only paid for the study, which has roiled the faculty at Tennessee Tech and is the subject of an internal investigation, but it had also offered to build a new research center for the university on land owned by the company.” [New York Times, [2/15/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/15/us/politics/epa-pollution-loophole-glider-trucks.html)]

* **New York Times: The Study Concluded that Emissions from Fitzgerald’s Glider Trucks “Were as Clean as Those With Modern Systems.”** “The study, which Mr. Pruitt cited in the E.P.A.’s November announcement of the rollback, concluded that emissions from the company’s trucks were as clean as those with modern systems.” [New York Times, [2/15/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/15/us/politics/epa-pollution-loophole-glider-trucks.html)]

**NYT: Fitzgerald Submitted the Tennessee Tech Study to the EPA in Petitioning for an Exemption From the Glider Rule and Pruitt Cited the Study in His Rollback Announcement.** “Fitzgerald, with Ms. Black’s help, submitted a petition in July asking Mr. Pruitt to suspend the cap and declare that all gliders made by Fitzgerald and at least two other dealers — Iowa-based Harrison Truck Centers and Indiana Phoenix of Avilla, Ind. — be exempted because the new emissions requirements applied only to ‘new motor vehicle engines.’ […] To bolster their argument, Fitzgerald submitted the study conducted by Tennessee Tech in late 2016. The study, which Mr. Pruitt cited in the E.P.A.’s November announcement of the rollback, concluded that emissions from the company’s trucks were as clean as those with modern systems.” [New York Times, [2/15/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/15/us/politics/epa-pollution-loophole-glider-trucks.html)]

**EPA Cited the Study, Which Contradicted the EPA’s Own Findings, Several Times in its Rollback Announcement.** “TTU’s study concluded that gliders do not produce greater emissions of nitrogen oxide and greenhouse gases than new trucks, contradicting EPA’s own studies. EPA cited the TTU study’s conclusions several times in its 2017 decision to roll back the Obama-era regs, though recently EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt told The New York Times the agency did not rely on the study to make that decision.” [Overdrive Magazine, [2/22/18](https://www.overdriveonline.com/study-used-in-glider-emissions-reversal-under-review-school-tells-epa/)]

**February 2018: Tennessee Tech Told the EPA to Disregard The Study and Launched an Investigation Over the Study’s Methodology and Accuracy.** “Tennessee Technological University, paid by Fitzgerald Glider Kits to perform a study measuring the exhaust emissions of glider kit trucks, has told the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to disregard the study until the university can ‘assure its validity.’ The EPA referenced the report’s conclusions last year when it proposed rescinding emissions regulations placed on glider kit makers by the Obama-era EPA in 2016. That proposal has not reached a final rule stage. The existing regulations are slated to take effect this year and would, if upheld, require glider makers like Fitzgerald to retool the older engines used in gliders to meet the new restrictions. […]In a Feb. 19 letter to Pruitt, TTU President Philip B. Oldham said the study’s research was under investigation after questions were raised by faculty members about its “methodology and accuracy.” Oldham also said the university is investigating a claim of ‘research misconduct related to the study.’ TTU officials, when queried, referred Overdrive to a statement on its website, which only stated the research was under investigation.” [Overdrive Magazine, [2/22/18](https://www.overdriveonline.com/study-used-in-glider-emissions-reversal-under-review-school-tells-epa/)]

### Reality: Federal Court Blocked Pruitt’s Decision to Not to Enforce Glider Truck Emissions Cap

**U.S. court blocks EPA decision not to enforce 'glider truck' limits “**A federal appeals court on Wednesday temporarily blocked a decision by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency that would have lifted strict limits on the number of remanufactured heavy duty vehicles known as “glider trucks” that could be sold. The vehicles have a used engine in a new frame and rules introduced under former President Barack Obama, a Democrat, said nearly all new trucks on the road must use more efficient, less polluting engines. The glider trucks emit up to 450 times more diesel particulate matter and up to 40 times more smog-forming nitrogen oxides than new trucks on the market, the EPA has said.” [Reuters, [7/18/18](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trucks-pollution/us-court-blocks-epa-decision-not-to-enforce-glider-truck-limits-idUSKBN1K82OX)]

**July 2018: Before Resigning, Pruitt Granted Glider Trucks Loophole.** “In the final hours of Scott Pruitt’s tenure as administrator, the Environmental Protection Agency moved on Friday to effectively grant a loophole that will allow a major increase in the manufacturing of a diesel freight truck that produces as much as 55 times the air pollution as trucks that have modern emissions controls. The move by the E.P.A. came after intense lobbying by a small set of manufacturers that sell glider trucks, which use old engines built before new technologies significantly reduced emissions of particulates and nitrogen oxide that are blamed for asthma, lung cancer and other ailments.” [The New York Times, [7/06/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/06/us/glider-trucks-loophole-pruitt.html)]

### Reality: After Pruitt Resigned, EPA’s New Acting Administrator Withdrew Pruitt’s Signoff On the Glider Truck Loophole

**July 2018: EPA Reverses Course, Says It Will Enforce Stricter Pollution Limits For Glider Trucks.** “The Environmental Protection Agency reversed course late Thursday and announced it would enforce stricter pollution controls on diesel freight trucks known as “gliders,” which use older engines that emit dozens of times more soot and contaminants compared to newer ones. In a three-page memo to his deputies, acting administrator Andrew Wheeler said he would withdraw the “no action assurance” the agency had given the manufacturers of glider trucks on the last day that his predecessor, Scott Pruitt, headed the EPA. That letter assured firms that they would not have to limit their annual production to 300 vehicles through the end of 2019.” [The Washington Post, [7/26/18](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/epa-reverses-course-says-it-will-enforce-stricter-pollution-limits-for-glider-trucks/2018/07/26/705ff4ee-9144-11e8-8322-b5482bf5e0f5_story.html?utm_term=.82c23e77c94c)]

**HEADLINE: New E.P.A. Chief Closes Dirty-Truck Loophole Left by Scott Pruitt.** [The New York Times, [7/27/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/27/climate/wheeler-pruitt-glider-truck-reversal.html?rref=collection%2Fsectioncollection%2Fclimate&action=click&contentCollection=climate&region=stream&module=stream_unit&version=latest&contentPlacement=4&pgtype=sectionfront)]