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# Trump Rhetoric

## Rhetoric: We Have The Cleanest Air

***Trump****: “From day one, my administration has made it a top priority to ensure that America has among the very cleanest air and cleanest water on the planet. We want the cleanest air.” [Remarks by President Trump,* [*7/8/19*](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-americas-environmental-leadership/)*]*

### Reality: No, We Do Not

**The Associated Press: Trump Is “Getting His Facts Wrong.”** According to the Associated Press, “President Donald Trump is getting his facts wrong when it comes to clean air in the U.S….The Obama administration set the records for clean air in 2016, and air quality under Trump has worsened since then….Trump’s own Environmental Protection Agency data show that in 2017, among 35 major U.S. cities, there were 729 cases of “unhealthy days for ozone and fine particle pollution.” That’s up 22 percent from 2014 and the worst year since 2012.” [Associated Press, [6/5/2019](https://www.apnews.com/a2e7024d43c9409087ec8d5245534092)]

**Obama Administration Set Records For Fewest Air Polluted Days in 2016.** According to the Associated Press, “The Obama administration, in fact, set records for the fewest air polluted days in 2016. In 2017, after Trump took office, the number of bad air days per metro area went up 20%.”[Associated Press, [6/5/2019](https://www.apnews.com/a2e7024d43c9409087ec8d5245534092)]

**Axios: Trump Is Taking Credit for Actions of Earlier Administrations.**  “Since Trump entered the White House, the little data available show that many pollutant emissions have plateaued, while a few have even increased, according to a [preview](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2019-07/documents/airtrendsreport_07012019_custom_v1_d1.pdf) of the report EPA posted Monday.” [Axios, [7/8/19](https://www.axios.com/reality-checking-trumps-comments-on-clean-air-epa-02984121-83be-4a26-84b9-66d68a7b5c1e.html)]

### Reality: Greenhouse Gas Reductions Slowed Under Trump

**The Hill: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Significantly Slowed Under The Trump Administration In 2017.** According to The Hill, “Earlier this year, data from the Environmental Protection Agency also found that reductions in greenhouse gas emissions significantly slowed under the Trump administration in 2017 as his office continues to work to roll back Obama-era regulations designed to reduce emissions of the harmful gasses.” [The Hill, [6/18/19](https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/449239-trump-says-air-and-water-are-the-cleanest-theyve-ever-been-before)]

### Reality: Trump Didn’t Set Records On Clean Air In US

**AP: “Among 35 Major U.S. Cities, There Were 729 Cases Of ‘Unhealthy Days For Ozone And Fine Particle Pollution.’ That’s Up 22 Percent From 2014 And The Worst Year Since 2012.”** According to the Associated Press, “Trump’s own Environmental Protection Agency data show that in 2017, among 35 major U.S. cities, there were 729 cases of “unhealthy days for ozone and fine particle pollution.” That’s up 22 percent from 2014 and the worst year since 2012.” [Associated Press, [6/5/19](https://www.apnews.com/a2e7024d43c9409087ec8d5245534092)]

**“The State Of Global Air 2019 Report By The Health Effects Institute Rated The U.S. As Having The Eighth Cleanest Air For Particle Pollution.”** According to the Associated Press, “The State of Global Air 2019 report by the Health Effects Institute rated the U.S. as having the eighth cleanest air for particle pollution — which kills 85,000 Americans each year — behind Canada, Scandinavian countries and others. The U.S. ranks poorly on smog pollution, which kills 24,000 Americans per year. On a scale from the cleanest to the dirtiest, the U.S. is at 123 out of 195 countries measured.” [Associated Press, [6/5/19](https://www.apnews.com/a2e7024d43c9409087ec8d5245534092)]

### Reality: Administration’s Own Analysis Showed That Air Pollutants Would Increase Under Cars 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)]

## Rhetoric: We Have The Cleanest Water

***Trump****: “From day one, my administration has made it a top priority to ensure that America has among the very cleanest air and cleanest water on the planet. We want the cleanest air.” [Remarks by President Trump,* [*7/8/19*](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-americas-environmental-leadership/)*]*

### Reality: Tens of Millions of Americans Potentially Drink Unsafe Water

**Tens of Millions of Americans Potentially Drink Unsafe Water.**A study found tens of millions of Americans could be exposed to unsafe drinking water in any given year, consuming a wide spectrum of contaminants, including fecal coliform, lead and arsenic.  In 2015, nearly 21 million people relied on community water systems that violated health-based quality standards, according to the [study](http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2018/02/06/1719805115), published Monday in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. Although not all infractions pose immediate health concerns, drinking water contaminants can cause short-term illnesses such as gastroenteritis, as well as chronic conditions including cancer and neurological disorders.” [USA Today, [2/12/18](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/health/2018/02/12/tens-millions-americans-exposed-unsafe-drinking-water-each-year/330516002/)]

### Reality: Trump’s EPA Fails To Limit Chemicals Linked to Cancer and “Developmental Defects” in Drinking Water

**EPA Fails to Set Drinking Water Limits For Chemicals Linked to Cancer and “Developmental Defects.”** After intense pressure from politicians and environmental and public health groups, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) today published a plan to tackle industrial chemicals known as per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) that are showing up in drinking water supplies across the nation. But critics say the plan is vague and lacks regulatory teeth, and it will do little to reduce health risks. [Science, [2/14/19](https://www.sciencemag.org/news/2019/02/epa-blasted-failing-set-drinking-water-limits-forever-chemicals)]

Reality: United States Ranked 88th In Clean Air; 29th In Water Quality

**United States Ranks 88th On Exposure To Particulate Matter**. According to PolitiFact, “The United States ranks 88th on exposure to particulate matter, which Geddes called ‘a really good indicator for health effects from air pollution.’ The scientists used satellites and ground-based measurements to collect the data for 228 countries and territories dating from 2008 to 2015. That predates Trump. In general, however, changes between 2018 scores and the baseline (roughly 10 years earlier) are mixed and small, Wendling said.” [PolitiFact, [8/23/18](https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2018/aug/23/donald-trump/united-states-not-cleanest-country/)]

**United States Ranks 29th Overall In Water Quality**. According to PolitiFact, “The United States ranks 29th overall in water quality. In drinking water, it ranks first (alongside nine other countries) and in sanitation, 31st. ‘For both drinking water and sanitation, the United States is performing okay in absolute terms, with about 3.3 disability-adjusted life-years lost per 100,000 people from risks due to unsafe drinking water, as compared to 6.4 for unsafe sanitation,’ Wendling said.” [PolitiFact, [8/23/18](https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2018/aug/23/donald-trump/united-states-not-cleanest-country/)]

## Rhetoric: The US Is The World’s Biggest Oil And Gas Producer

***Trump****: “We’re seeing, on your watch, America become the number-one producer of oil and gas in the world.” [Remarks by President Trump,* [*7/8/19*](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-americas-environmental-leadership/)*]*

### Reality: Thanks, Obama

**The United States Has Exported More Energy Than We Imported Since 2015. "**The notion that “a revolution” in energy began under the Trump administration is wrong. The United States has exported more energy than it has imported since 2015 and has led the world in natural gas production [since 2009](https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=36292). Crude oil production has been increasing rapidly since 2010, reaching record levels in August 2018, according to [U.S. Energy Information Administration](https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=37416https://www.eia.gov/dnav/pet/pet_sum_snd_d_nus_mbblpd_m_cur-3.htm) data." [The Washington Post, [2/5/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/live-updates/trump-white-house/live-fact-checking-and-analysis-of-trumps-2019-state-of-the-union-address/the-u-s-is-the-largest-global-crude-oil-producer/?utm_term=.b56448235029)]

## Rhetoric: Trump Supported The Solar Industry

***Trump****: “My administration is now revising the past administration’s misguided regulations to better protect the environment and to protect our American workers, so importantly. As an example, there is a very good place for solar energy. I’m a believer in solar energy. It hasn’t fully developed. It’s got a long way to go, but it’s really got a tremendous future.” [Remarks by President Trump,* [*7/8/19*](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-americas-environmental-leadership/)*]*

### Reality: Billions of Dollars of Solar Projects Shelved Under Trump

**2018: Billions in U.S. Solar Projects Shelved After Trump panel tariff.**"President Donald Trump’s tariff on imported solar panels has led U.S. renewable energy companies to cancel or freeze investments of more than $2.5 billion in large installation projects, along with thousands of jobs, the developers told Reuters...The tariff’s bifurcated impact on the solar industry underscores how protectionist trade measures almost invariably hurt one or more domestic industries for every one they shield from foreign competition. Trump’s steel and aluminum tariffs, for instance, have hurt manufacturers of U.S. farm equipment made with steel, such as tractors and grain bins, along with the farmers buying them at higher prices. White House officials did not respond to a request for comment." [Reuters, [6/7/1](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-trump-effect-solar-insight/billions-in-u-s-solar-projects-shelved-after-trump-panel-tariff-idUSKCN1J30CT)8]

## Rhetoric: The Trump Administration' Worked To Protect Our Coasts

***Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality Mary Neumayr:*** *“One of the many important areas where President Trump has taken action is with regard to ocean policy. Our country is blessed with some of the most beautiful coastlines in the world. Our beaches are places for our families to enjoy, especially at this time of year. Our oceans provide a way of life, support diverse marine species and habitats, and offer recreational opportunities. Our oceans also support the livelihoods of millions of Americans. Coastal communities depend on clean, healthy waters.” [Remarks by President Trump,* [*7/8/19*](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-americas-environmental-leadership/)*]*

### Reality: Climate Change Threatens Our Coasts

**Climate Change Would Impact Coastal Flooding Due To Sea Level Rise And Increases In Heavy Rainfall**. According to the National Climate Assessment, “Coastal flooding is predominantly caused by storm surges that accompany hurricanes and other storms that push large seawater domes toward the shore. Storm surge can cause deaths, widespread infrastructure damage, and severe beach erosion. Storm-related rainfall can also cause inland flooding and is responsible for more than half of the deaths associated with tropical storms. Climate change affects coastal flooding through sea level rise and storm surge, and increases in heavy rainfall during storms.” [National Climate Assessment, Extreme Weather, [2014](http://nca2014.globalchange.gov/highlights/report-findings/extreme-weather#submenu-highlights-overview)]

**Navy Region Mid-Atlantic And The Greater Hampton Roads Area In Virginia Is One Of The Most Vulnerable To Flooding In The U.S.** According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Navy Region Mid-Atlantic and the greater Hampton Roads area is one of the most vulnerable to flooding military operational installation areas in the United States. Sea level rise, land subsidence, and changing ocean currents have resulted in more frequent nuisance flooding and increased vulnerability to coastal storms. As a result, and to better mitigate these issues, the Region has engaged in several initiatives and partnerships to address the associated challenges.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

### Reality: Trump Ocean Policy Threaten US Jobs

**Offshore Drilling Plan Threatened 2.6 Million Jobs and $180 Billion in GDP for Two Years’ Worth of Oil and One Year’s Worth of Gas.** “Oceana’s new economic analysis finds that the Trump administration’s offshore drilling plan threatens more than 2.6 million jobs and nearly $180 billion in GDP for only two years’-worth of oil and just over one year’s-worth of gas. Specifically, the analysis looks at the latest available data for ocean-dependent jobs and revenue from fishing, tourism and recreation along the coasts of Atlantic and Pacific states, as well as Florida’s Gulf coast.” [Oceana, accessed [3/27/19](https://usa.oceana.org/publications/reports/clean-coast-economy)]

**East Coast: 1.5 Million Jobs and $108 Billion.** “Offshore drilling threatens over 1.5 million jobs and nearly $108 billion in GDP along the East Coast for only seven month’s-worth of oil and six month’s-worth of gas.” [Oceana, accessed [3/27/19](https://usa.oceana.org/publications/reports/clean-coast-economy)]

**West Coast: 746,000 Jobs and $53 Billion.** “Offshore drilling threatens nearly 746,000 jobs and nearly $53 billion in GDP along the West Coast for only 12 month’s-worth of oil and four month’s-worth of gas.” [Oceana, accessed [3/27/19](https://usa.oceana.org/publications/reports/clean-coast-economy)]

**Almost Every Coastal Governor Opposed Offshore Drilling Expansion.** “That move by Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke drew accusations of favoritism, which have been denied. But the fact remains that nearly every governor with ocean coastline opposes drilling off their coast or, in one case, has concerns. The map paints a startling picture of opposition to the drilling proposal.” [CNN, [1/11/18](http://www.cnn.com/2018/01/11/politics/governors-ocean-coastline-offshore-drilling-trump/index.html)]

**22 Senators from 12 States Called for Drilling Exemption.**“Twenty-two Democratic U.S. senators from 12 states on Thursday joined the chorus of local representatives seeking exemptions from Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke’s newly proposed offshore drilling plan, after his surprise move on Tuesday to shield Florida.” [Reuters, [1/11/18](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-offshore-drilling-states/senators-from-12-states-seek-offshore-drilling-exemptions-like-floridas-idUSKBN1F02TP?feedType=RSS&feedName=newsOne)]

### Reality: Interior Handed Out 1,700 Exemptions to Offshore Safety Rules

**Interior Department Awarded Nearly 1,700 Exemptions to Offshore Safety Regulations; Many Were Waivers for Blowout Preventers.** “The Interior Department has given offshore oil drillers nearly 1,700 exemptions to Obama-era safety rules put in place after BP's 2010 Gulf of Mexico oil disaster, effectively gutting parts of the regulation before the Trump administration officially rolls them back. Those waivers were awarded in the first 20 months after the Well Control Rule took effect, according to data provided to POLITICO under a Freedom of Information Act request. The most common waivers were those that allowed the companies to sidestep tighter rules for blowout preventers — the device that failed to seal off BP's well after it erupted in 2010, killing 10 workers and spewing more than 200 million gallons of oil into the Gulf over five months.” [Politico, [2/25/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/02/25/offshore-drilling-trump-administration-interior-department-1190762)]

**Waivers Allowed Under Rule, but Agency Does Not Track Requests or Need to Make Them to Public.** “An Interior Department spokesperson said the waivers — also known as “departures,” “variances” and “alternative compliance” — are allowed under the Well Control Rule, but the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement does not track requests and is not required to make them public since they may include company’s trade secrets.” [Politico, [2/25/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/02/25/offshore-drilling-trump-administration-interior-department-1190762)]

**Over a Third of the Waivers Dealt With Blowout Preventers.** “More than a third of the 1,679 waivers granted during those 20 months allowed companies to deviate from regulations concerning tests that companies must perform on blowout preventers. The provisions had stipulated how often a blowout preventer should be tested, how long each test should last, and the parts that should be inspected.” [Politico, [2/25/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/02/25/offshore-drilling-trump-administration-interior-department-1190762)]

## Rhetoric: Trump Was Right On Wildfires

***Trump****: “I went to the fires in California and I said, ‘It’s also management.’ It’s a lot of things happening, but it’s management. You can’t have dirty floors. You can’t have 20 years of leaves and fallen trees. After the first 17 months, they say the tree is like a piece of tinder. You have to be very careful. So you can’t have that. That’s why you have so many fires.” [Remarks by President Trump,* [*7/8/19*](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-americas-environmental-leadership/)*]*

### Reality: Trump Ignored Underlying Causes of Wildfires According to Experts

**Trump Ignored Underlying Causes of Wildfires.**   "...Trump’s claim was swiftly and definitively debunked by fact-checkers and scientists who explained that not only has climate change has created conditions in California in which wildfires thrive, but also that a large portion of the affected area wasn’t a forest... Trump, however, is not only pretending that he was right all along, but now he’s going even further and falsely claiming California officials were enlightened by and acted upon his unscientific analysis of the fires... It is true that informed people have legitimate concerns about forest management in California, including the clearing of dead trees from forests. But even experts who take those concerns seriously criticized Trump for trying to pin most of the blame for wildfires on management while ignoring the most significant underlying causes." [Vox, [6/12/19](https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2019/6/12/18662634/trump-california-wildfires-iowa)]

**Trump Administration Attempted to Decrease Wildland Fire Management Budget by $116 Million.** “Under the Interior Department’s 2019 budget proposal funding for Wildland Fire Management would be decreased by $116 million, a devastating cut to an increasingly important area of land management that would limit support for preparedness and suppression in fire-prone areas. With fires burning longer and hotter across the West, decreased funding could have disastrous effects.” [Westwise,[3/7/19](https://medium.com/westwise/will-acting-interior-secretary-david-bernhardt-put-some-money-where-his-mouth-is-16a0ea330c5b)]

## Rhetoric: Superfund Sites Have Been Cleaned Up

***Trump****: “There may be no better example than our renewed focus on Superfund — the federal program that cleans up large, hazardous sites. In the past, it wasn’t unusual for a site to sit on the ‘Superfund: National Priorities List’ for decades. We believe that a site on the National Priorities List should be just that: a national priority.” [Remarks by President Trump,* [*7/8/19*](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-americas-environmental-leadership/)*]*

### Reality: Trump Administration Takes Credit for Work Done During Obama Administration and Earlier

**2017: Seven Superfund Sites Removed from EPA’s List During the Trump Administration Were Cleaned Up During the Obama Administration.**According to the Associated Press, the EPA touted “cleanups at seven of the nation’s most polluted places as a signature accomplishment in the Trump administration’s effort to reduce the number of Superfund sites, even though records show the physical work was completed before President Donald Trump took office.” [Associated Press, [1/5/2018](https://apnews.com/501eaf68d3f54f0eb9a90d3f271670c3)]

**Davis Timber Company Site Was Deleted in 2018, But Cleanup Took Place in 2011 and 2012.**According to The Hill, “…the Davis Timber Co. site in Mississippi was recently deleted from the list. But it was first listed in 2000, and cleanup activities took place in 2011 and 2012, funded in part by a jobs initiative from former President Obama.” [The Hill, [10/10/18](https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/410742-epa-removes-22-cleaned-up-sites-from-superfund-list)]

**Futon Terminals Site Was Deleted in 2018, But Cleanup Took Place in 1999.**  According to The Hill, “…the Fulton Terminals site in New York, was cleaned up in stages ending in 1999 and was partially removed from the Superfund list in 2015, but it wasn’t fully removed until this year.” [The Hill, [10/10/18](https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/410742-epa-removes-22-cleaned-up-sites-from-superfund-list)]

**AP: “The Trump Administration Is Taking Undue Credit For Cleanup Of Hazardous Industrial Sites That Was Largely Done Under President Barack Obama And Previous Administrations.”** According to the Associated Press, “The Trump administration is taking undue credit for cleanup of hazardous industrial sites that was largely done under President Barack Obama and previous administrations. In addition, Wheeler’s reference to a ‘renewed focus’ on the Superfund program ignores the fact that the administration recommended cutting the program’s budget 15%.” [Associated Press, [7/13/19](https://www.ctpost.com/news/article/AP-FACT-CHECK-Trump-and-an-eco-legacy-not-his-own-14093155.php)]

**AP: “It Takes Years, If Not Decades, To Clean Up A Superfund Site Before It Is Removed From The List. That Means The Construction Work…Would Have Been Largely Done Before The Trump Administration.”** According to the Associated Press, “It’s true that the EPA announced last year that it had deleted 22 Superfund toxic waste sites from the government’s national priorities list, the most since 2005. But it takes years, if not decades, to clean up a Superfund site before it is removed from the list. That means the construction work, such as removing soil or drilling wells to suck out contaminated groundwater, would have been largely done before the Trump administration. For instance, an analysis of EPA records by The Associated Press found that at seven Superfund sites the EPA took off the list in 2017 and boasted about, the physical cleanup was performed before Trump took office. Removing sites from the list is a procedural step that occurs after monitoring data show that remaining levels of harmful contaminates meet cleanup targets, which were often set by EPA decades ago. There are currently more than 1,300 Superfund sites on EPA’s National Priorities List at various stages in the cleanup process.” [Associated Press, [7/13/19](https://www.ctpost.com/news/article/AP-FACT-CHECK-Trump-and-an-eco-legacy-not-his-own-14093155.php)]

## Rhetoric: Carbon Emissions Are Falling

***Wheeler****: “From 1970 to 2018, U.S. criteria air pollution fell 74 percent. ... Under your administration, emissions of all the criteria air pollutants continue to decline. For example, the lead and sulfur dioxide have dropped by double-digit percentages over the last two years. Today, we have the cleanest air on record.” [Associated Press,* [*7/13/19*](https://www.ctpost.com/news/article/AP-FACT-CHECK-Trump-and-an-eco-legacy-not-his-own-14093155.php)*]*

### Reality: Air quality has not improved since Trump took office and air in the U.S. is not the cleanest on record.

**AP: “Wheeler Specifically Is Incorrect That Emissions For All Six Of The ‘Criteria’ Air Pollutants Tracked By EPA Have Declined During The Trump Administration.”** According to the Associated Press, “Wheeler specifically is incorrect that emissions for all six of the "criteria" air pollutants tracked by EPA have declined during the Trump administration. Of the six, three actually increased in 2017: carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide and two measures of particulate matter pollution. The other three, ozone, lead and sulfur dioxide, did decline.” [Associated Press, [7/13/19](https://www.ctpost.com/news/article/AP-FACT-CHECK-Trump-and-an-eco-legacy-not-his-own-14093155.php)]

**AP: “Over The Last Two Years The U.S. Had More Polluted Air Days Than Just A Few Years Earlier.”** According to the Associated Press, “Indeed, after decades of improvement, progress in air quality stalled. Over the last two years the U.S. had more polluted air days than just a few years earlier , according to EPA data analyzed by The AP. There were 15% more days with unhealthy air in America both last year and the year before than there were on average from 2013 through 2016, the four years when the U.S had its fewest number of those days since at least 1980, when the measurement started.” [Associated Press, [7/13/19](https://www.ctpost.com/news/article/AP-FACT-CHECK-Trump-and-an-eco-legacy-not-his-own-14093155.php)]

**AP: “The Health Effects Institute's State Of Global Air 2019 Report Ranked The U.S. 37th Dirtiest Out Of 195 Countries For Ozone.”** According to the Associated Press, “How is U.S. air quality doing overall? The Health Effects Institute's State of Global Air 2019 report ranked the U.S. 37th dirtiest out of 195 countries for ozone, also known as smog, worse than the global average for population-weighted pollution. Countries such as Britain, Japan, Spain, Portugal, France, Germany, Albania, Cuba, Russia, Vietnam, New Zealand and Canada have less smoggy air. The U.S. ranks 8th cleanest on the more deadly category of fine particles in the air. It's still behind countries such as Canada and New Zealand but better than the global average.” [Associated Press, [7/13/19](https://www.ctpost.com/news/article/AP-FACT-CHECK-Trump-and-an-eco-legacy-not-his-own-14093155.php)]

**AP: “Records For The Fewest Air Polluted Days Were Set During The Obama Administration**.” [Associated Press, [7/13/19](https://www.ctpost.com/news/article/AP-FACT-CHECK-Trump-and-an-eco-legacy-not-his-own-14093155.php)]

## Rhetoric: There Is A War On American Energy

***Trump****: “The previous administration waged a relentless war on American energy.” [Associated Press,* [*7/13/19*](https://www.ctpost.com/news/article/AP-FACT-CHECK-Trump-and-an-eco-legacy-not-his-own-14093155.php)*]*

### Reality: Accusation Is Hard To Sustain Given The Rise Of U.S. Energy Under Obama

**AP: “In 2013, The U.S. Became The World's Top Producer Both Of Natural Gas And Petroleum Hydrocarbons.”** According to the Associated Press, “This accusation is hard to sustain given the rise of U.S. energy under Obama. In 2013, the U.S. became the world's top producer both of natural gas and petroleum hydrocarbons, says the government's U.S. Energy Information Administration. As for crude oil specifically, the agency says the U.S. became the world's top crude oil producer last year. That is largely attributed to the shale oil boom that began late in George W. Bush's administration and proceeded apace during the Obama years.” [Associated Press, [7/13/19](https://www.ctpost.com/news/article/AP-FACT-CHECK-Trump-and-an-eco-legacy-not-his-own-14093155.php)]

According to the Associated Press, “The boom came because of fracking and other technology, such as horizontal drilling, that made it possible to find a lot more oil and gas without drilling more holes. (As a senator, Obama voted for a 2005 law that exempted fracking from a range of regulations.) As president, Obama did impose fracking regulations on federal lands that were challenged by industry, then overturned by Trump, but he did little to slow the surge, especially on state and private lands. Altogether, the government issued permits for about 30,000 new oil and gas wells on federal lands during Obama’s presidency.” [Associated Press, [7/13/19](https://www.ctpost.com/news/article/AP-FACT-CHECK-Trump-and-an-eco-legacy-not-his-own-14093155.php)]

**AP: “Despite His Keen Focus On Wind And Solar Power, The Greatest Energy Revolution Of The Past Half Century Happened On [Obama’s] Watch.”** According to the Associated Press, “Perhaps the central paradox of the Obama energy policy is that, despite his keen focus on wind and solar power, the greatest energy revolution of the past half century happened on his watch as U.S. petroleum and natural gas production achieved pre-eminence.” [Associated Press, [7/13/19](https://www.ctpost.com/news/article/AP-FACT-CHECK-Trump-and-an-eco-legacy-not-his-own-14093155.php)]

***Trump****: “Since 2000, our nation’s energy-related carbon emissions have declined more than any other country on Earth. Think of that. Emissions are projected to drop in 2019 and 2020. We’re doing a very tough job and not everybody knows it, and that’s one of the reasons we’re here today to speak to you.” [Remarks by President Trump,* [*7/8/19*](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-americas-environmental-leadership/)*]*

**Politico: “Downward Trend Appears To Have Reversed Itself In 2018, When Greenhouse Gases Began Rising Again After Falling To A 25-Year Low.”** According to Politico, “Air pollution in the U.S. has indeed plummeted since Congress last overhauled the Clean Air Act in 1990, at least judged by EPA data on several key pollutants. But that downward trend appears to have reversed itself in 2018, when greenhouse gases began rising again after falling to a 25-year low in 2017. The Rhodium Group, an independent research group, said in May that U.S. greenhouse gas emissions increased by as much as 2.5 percent last year, while efforts to lessen carbon pollution by the utility industry slowed in 2018.” [Politico, [7/8/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/07/08/fact-check-trumps-environmental-claims-1573352)]

**Politico: Analysis “Shows A 15 Percent Increase In The Number Of High Air Pollution Days In The Two Years Of The Trump Administration As Compared With The Last Four Years Of The Obama Administration.”** According to Politico, “Trump has also flopped on clean air in general, according to an Associated Press analysis of EPA data. It shows a 15 percent increase in the number of high air pollution days in the two years of the Trump administration as compared with the last four years of the Obama administration. That’s a setback from a long-term decline under the previous four presidents, which has led to emissions of sulfur dioxide – a component of acid rain – to fall 88 percent below 1990 levels, according to EPA data. Lead pollution in air is down 80 percent over the same period, and soot and nitrogen dioxide are down between 34 and 56 percent. Ground-level ozone, which causes smog, is down 22 percent.” [Politico, [7/8/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/07/08/fact-check-trumps-environmental-claims-1573352)]

***Trump****: “And for the first time in nearly 30 years, we’re in the process of strengthening national drinking water standards to protect vulnerable children from lead and copper exposure — something that has not been done, and we’re doing it. And last month, our EPA took the first major action in nearly two decades to reduce exposure to lead-contaminated dust.” [Remarks by President Trump,* [*7/8/19*](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-americas-environmental-leadership/)*]*

### Reality: Trump Only Acted When Ordered By Court

**Politico: “The Trump Administration Has Touted Its Work To Reduce Childhood Exposure To Lead, A Potent Neurotoxin, But Has Taken Few Concrete Steps That Weren’t Legally Mandated.”** According to Politico, “The Trump administration has touted its work to reduce childhood exposure to lead, a potent neurotoxin, but has taken few concrete steps that weren’t legally mandated. The Trump administration struggled to reconcile the need to replace millions of lead service lines around the country with the cost of doing so. EPA finally sent a proposal to the White House for review last month. EPA has said that rule will make a priority of replacing the most corrosive lines first and will require lead lines to be mapped, monitored and ultimately replaced over a 30-year period.” [Politico, [7/8/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/07/08/fact-check-trumps-environmental-claims-1573352)]

**EPA Finalized Rule On Lead Dust After Court Order**. According to Politico, “Late last month, the agency also finished a new rule tightening standards for lead dust on floors and window sills — a move required by court order. But environmental groups criticized the rule for not addressing requirements for tests of dust after rehabilitation.” [Politico, [7/8/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/07/08/fact-check-trumps-environmental-claims-1573352)]

Rhetoric: Paris is Bad

***Trump****: “I withdrew the United States from the unfair, ineffective, and very, very expensive Paris Climate Accord.” [Remarks by President Trump,* [*7/8/19*](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-americas-environmental-leadership/)*]*

Reality: The Paris Agreement Is A Good Deal For The US

**Foreign Policy Magazine: “Leaving The Paris Agreement Is A Bad Deal For The United States.”** According to Foreign Policy, “The U.S. House of Representatives passed legislation this month aimed at preventing President Donald Trump’s withdrawal from the 2016 Paris climate accord and mandating that the United States develop a strategy to achieve the commitments it made under the agreement. The Republican-controlled Senate is unlikely to give it the green light—and Trump could begin withdrawal procedures in November and formally withdraw from Paris a day after the 2020 election. All indications suggest that this is his goal. In Trump’s June 2017 speech announcing his intent to leave the accord, he disparaged it, saying it ‘punishes’ the United States while imposing ‘no meaningful obligations’ on major polluters, such as China and India, that will take advantage of the United States’ supposed sacrifice. Ever since, many Republicans, including Sen. Ted Cruz and Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, have backed him up by crying foul that other countries got a better deal.” [Foreign Policy, [5/19/19](https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/05/19/leaving-the-paris-agreement-is-a-bad-deal-for-the-united-states/)]

**“The Paris Climate Agreement: A Good Deal For The United States. An Essential Deal For The Planet.”** According to Earthjustice, “For the first time in history, the Paris Agreement brought all nations—developed and developing, and including China and India—together to fight the climate crisis. U.S. leadership was critical in getting us there. Instead of questioning our leadership and involvement, Mr. Trump should help our country do more to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to accelerate the clean energy transition.” [Earthjustice, 3/27/19]

# Green New Deal

Rhetoric: Green New Deal Would Cost $93 Trillion

*Mitch McConnell: “All this and more can be ours -- for the low, low price of a staggering expansion of centralized government and -- wait for it -- upwards of 93 trillion dollars. $93 trillion is more than every dollar our federal government has spent in its entire history to date, combined. It’s more than the combined annual GDP of every nation on Earth.” [Senator Mitch McConnell,* [*3/6/19*](https://www.mcconnell.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2019/3/green-new-deal-would-bankrupt-american-middle-class)*]*

Reality: Study Fabricated Cost of Green New Deal

**Politico: $93 Trillion Figure Does Not Appear In In Think Tank Report**. According to Politico, “The number originated with a report by a conservative think tank, American Action Forum, that made huge assumptions about how Democrats would implement their plan. But the $93 trillion figure does not appear anywhere in the think tank’s report — and AAF President Douglas Holtz-Eakin confessed he has no idea how much the Green New Deal would cost. ‘Is it billions or trillions?’ asked Holtz-Eakin, a former director of the Congressional Budget Office. ‘Any precision past that is illusory.’” [Politico, [3/10/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/03/10/republican-green-new-deal-attack-1250859)]

**Politico: Republican Talking Point On $93 Trillion Cost Of GND Is “Essentially Vapor.”** According to Politico, “A shockingly high cost estimate largely plucked from thin air has become a prominent talking point for Republicans denouncing the Green New Deal — allowing them to attack progressives’ sweeping-but-vague vision statement without explaining what the GOP wants to do about climate change. The number — $93 trillion, or more than four times the size of the U.S. economy — is essentially vapor: It originated with a report from the conservative think tank American Action Forum but does not appear anywhere in the report itself. And AAF President Douglas Holtz-Eakin confessed he has no idea how much exactly the Green New Deal would cost to implement.” [Politico, [3/8/19](https://subscriber.politicopro.com/energy/article/2019/03/republicans-seize-on-tenuous-price-tag-to-attack-green-new-deal-1250859)]

**GOP Estimates On Cost Of Green New Deal Are “Based On Sweeping Assumptions About Universal Healthcare And Jobs Programs Rather Than The Costs Of Transitioning To Carbon-Free Electricity And Transportation.”** According to Politico, “To come up with the total, Republicans added together the cost estimates that the report’s authors placed on various aspects of a Green New Deal platform. Most of those were based on sweeping assumptions about universal healthcare and jobs programs rather than the costs of transitioning to carbon-free electricity and transportation. ‘There’s a race for think-tankers, analysts and academia to be the first to come up with a number, and you can see why — look at how many people latched onto that $93 trillion number,’ said Nick Loris, an economist at the conservative Heritage Foundation. ‘A lot of times you just see the number and you don’t get a lot of the backstory behind the number.’” [Politico, [3/8/19](https://subscriber.politicopro.com/energy/article/2019/03/republicans-seize-on-tenuous-price-tag-to-attack-green-new-deal-1250859)]

**Politico: “$80.6 Trillion Of The Costs In AAF’s Study Come From A Jobs Guarantee And Universal Health Care.”** According to Politico, “In fact, $80.6 trillion of the costs in AAF’s study come from a jobs guarantee and universal health care. The Green New Deal resolution calls for guaranteeing a job’ and providing high-quality health care to everyone, but it is primarily focused on outlining a set of goals to get the U.S. economy to net-zero carbon emissions by mid-century. While liberal activists say economic justice must be a part of any eventual policy based on the resolution, most see the Green New Deal itself as a vehicle for an energy transition and industrial economic policy, rather than something more sweeping, like ‘Medicare for All.’” [Politico, [3/10/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/03/10/republican-green-new-deal-attack-1250859)]

Reality: No Plan Exists To Base Cost Estimated In GOP Study

**Politico: “The Green New Deal Isn’t Even A Plan Yet.”** According to Politico, “The Green New Deal isn’t even a plan yet — at the moment it’s a non-binding resolution that calls for major action to stop greenhouse gas pollution while reducing income inequality and creating ‘millions of good, high-wage jobs.’ But top Republicans have embraced the $93 trillion price tag, using it to argue that the climate plan would bankrupt the United States.” [Politico, [3/10/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/03/10/republican-green-new-deal-attack-1250859)]

**Robert Stavins , Environmental Economist At Harvard University: Cost Of Green New Deal Was “Exceptionally Speculative.”** According to Politico, “‘Given that the [Green New Deal] is at this point simply a set of long-term goals, without any specification of how those goals would be achieved, any estimate of cost is itself likely to be exceptionally speculative,’ Robert Stavins, an environmental economist at Harvard University, said in an email.” [Politico, [3/10/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/03/10/republican-green-new-deal-attack-1250859)]

Reality: Studies Warning Of Regulations Often Exaggerate Costs

**PEW: “Government Regulation: Costs Lower, Benefits Greater Than Industry Estimates.”** According to Pew, “Regulatory requirements to protect the environment, workers, and consumers often lead to innovation, increased productivity, and new businesses and jobs. Although an argument is sometimes made that the cost of complying with regulations is too high, that the societal benefits do not justify the investment, or that job losses will result, a review of past regulations reveals just the opposite. Historically, compliance costs have been less and benefits greater than industry predictions, and regulation typically poses little challenge to economic competitiveness.” [PEW, May [2015](https://www.pewtrusts.org/-/media/assets/2015/05/industry/government_regulation_costs_lower_benefits_greater_than_industry_estimates.pdf)]

**PEW: “History Shows, However, That These Cost-Based Assumptions Focus On And Overstate Adverse Economic Impacts While Devaluing Societal Benefits.”** According to Pew, “Opposition persists, based on anticipated costs, to new regulations intended to reduce pollution emissions, save money, and increase the country’s energy security. History shows, however, that these cost-based assumptions focus on and overstate adverse economic impacts while devaluing societal benefits. Policymakers should account for any environmental and human health benefits as well as opportunities for economic growth presented by new or proposed regulations. Research shows that regulation routinely fosters innovation and promotes economic competitiveness.” [PEW, May [2015](https://www.pewtrusts.org/-/media/assets/2015/05/industry/government_regulation_costs_lower_benefits_greater_than_industry_estimates.pdf)]

Reality: Cost Of Climate Inaction Could Reach $69 Trillion Worldwide

**Intergovernmental Panel On Climate Change: Cost Of 2 Degree Rise In Global Temperatures Could Reach $69 Trillion**. According to Politico, “The United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change said in October that the global cost of temperatures rising 1½ degrees Celsius — the target the Green New Deal aims to avoid — would be $54 trillion in 2100. That would rise to $69 trillion in a 2-degree scenario. Those targets also served as the basis of the 2015 Paris climate agreement, which Trump has announced plans to abandon.” [Politico, [3/10/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/03/10/republican-green-new-deal-attack-1250859)]

Reality: American Action Forum Is A Republican Dark Money Group

**American Action Forum Is Sister Organization Of American Action Network Exempt From Donor Disclosure Rules**. The American Action Network’s policy arm and “sister organization,” the American Action Forum, is a 501(c)(3) organization and is also exempt from disclosing its donors. Douglas Holtz-Eakin, previously a senior policy adviser for John McCain’s 2008 presidential run, is the forum’s current president. Malek also serves as the group’s chairman. Other members of American Action Forum leadership include former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush and former Secretary of Labor Elaine Chao. Chao is now a distinguished fellow at the Heritage Foundation. She is also married to Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell.” [FactChek.Org, [2/16/14](https://www.factcheck.org/2014/02/american-action-networkamerican-action-forum/)]

**AAN Was Founded By Former Republican Senator And Republican Strategist**. According to FactCheck.Org, “The American Action Network — a self-described “action tank” that advocates for “center-right policies” — was founded in February 2010 before the midterm congressional elections. It was started by Norm Coleman, a former Republican senator from Minnesota, and Fred Malek, a longtime Republican fundraiser and strategist.” [FactChek.Org, [2/16/14](https://www.factcheck.org/2014/02/american-action-networkamerican-action-forum/)]

**AAN Is A 501(C)(4) Organization That Does Not Disclose Donors**. According to FactCheck.Org, “The American Action Network is a 501(c)(4) organization and, therefore, does not have to disclose its donors. The group raised $22.6 million in the fiscal year that ended June 30, 2012, and $24.4 million from July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013. Federal Election Commission records indicate that the American Action Network spent $11.1 million during the 2012 campaign on TV ads and other independent expenditures — placing it among the top 25 biggest outside spenders in that campaign cycle. But that was down from nearly $19 million in the 2010 cycle — the third highest amount spent in that cycle.” [FactChek.Org, [2/16/14](https://www.factcheck.org/2014/02/american-action-networkamerican-action-forum/)]

Reality: Previous Research By American Action Network Repeatedly Rated As False

**American Action Network Has Received Ratings Of Mostly False, Half True, And Pants On Fire By PolitiFact**. [PolitiFact, accessed [3/6/19](https://www.politifact.com/personalities/american-action-network/statements/by/)]

* **AAN Statement Ed Perlmutter Voted For "Viagra For Rapists" Paid For With Tax Dollars. Rated PANTS ON FIRE**. [PolitiFact, [10/26/10](https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2010/oct/26/american-action-network/viagra-sex-offenders-paid-health-care-bill-nope/)]
* **AAN Statement "Under Conservative Leadership, Congress Has Reduced The Federal Deficit By 60 Percent – Nearly $800 Billion" Rated MOSTLY FALSE**. [PolitiFact, [12/11/15](https://www.politifact.com/wisconsin/statements/2015/dec/11/american-action-network/conservatives-slashed-federal-deficit-60-group-say/)]
* **AAN Statement Under The American Health Care Act "People With Pre-Existing Conditions Are Protected” Rated MOSTLY FALSE**. [PolitiFact, [5/24/17](https://www.politifact.com/florida/statements/2017/may/24/american-action-network/conservative-groups-ad-misleads-about-pre-existing/)]
* **AAN Statement Says The Republican Tax Plan ‘Helps Families’ Like One In Which A Woman Lost Her Job And Then Lost Her Life Savings Fighting Her Husband’s Cancer Rated Half True.** [PolitiFact, [11/13/17](https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2017/nov/13/american-action-network/how-would-gop-tax-bills-affect-families-strapped-b/)]

Rhetoric: Green New Deal Would Raise Taxes

*Justin Haskins, Fox News: “All this would hit American families and businesses hard in the wallet – not just with increased taxes to fund the Green New Deal but with dramatically higher prices of much of what we buy.” [Fox News,* [*2/8/19*](https://www.foxnews.com/opinion/democrats-green-new-deal-is-a-crazy-new-deal-that-would-be-a-disaster-for-us-all)*]*

Reality: Green New Deal Does Not Raise Taxes

**PolitiFact: Green New Deal Doesn't Lay Out Any New Taxes Or Revenue Streams**. According to PolitiFact, “Broadly, these resolutions address ways to curb climate change and protect the environment. It doesn't lay out any new taxes or revenue streams other than saying that these changes will pay for themselves.” [PolitiFact, [2/12/19](https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/article/2019/feb/12/seven-questions-about-green-new-deal/)]

Rhetoric: Green New Deal Would End Air Travel, Outlaw Cows

*President Trump: But I really don't like their policy of taking away your car, of taking away your airplane flights, of, 'Let's hop a train to California,' of ... 'You're not allowed to own cows anymore.” [CNN, El Paso Speech,* [*2/11/19*](https://www.cnn.com/2019/02/12/politics/donald-trump-el-paso-beto-orourke/index.html)*]*

Reality: Green New Deal Would Not End Air Travel, Prohibit Cows

**Washington Post Fact Checker: “There’s Nothing In There About Putting An End To Cars Or Cows Or Air Travel Or The Military.”** According to the Washington Post, “The resolution in Congress is full of sweeping ambition and grand goals, but it’s also vaguer and more moderate than he says. There’s nothing in there about putting an end to cars or cows or air travel or the military.” [Washington Post, [2/11/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/02/11/whats-actually-green-new-deal-democrats/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.c143afdb0622)]

**Washington Post Fact Checker: “Trump Is Misrepresenting The Green New Deal As The Plan Is Currently Written.”** According to the Washington Post, “Trump is misrepresenting the Green New Deal as the plan is currently written. The resolution in Congress is full of sweeping ambition and grand goals, but it’s also vaguer and more moderate than he says. There’s nothing in there about putting an end to cars or cows or air travel or the military.” [Washington Post, [2/11/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/02/11/whats-actually-green-new-deal-democrats/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.c143afdb0622)]

Rhetoric: Green New Deal Would Eliminate 99% of Cars

*The Federalist: “Eliminate 99 percent of cars. To be fair, under the GND, everyone will need to retrofit their cars with Flintstones-style foot holes or pedals for cycling. The authors state that the GND would like to replace every “combustion-engine vehicle” — trucks, airplanes, boats, and 99 percent of cars — within ten years.” [The Federalist,* [*2/7/19*](http://thefederalist.com/2019/02/07/ten-most-insane-requirements-green-new-deal/)*]*

Reality: Green New Deal Would Eliminate Cars

**Washington Post Fact Checker: “No One Is Proposing To ‘Eliminate All Planes, Cars, Cows, Oil, Gas And The Military.”** [Washington Post, [2/11/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/02/11/whats-actually-green-new-deal-democrats/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.c143afdb0622)]

Rhetoric: Green New Deal Would Eliminate Fossil Fuels

*Republican National Committee: “‘This deal is going to cost a lot of green. Here’s what the Green New Deal socialist wish list will look like in the real world,’ advises a Republican National Committee analysis of the Ocasio-Cortez proposal. ‘To fully decarbonize the economy alone would be a ‘dramatic’ and unrealistic transition, and could cost at least $2 trillion, a goal that one scholar has stated defies the laws of physics. Eliminating fossil fuels completely would put at least a million Americans out of work.” [Washington Times,* [*2/7/19*](https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2019/feb/7/inside-the-beltway-alexandria-ocasio-cortez-turns-/)*]*

Reality: Green New Deal Won’t Eliminate Fossil Fuels

**Politico: Green New Deal “Does Not Explicitly Call For Eliminating Fossil Fuels Themselves.”** According to Politico, “The text includes an aim to “achieve net-zero greenhouse gas emissions for a fair and just transition for frontline communities and displaced workers,” among other high-level ambitions. It also opens the door to using still-unproven technology to eliminate carbon pollution from fossil fuel use — an avenue that many climate activists dismiss as an expensive dead end. But it does not explicitly call for eliminating fossil fuels themselves.” [Politico, [2/4/19](https://www.politico.com/story/2019/02/04/green-new-deal-fossil-fuels-1142544)]

**Washington Examiner: Green New Deal “Does Not Explicitly Call For The End Of Fossil Fuels Or A Shift To 100 Percent Renewable Energy.”** According to the Washington Examiner, “Centrist Democrats and some environmental groups are welcoming a subtle shift in the ‘Green New Deal’ that could help broaden its support beyond progressives. A ‘Green New Deal’ resolution unveiled Thursday does not explicitly call for the end of fossil fuels or a shift to 100 percent renewable energy, as originally intended. Instead, the proposal, introduced by Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, D-N.Y., and Sen. Ed Markey, D-Mass., would mandate ‘net-zero greenhouse gas emissions’ by 2030 but allow for noncarbon-emitting energy sources that aren’t wind and solar power to reach the goal.” [Washington Examiner, [2/7/19](https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/policy/energy/green-new-deal-could-win-over-centrists-by-avoiding-a-ban-on-fossil-fuels)]

Rhetoric: GND Would Require Every Building In Country To Be Rebuilt

*Hugh Hewitt: It will take courage on the part of debate moderators and panelists to press the would-be nominees assembled on the cow-unfriendly, airplane-ending, 100 percent rebuild-of-every-building exercise in “massive” government coercion (“massive” or “massively” being the single most used word in the Green New Deal manifesto), but that’s what the media exists to do, right? [Washington Post,* [*2/11/19*](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2019/02/11/what-we-should-ask-democrats-about-green-new-deal/?utm_term=.70b32692652d)*]*

Reality: Green New Deal Does Not Require Rebuilding All Existing Buildings

**Green New Deal Resolution Called For “Upgrading” Existing Buildings.** “Upgrading all existing buildings in the United States and building new buildings to achieve maximal energy efficiency, water efficiency, safety, affordability, comfort, and durability, including through electrification.” [Green New Deal Resolution, [2/5/19](https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/5729033/Green-New-Deal-FINAL.pdf#page=8)]

Rhetoric: Green New Deal Promised Free College For Every American

*The Federalist: Free education for life. GND promises free college or trade schools for every American. [The Federalist,* [*2/7/19*](http://thefederalist.com/2019/02/07/ten-most-insane-requirements-green-new-deal/)*]*

Reality: Green New Deal Called For Education As Part Of Mobilization To Achieve Lower Emissions

**Green New Deal Resolution Did Not Contain Promise Of Free Education**. The Green New Deal Resolution stated, “To achieve the Green New Deal goals and mobilization, a Green New Deal will require the following goals and projects… providing resources, training, and high-quality education, including higher education, to all people of the United States, with a focus on frontline and vulnerable communities, so those communities may be full and equal participants in the Green New Deal mobilization.” [Green New Deal Resolution, [2/5/19](https://assets.documentcloud.org/documents/5729033/Green-New-Deal-FINAL.pdf#page=8)]

**Ocasio-Cortez Said Statements In FAQs Were Not Officially Part Of Green New Deal**. According to the Washington Post, “On Saturday, however, Ocasio-Cortez walked back all the statements in the FAQs. ‘Point is, the real one is our submitted resolution, H.Res. 109,’ she tweeted. Ocasio-Cortez also said: ‘There are multiple doctored GND resolutions and FAQs floating around. There was also a draft version that got uploaded + taken down. There’s also draft versions floating out there.’” [Washington Post, [2/11/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/02/11/whats-actually-green-new-deal-democrats/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.c143afdb0622)]

**Ocasio-Cortez’s Green New Deal Was A Resolution Without Force Of Law**. According to the Washington Post, “Even if it passed, the resolution would not have the force of law. Resolutions like this are broad statements about policy priorities. Ocasio-Cortez’s office says a formal legislative proposal would come later.” [Washington Post, [2/11/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/02/11/whats-actually-green-new-deal-democrats/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.c143afdb0622)]

Rhetoric: Green New Deal Threatens Electrical Grid

*Andrew Wheeler: “I am concerned that they really don’t seem to value a stable electricity source, grid reliability. For human health and the environment here at the agency, I have to be very concerned about that because it’s the electricity system that supplies our drinking water system and runs it. It’s not really addressed in their Green Deal.” [ABC News,* [*2/13/19*](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/epa-chief-andrew-wheeler-calls-toxic-chemicals-drinking/story?id=61004327)*]*

Reality: Green New Deal Would Not Threaten Electrical Grid

**Vox: “But [Wheeler’s] Notion That The Green New Deal Would Threaten The Stability Of The Power Grid Doesn’t Hold Water.”** According to Vox, “But his notion that the Green New Deal would threaten the stability of the power grid doesn’t hold water. The proposal calls for a vast deployment of renewable energy sources like wind and solar power alongside a rapid drawdown of fossil fuels like coal and natural gas in order to make the United States carbon neutral by 2030. Presumably, Wheeler’s reasoning is that more intermittent energy sources like wind and solar on the grid will make it harder to keep the lights on and keep water treatment plants running.” [Vox, [2/15/19](https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2019/2/15/18224844/green-new-deal-epa-andrew-wheeler)]

**Vox: “Power Analysts Have Also Determined That The US Grid Can Decarbonize By 80 Percent Using Just Existing Technology.”** According to Vox, “Researchers have found that renewables like wind and solar power can also complement each other throughout the day and over the course the year to reduce the need for energy storage and backup generation. Power analysts have also determined that the US grid can decarbonize by 80 percent using just existing technology.” [Vox, [2/15/19](https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2019/2/15/18224844/green-new-deal-epa-andrew-wheeler)]

**Vox: “As For The Things That Do Pose A Threat To Grid Stability, The Infrastructure Exposed To Storms, Fires, And Heat Stands To Be The Bigger Vulnerability.”** According to Vox, “As for the things that do pose a threat to grid stability, the infrastructure exposed to storms, fires, and heat stands to be the bigger vulnerability. ‘By far the most important environmental factor affecting [electricity transmission, storage, and distribution] infrastructure needs now and going forward is global climate change,’ the US Department of Energy noted in its 2015 Quadrennial Energy Review.” [Vox, [2/15/19](https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2019/2/15/18224844/green-new-deal-epa-andrew-wheeler)]

Rhetoric: We Reduced Greenhouse Gases By Market Forces

*[Western Energy] Alliance Pres. @KathleenSgamma spoke about #GreenNewDeal on @1310kfkanews. "If you look at what's happened in the US, we've reduced greenhouse gas emissions more than any other nation in the world. The way we did that is through market forces. [Twitter,* [*2/12/19*](https://twitter.com/WesternEnergy1/status/1095406391697666048)*]*

Reality: Carbon Emissions Are Again On The Rise

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions Rose By 3.4% In The US In 2018**. According to the Rhodium Group, “After three years of decline, US carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions rose sharply last year. Based on preliminary power generation, natural gas, and oil consumption data, we estimate emissions increased by 3.4% in 2018. This marks the second largest annual gain in more than two decades — surpassed only by 2010 when the economy bounced back from the Great Recession.” [Rhodium Group, [1/8/19](https://rhg.com/research/preliminary-us-emissions-estimates-for-2018/)]

**Electricity Demand, Increase In Consumption Of Diesel, Jet Fuel, And Industrial Fuels Spurred Increase**. According to the Rhodium Group, “While a record number of coal-fired power plants were retired last year, natural gas not only beat out renewables to replace most of this lost generation but also fed most of the growth in electricity demand. As a result, power sector emissions overall rose by 1.9%. The transportation sector held its title as the largest source of US emissions for the third year running, as robust growth in demand for diesel and jet fuel offset a modest decline in gasoline consumption. The buildings and industrial sectors also both posted big year-on-year emissions gains.” [Rhodium Group, [1/8/19](https://rhg.com/research/preliminary-us-emissions-estimates-for-2018/)]

Rhetoric: Republicans Have A Plan To Address Climate Change

*House GOP Op-Ed: The reality is, the Green New Deal is a policy of regulation, taxation, and ultimately, economic stagnation. Americans deserve better. That’s why we back sensible, realistic, and effective policies to tackle climate change. [Real Clear Policy,* [*2/13/19*](https://www.realclearpolicy.com/articles/2019/02/13/republicans_have_better_solutions_to_climate_change_111045.html)*]*

Reality: Republican Led House Voted Repeatedly To Restrict EPA Authority

**2018: House Passed FY 2019 Appropriations Bill That Would Restrict Greenhouse Gas Emissions Regulations and Limit Funding for Endangered Species Protections.** According to CQ, the bill “would make available $58.7 billion through fiscal 2019, with $35.3 billion for the Department of Interior and environmental programs, and $23.4 billion for financial services matters and related agencies. Specifically, it would provide $8 billion for the Environmental Protection Agency, $3.1 billion for the U.S. Forest Service, non-wildfire, core functions, $13 billion for the Interior Department, and $11.6 billion for the Internal Revenue Service. It would also place $585 million into a "savings account" that could not be used until the federal budget is balanced. As amended, it would also restrict greenhouse gas emissions regulations and would limit funding for enforcement of endangered species-protections for certain animals. Other amendments would also prohibit the District of Columbia from enforcing certain health care-related provisions.” The bill passed by a vote of 217-199. [HR 6147, House vote [#365](http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2018/roll365.xml), 7/19/18; CQ Floor Votes, 7/19/18]

**2017: House Passed Bill to Delay Ozone Standards**. On July 18, 2017, the United States House of Representatives voted on the Ozone Standards Implementation Act of 2017. The Measure passed by a 229-199 vote. According to Roll Call, “House Republicans plan to vote this week on a measure that would delay the compliance date for an Obama-era ground level ozone standard that they say would put an undue economic burden on industry. The bill (HR 806) would also give legal cover to the Environmental Protection Agency as its administrator, former Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt, looks to replace the current standards with levels more flexible for states and their economic development plans.” The bill passed 229-199. [United States House of Representatives, Roll Call 391, [7/18/17](http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2017/roll391.xml); Roll Call, [7/17/17](https://www.rollcall.com/news/policy/house-takes-bill-delay-ozone-rule-compliance)]

**2017: House Passed Bill To Prevent EPA From Using Best Available Science In Studies**. According to LCV, “Rep. Lamar Smith (R-TX) introduced H.R. 1430, the “HONEST Act,” which would endanger public health by making it extremely difficult for the EPA to use the best available science. The bill contains favorable exemptions for industry and would restrict the health studies that the EPA is able to use by requiring that data is shared with anyone willing to sign a vague confidentiality agreement. These provisions would severely limit the EPA’s ability to use data that includes studies with confidential health information, which are the basis for the best research on the health effects of pollution. This legislation would result in less effective public health protections. On March 29, the House approved H.R. 1430 (House roll call vote 206) by a vote of 228-194. NO IS THE PRO-ENVIRONMENT VOTE.” The bill passed 228-194. [LCV Scorecard, 2017; House of Representatives, Roll Call 206, [3/29/17](http://clerk.house.gov/evs/2017/roll206.xml)]

Reality: No Republican Bill To Reduce Carbon Considered By Senate Under McConnell

**No Republicans Bills To Reduce Carbon Considered In Senate Since 2015**. According to Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer, “Since Republicans took control of this Chamber in 2015, they have not brought a single Republican bill to meaningfully reduce carbon emissions to the floor of the Senate—not one bill. Republicans have controlled this Chamber for 4 years and have not brought a single bill to significantly reduce carbon emissions.” [Congressional Record, [2/14/19](https://www.congress.gov/116/crec/2019/02/14/CREC-2019-02-14-senate.pdf)]

Reality: Affordable Clean Energy Plan Would Not Stop Threat Of Climate Change

**Washington Post: “New Trump Power Plant Plan Would Release Hundreds Of Millions Of Tons Of CO2 Into The Air.”** According to the Washington Post, “President Trump plans this week to unveil a proposal that would empower states to establish emission standards for coal-fired power plants rather than speeding their retirement — a major overhaul of the Obama administration’s signature climate policy. The plan, which is projected to release at least 12 times the amount of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere compared with the Obama rule over the next decade, comes as scientists have warned that the world will experience increasingly dire climate effects absent a major cut in carbon emissions.” [Washington Post, [8/18/18](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/new-trump-power-plant-plan-would-release-hundreds-of-millions-of-tons-of-co2-into-the-air/2018/08/18/be823078-a28e-11e8-83d2-70203b8d7b44_story.html?utm_term=.1ddd9a25eb7c)]

**Trump EPA Analysis Of ACE Projected Plan Would Only Slightly Cut Emissions**. According to the Washington Post, “The Environmental Protection Agency’s own impact analysis, which runs nearly 300 pages, projects that the proposal would make only slight cuts to overall emissions of pollutants — including carbon dioxide, sulfur dioxide and nitrogen oxides — over the next decade. The Obama rule, by contrast, dwarfs those cuts by a factor of more than 12.” [Washington Post, [8/18/18](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/new-trump-power-plant-plan-would-release-hundreds-of-millions-of-tons-of-co2-into-the-air/2018/08/18/be823078-a28e-11e8-83d2-70203b8d7b44_story.html?utm_term=.1ddd9a25eb7c)]

Reality: Clean Power Plan Would Reduce Pollution Nearly 20%.

**Clean Power Plan Would Reduce Carbon Emission 19% By 2030**. According to the Washington Post, “By 2030, according to administration officials, the proposal would cut CO2 emissions from 2005 levels by between 0.7 percent and 1.5 percent, compared with a business-as-usual approach. Those reductions are equivalent to taking between 2.7 million and 5.3 million cars off the road. By comparison, the Obama administration’s Clean Power Plan would have reduced carbon dioxide emissions by about 19 percent during that same time frame. That is equivalent to taking 75 million cars out of circulation and preventing more than 365 million metric tons of carbon dioxide from entering the atmosphere.” [Washington Post, [8/18/18](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/new-trump-power-plant-plan-would-release-hundreds-of-millions-of-tons-of-co2-into-the-air/2018/08/18/be823078-a28e-11e8-83d2-70203b8d7b44_story.html?utm_term=.1ddd9a25eb7c)]

# Affordable Clean Energy Rule

## Rhetoric: Study Found CPP Would Increase Electricity Prices

***Andrew Wheeler****: “Aside from legal concerns, the CPP’s punitive demands on energy providers would have unnecessarily raised electricity prices, decreased the competitiveness of America’s manufacturers, cost Americans jobs and undermined the nation’s energy security. For example, an economic analysis by the National Economic Research Associates found that the CPP could have caused double-digit electricity price increases in 40 states.”* [Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, [8/21/18](http://www.post-gazette.com/opinion/Op-Ed/2018/08/21/A-better-way-to-ensure-clean-reliable-energy/stories/201808220021)]

### Reality: U.S. Residential Electricity Prices Decline For The First Time In Many Years

**EIA: U.S. Residential Electricity Prices Decline For The First Time In Many Years.** According to EIA, “During the first six months of 2016, residential customers paid on average 12.4 cents per kilowatthour (kWh), or 0.7% lower than the same period last year. If this trend continues for the rest of 2016, annual average residential electricity prices would decline for the first time since 2002. Over the past five years, nominal residential prices have increased an average of 1.9% annually, about the same rate as overall inflation.” [EIA, [10/6/16](http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=28252)]

**EIA: “Declining Costs Of Fuel, Especially Natural Gas, Have Been A Key Driver Of Recent Reductions In Retail Electricity Prices.”** According to EIA, “Residential customers in most areas of the country are seeing lower retail electricity prices this year compared with the same time last year. Declining costs of fuel, especially natural gas, have been a key driver of recent reductions in retail electricity prices. Over the first six months of 2016, the weighted average cost of natural gas delivered to electricity generators was $2.58 per million Btu, 28% lower than in the first half of 2015.” [EIA, [10/6/16](http://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=28252)]

### Reality: NERA Study Flawed

**Washington PostFact Checker: It Is “Misleading” To Cite The NERA Study's Figures On The Clean Power Plan.**When Sen. James Inhofe (R-OK) cited the NERA study to claim that the Clean Power Plan ‘will result in double-digit electricity prices in 43 states,’ *The* *Washington Post*’s Fact Checker blog responded that Inhofe’s claim was ‘misleading’ because the study’s numbers ‘are on the high end of a range of cost impacts, which are mere projections at this point.’ The Fact Checker noted that supporters of the Clean Power Plan say the NERA study ‘inflates the cost of energy efficiency programs’ and ‘ignores long-term benefits of energy efficiency programs that ultimately could drive actual energy bills down.’ It concluded: ‘A lot of the costs can be driven down by state, local and regional policymakers, and some of them already are working with the EPA to figure out cost-effective plans." [Washington Post, [3/13/15](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/fact-checker/wp/2015/03/13/inhofes-misleading-statements-on-carbon-emissions-rule/)]

**EPA Projected Clean Power Plan Will Reduce Electricity Bills, Provide Net Economic Benefits.**The Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Clean Power Plan will place the first-ever limits on carbon pollution and is a key part of President Obama's climate agenda. In the final rule, EPA projects that electricity bills will rise modestly in the short term (2.4 to 2.7 percent) but then decline up to 3.8 percent between 2020 and 2030, resulting in electricity bills lowered by an average of $80 per year in 2030.  The EPA also projects that the rule will bring climate and public health improvements that result in $26 to $45 billion in annual net benefits to the economy. [Union of Concerned Scientists, [8/5/15](http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/reduce-emissions/how-much-will-clean-power-plan-cost#bf-toc-2)]

**Earlier Fossil Fuel-Funded NERA Study Warned That Clean Power Plan Would Drastically Increase Electricity Prices, Harm Economy.**NERA released a study in October, 2014 -- commissioned by fossil fuel trade associations including American Coalition for Clean Coal Electricity, American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, and National Mining Association, among others -- claiming that the EPA's climate plan would cause double-digit increases in electric prices in 43 states and add $479 billion in energy system costs. [NERA, [October 2014](http://www.nera.com/content/dam/nera/publications/2014/NERA_ACCCE_CPP_Final_10.17.2014.pdf)]

## Rhetoric: We Will Not Pick Winners And Losers In The Marketplace

***Wheeler****: “EPA takes its Clean Air Act responsibilities seriously and is committed to providing certainty to state and industry partners. We will not use our authority to pick winners and losers in the energy marketplace.”* [Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, [8/21/18](http://www.post-gazette.com/opinion/Op-Ed/2018/08/21/A-better-way-to-ensure-clean-reliable-energy/stories/201808220021)]

### Reality: Trump Favored Coal And Nuclear Technology

**NBC News: “Trump Energy Plan Would Prop Up Failing Coal And Nuclear Plants**.” According to NBC News, “The Trump administration is preparing a plan that could require electric grid operators to keep coal and nuclear power plants open. It’s a move the administration says will bolster national security but that critics say will drive up the price of electricity and slow the conversion to green power. Under a preliminary plan, first reported by Bloomberg Friday, the Energy Department could use its emergency power under two federal laws to require utilities to buy some of their power from coal and nuclear-powered plants that are threatened with closure.” [NBC News, [6/4/18](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/trump-energy-plan-would-prop-failing-coal-nuclear-plants-n879406)]

**Bloomberg: “Trump Prepares Lifeline For Money-Losing Coal Plants.”** According to Bloomberg, “Trump administration officials are making plans to order grid operators to buy electricity from struggling coal and nuclear plants in an effort to extend their life, a move that could represent an unprecedented intervention into U.S. energy markets. The Energy Department would exercise emergency authority under a pair of federal laws to direct the operators to purchase electricity or electric generation capacity from at-risk facilities, according to a memo obtained by Bloomberg News. The agency also is making plans to establish a ‘Strategic Electric Generation Reserve’ with the aim of promoting the national defense and maximizing domestic energy supplies.” [Bloomberg, [6/1/18](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-06-01/trump-said-to-grant-lifeline-to-money-losing-coal-power-plants-jhv94ghl)]

## Rhetoric: Carbon Emissions Are Already Falling

***Wheeler****: “Our rule also would ensure that America remains the gold standard for energy production and environmental protection. From 2005 to 2017, U.S. energy-related CO2 emissions fell by 14 percent, according to the Energy Information Administration, while global emissions increased over 20 percent. Additionally, since 1970, total emissions of the six criteria air pollutants (carbon monoxide, lead, ground-level ozone, nitrogen dioxide, particulate matter and sulfur dioxide) established under the Clean Air Act have dropped 73 percent, while the economy grew over 260 percent.”* [Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, [8/21/18](http://www.post-gazette.com/opinion/Op-Ed/2018/08/21/A-better-way-to-ensure-clean-reliable-energy/stories/201808220021)]

### Reality: Reduction In Greenhouse Gas Emissions Occurred Under President Obama

**PolitiFact: Are Greenhouse Emissions Down Under Donald Trump, As EPA Says? Half True.** According to PolitiFact, “When we asked the EPA for supporting evidence, they pointed us to a report titled, ‘Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks.’ This includes data collected and released regularly by the EPA, most recently in April 2018. The report found that the amount of greenhouse emissions by the United States fell in the most recent year. But there’s a problem: Due to the lag in data collection, that decline occurred during President Barack Obama’s final year in office, 2016, not under Trump.” [PolitiFact, [6/18/18](https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2018/jun/18/environmental-protection-agency/are-greenhouse-emissions-down-under-donald-trump-e/)]

## Rhetoric: CPP Would Not Have An Impact On Climate

***Wheeler****: “The CPP would have stunted this progress through regulatory overreach. It threatened energy security and prosperity to produce a negligible impact on the climate by the year 2100.”* [Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, [8/21/18](http://www.post-gazette.com/opinion/Op-Ed/2018/08/21/A-better-way-to-ensure-clean-reliable-energy/stories/201808220021)]

### Reality: It’s Not Too Late

**Princeton Climate Scientist: “Not Too Late To Make A Two-Degree Target.”** According to the Huffington Post, “Based on nations’ current pledges, the UNEP estimated that global temperatures could still jump at least three degrees Celsius (4.8 degrees Fahrenheit) by 2100. ‘It’s not too late to make a two-degree target, but it’s getting late fast,’ Oppenheimer said. ‘If we twiddle our thumbs for another 10 years, it will be almost impossible to make it without some Hail Mary pass with technology that may or may not work out.’ (Scientists are investigating an assortment of extreme measures, such as sucking massive amounts of carbon dioxide out of the atmosphere.)” [Huffington Post, [11/6/15](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/carbon-emissions-reduction-pledges-paris_us_563d0c03e4b0411d30710b42)]

## Rhetoric: Cpp Would Cost Billions, Raise Electricity Costs

***White House****: “Independent economic analysis by NERA found that CPP’s overreach would have cost up to $292 billion and caused double digit electricity price increases in 40 states.”* [White House Talking Points, [8/21/18](https://www.eenews.net/assets/2018/08/21/document_ew_01.pdf)]

Reality: NERA Conclusion Based on Highly Unrealistic Assumptions

**Washington Post Fact Check: “Trump Cited A Slew Of Statistics From A Study That Was Funded By The U.S. Chamber Of Commerce And The American Council For Capital Formation.”** According to the Washington Post, “Trump cited a slew of statistics from a study that was funded by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the American Council for Capital Formation, foes of the Paris Accord. So the figures must be viewed with a jaundiced eye. Moreover, the study assumed a scenario that no policy analyst expects — that the United States takes drastic steps to meet the Obama pledge of a 26 to 28 percent reduction in emissions by 2025.” [Washington Post, [6/1/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2017/06/01/fact-checking-president-trumps-claims-on-the-paris-climate-change-deal/?utm_term=.f0239c9d47e2)]

**Study Based On “Highly Unrealistic And Unnecessarily Expensive Pathway” To Achieving US Targets**. According to the World Resources Institute, “The Chamber Energy Institute’s claims are based on a highly unrealistic and unnecessarily expensive pathway to achieving the U.S. 2025 target.” [WRI, [4/26/17](http://www.wri.org/blog/2017/04/us-chamber-commerces-energy-institute-misleads-climate-action-costs-3-things-know)]

**WRI: “NERA Study Assumes That Innovation In Clean Energy Slows Considerably, Which Makes Climate Action Appear Artificially Costly.”** According to the World Resources Institute, “NERA’s estimates of 2040 economic impacts apply only to a future in which businesses, entrepreneurs and scientists fail to innovate over the coming decades. If, instead, innovation continues at its recent pace or accelerates due to the additional incentives for clean energy innovation in a decarbonizing world, the economic benefits would be far better.” [WRI, [4/26/17](http://www.wri.org/blog/2017/04/us-chamber-commerces-energy-institute-misleads-climate-action-costs-3-things-know)]

**WRI: “Full NERA Study Shows That The United States Can Achieve Its 2025 Targets At A Relatively Low Cost.”** According to the World Resources Institute, “While the article by the Chamber Energy Institute focuses on one scenario from the NERA study, the full study also includes an alternative pathway to achieving the U.S. 2025 target that combines regulatory measures with a national carbon market. In contrast to the scenario described above that mandates in which sectors emissions reductions must occur, a carbon market encourages emissions reductions to take place whenever and wherever they can be achieved most cost-effectively.” [WRI, [4/26/17](http://www.wri.org/blog/2017/04/us-chamber-commerces-energy-institute-misleads-climate-action-costs-3-things-know)]

## Rhetoric: CPP Would Be Harmful To Minorities

***White House****: “CPP would have hurt minorities and senior citizens disproportionally.”* [White House Talking Points, [8/21/18](https://www.eenews.net/assets/2018/08/21/document_ew_01.pdf)]

### Reality: Minorities More Likely To Suffer From Asthma Attacks Brought On By Warmer Climate

**African American Children Are Four Times More Likely To Be Admitted To The Hospital And Ten Times More Likely To Die From Asthma**. According to the Department of Health and Human Services, “In 2015, African American children had a death rate ten times that of non-Hispanic white children. Black children are 4 times more likely to be admitted to the hospital for asthma, as compared to non-Hispanic white children. [Department of Health and Human Services, Accessed [9/7/18](https://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/omh/browse.aspx?lvl=4&lvlid=15)]

**Asthma Attacks Are Triggered More Easily In A Warmer Climate.** According to Yale Climate Connections, “‘Ozone and pollen can worsen existing respiratory allergies and asthma, and serve as triggers for asthma attacks,’ said Kim Knowlton, an NRDC senior scientist and assistant clinical professor of Environmental Health Sciences at Columbia University’s Mailman School of Public Health. ‘Climate change is going to make it more difficult for people who struggle with respiratory illness to stay healthy.’” [Yale Climate Connections, [7/9/17](https://www.yaleclimateconnections.org/2017/07/more-asthma-attacks-expected-in-a-warming-climate/)]

### Reality: Minority Populations More Likely To Be Impacted By Extreme Weather

**Urban Populations Feel The Effects Of Extreme Heat And With Less Resources**. According to Slate, “A recent multicounty analysis found that from 1950 through 2015, 27 percent of cities and 65 percent of urban populations experienced greater warming than the planetary average of 1 degree Fahrenheit. About 60 percent of the world’s city dwellers experienced warming twice as great as the rest of the world. One or 2 degrees may not seem like much, but for especially vulnerable groups like the elderly, the sick, the poor, pregnant women and infants, it may be enough to tip the scales.” [Slate, [8/8/17](http://www.slate.com/articles/health_and_science/science/2017/08/heat_waves_threaten_minorities_and_the_poor.html)]

**Hurricanes Disproportionately Affect People Of Color And Their Ability To Recover**. According to Metro, “Just like Louisiana’s petrochemical corridor, which has been dubbed ‘cancer alley’, the communities living closest to these sites are low income communities of color. They are exposed to these pollutants on a daily basis, an injustice that some commentators describe as ‘environmental racism’, but the risks have been enormously exacerbated by the storm. So beneath the narrative of resilience and unity that the mainstream media and the US government and authorities have done their best to circulate, the reality is that race and class disparities will determine the impact of the storm just as unjustly, if not as dramatically, as they did in 2005.” [Metro, [8/30/17](https://metro.co.uk/2017/08/30/just-like-katrina-black-americans-will-be-the-real-victims-of-hurricane-harvey-6890806/)]

### Reality: Minorities Live Close To Harmful Emissions

**6.7 Million African Americans Live Near A Refinery.** According To The NAACP, “There Are 91 counties across theU.S. that are building oil refineries or where refineries exist close to more than 6.7 million African Americans, disproportionately exposing the community to toxic and hazardous emissions such as benzene, sulfur dioxide and formaldehyde […] Each year, the oil and gas industry recklessly dumps 9 million tons of methane and toxic pollutants into our air, disproportionately impacting the health of African American communities across the country.” [NAACP, [11/17](https://www.naacp.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Fumes-Across-the-Fence-Line_NAACP-and-CATF-Study.pdf)]

## Rhetoric: CPP Would Result In Job Losses For African-Americans

***White House****: “According to Harry Alford, President of the National Black Chamber of Commerce, CPP would increase Black poverty by 23 percent and Hispanic poverty by 26 percent. It would result in cumulative job losses of 7 million for Blacks and nearly 12 million for Hispanics in 2035.* [White House Talking Points, [8/21/18](https://www.eenews.net/assets/2018/08/21/document_ew_01.pdf)]

### Reality: NBCC Study Relies On Misleading Claims Cut-And-Pasted From Several Previously Debunked Reports

**Union Of Concerned Scientists: “NBCC Study Relies On Misleading Claims Cut-And-Pasted From Several Previously Debunked Reports.”** According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, “A misleading report by the National Black Chamber of Commerce (NBCC) has been frequently cited by opponents of the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Clean Power Plan, including in the Wall Street Journal. Our review of the NBCC report found that it relies on misleading claims cut-and-pasted from several previously debunked reports. For example, the NBCC’s analysis relies on false claims from a 2014 U.S. Chamber of Commerce report that received scant attention in the media after a fact check by the Washington Post concluded politicians ‘should have avoided using the Chamber’s numbers in the first place.’” [Union of Concerned Scientists, [8/19/15](https://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/fight-misinformation/national-black-chamber-commerce-study-clean-power-plan#.W5LPX7gnaUk)]

**NBCC President Is A Climate Denier**. According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, “Elsewhere, Alford has falsely claimed that ‘there is no sound science to support the claims of global warming.’ Bezdek has likened concerns raised by climate advocates to ‘the old Nazi theory, that if you repeat a big lie loud enough and long enough, people believe it.’” [Union of Concerned Scientists, [8/19/15](https://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/fight-misinformation/national-black-chamber-commerce-study-clean-power-plan#.W5LPX7gnaUk)]

## Rhetoric: ACE Will Reduce Pollution By As Much As 35%

***Wheeler****: “Unlike the Clean Power Plan, ACE adheres to the Clean Air Act and gives states the regulatory certainty they need to continue to reduce emissions and provide a dependable, diverse supply of electricity that all Americans can afford. When ACE is fully implemented, we expect to see U.S. power sector CO2 emissions fall by as much as 35 percent below 2005 levels.” [EPA,* [*6/19/19*](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-finalizes-affordable-clean-energy-rule-ensuring-reliable-diversified-energy)*]*

### Reality: ACE Relied On Industry Trends To Reduce Emissions

**ACE Relied On “Industry Trends” To Achieved 35% Reduction Of Pollution**. According to EPA, “ACE, combined with emission reductions expected from various other industry trends, will reduce CO2 emissions from the electric sector by as much as 35 percent below 2005 levels in 2030.” [EPA, [6/18/19](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2019-06/documents/ace_ria_fact_sheet_6.18.19_final.pdf)]

**ACE Would Reduce Power Plant Emissions By 1.5 Percent By 2030**. According to Vox, “The EPA is still required to regulate greenhouse gases, but the CPP’s new replacement, the Affordable Clean Energy (ACE) rule, is drastically weaker. The ACE rule would lower power sector emissions by 11 million tons by 2030, or between 0.7 percent and 1.5 percent. The EPA noted that long-term industry trends are expected to still push emissions down 35 percent, but that’s largely independent of the ACE rule.” [Vox, [6/19/19](https://www.vox.com/2019/6/19/18684054/climate-change-clean-power-plan-repeal-affordable-emissions)]

**EPA: “ACE Rule Could Reduce 2030 CO2 Emissions By Up To 1.5%.”** According to EPA, “EPA estimates that the ACE Rule could reduce 2030 CO2 emissions by up to 1.5% from projected levels without the CPP.” [EPA, [8/21/18](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-proposes-affordable-clean-energy-ace-rule)]

**Reality: Clean Power Plan Required 32% Emission Reduction Form Power Plants**

**CPP Would Cut Carbon Pollution From The Power Sector By 32 Percent.** According to a 2015 EPA fact sheet, “When the Clean Power Plan is fully in place in 2030, carbon pollution from the power sector will be 32 percent below 2005 levels – or 870 million tons less carbon pollution – securing progress and making sure it continues.” [EPA, CPP by the Numbers, 8/3/15]

## Rhetoric: ACE Would Reduce CO2 And Other Pollutants

***EPA****: “ACE will reduce emissions of CO2, mercury, as well as precursors for pollutants like fine particulate matter and ground-level ozone.” [EPA,* [*6/19/19*](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-finalizes-affordable-clean-energy-rule-ensuring-reliable-diversified-energy)*]*

### Reality: ACE Rule Would Actually Increase CO2, SO2, And NOX Emissions

**ACE Rule Would Increase CO2, SO2, And NOX Emissions**. According to Environmental Research Letters, “As a result, the ACE only modestly reduces national power sector CO2 emissions and increases CO2 emissions by up to 8.7% in 18 states plus the District of Columbia in 2030 compared to no policy. We also find that the ACE increases SO2 and NO X emissions in 19 states and 20 states plus DC, respectively, in 2030 compared to no policy, with implications for air quality and public health.” [Environmental Research Letters, [4/9/19](https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1748-9326/aafe25/meta)]

**ACE Cut Carbon Emissions By Less Than Half Of What Experts Say Is Needed**. According to the Washington Post, “Despite a drumbeat of scientific warnings, the Trump administration Wednesday issued a new rule that cuts carbon emissions from power plants by less than half of what experts say is needed to avoid catastrophic global warming.” [Washington Post, [6/19/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/trump-epa-finalizes-rollback-of-key-obama-climate-rule-that-targeted-coal-plants/2019/06/19/b8ff1702-8eeb-11e9-8f69-a2795fca3343_story.html?utm_term=.4a4b49f5503d)]

### Reality: CPP Would Cut SO2 Pollution By 90 Percent; NOx By 72 Percent

**CPP Would Reduce SO2 Pollution By 90 Percent; NOx By 72 Percent**. According to a 2015 EPA fact sheet, “The transition to cleaner sources of energy will better protect Americans from other harmful air pollution, too. By 2030, emissions of SO2 from power plants will be 90 percent lower compared to 2005 levels, and emissions of NOx will be 72 percent lower.” [EPA, CPP by the Numbers, 8/3/15]

## Rhetoric: Public Had Opportunity to weigh in on ACE

### Reality: CPP Received Millions More Comments Than ACE

**CPP Received 4.3 Million Public Comments Before It Was Finalized**. According to a 2015 EPA fact sheet, “The plan takes into account the unprecedented input we received through numerous outreach efforts, including the 4.3 million comments that were submitted to the agency during the 6-month public comment period.” [EPA, CPP by the Numbers, 8/3/15]

**ACE Rule Received 500,000 Public Comments Before It Was Finalized**. According to the EPA, “The ACE proposal – which EPA issued in August 2018 – received 500,000 public comments and more than 200 people provided oral testimony at an October 1, 2018, public hearing in Chicago.” [EPA ACE Fact Sheet, accessed [7/12/19](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2019-06/documents/bser_and_eg_fact_sheet_6.18.19_final.pdf)]

## Rhetoric: State Goal

***EPA****: “Today, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) issued the final Affordable Clean Energy (ACE) rule – replacing the prior administration’s overreaching Clean Power Plan (CPP) with a rule that restores the rule of law and empowers states to continue to reduce emissions while providing affordable and reliable energy for all Americans.” [EPA,* [*6/19/19*](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-finalizes-affordable-clean-energy-rule-ensuring-reliable-diversified-energy)*]*

### Reality: CPP Set State Goals; ACE Did Not Set Specific Emission Reductions For States

**EPA Set State Goals With Mandatory Reductions By 2022**. According to the EPA, “States and utilities will have 15 years to meet the final goals by 2030. Investment can begin now, with the period for mandatory reductions beginning in 2022.” [EPA, CPP by the Numbers, 8/3/15]

**Washington Post: “The New Rule Does Not Set Specific Greenhouse Gas Emissions Cuts For Each State.”** According to the Washington Post, “Unlike the Obama administration’s 2015 Clean Power Plan, the new rule does not set specific greenhouse gas emissions cuts for each state. Instead, it allows state regulators to determine how utilities can improve efficiency and will not force companies to switch from coal to lower-carbon energy sources.” [Washington Post, [6/19/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/trump-epa-finalizes-rollback-of-key-obama-climate-rule-that-targeted-coal-plants/2019/06/19/b8ff1702-8eeb-11e9-8f69-a2795fca3343_story.html?utm_term=.4a4b49f5503d)]

## Rhetoric: Health benefits

### Reality: CPP Projected Billions In Health Savings

**Clean Power Plan Estimated As Much As $54 Billion In Health Savings Per Year In 2030**. According to a 2015 EPA fact sheet, “The Clean Power Plan has public health and climate benefits worth an estimated $34 billion to $54 billion per year in 2030, far outweighing the costs of $8.4 billion.” [EPA, CPP by the Numbers, 8/3/15]

**Under CPP Families Would See $4 In Health Benefits For Very $1 Invested**. According to a 2015 EPA fact sheet, “From the soot and smog reductions alone, for every dollar invested through the Clean Power Plan – American families will see up to $4 in health benefits.” [EPA, CPP by the Numbers, 8/3/15]

**EPA: “Clean Power Plan Will Reduce Pollutants That Contribute To The Soot And Smog That Make People Sick By Over 20 Percent In 2030.”** According to a 2015 EPA fact sheet, “The Clean Power Plan will reduce pollutants that contribute to the soot and smog that make people sick by over 20 percent in 2030. 318,000 tons of sulfur dioxide. 282,000 tons of nitrogen dioxide.” [EPA, CPP by the Numbers, 8/3/15]

### ACE Projected Health Benefits Of Up To $730 Million

**EPA Projected Ace Would Have Annual Net Climate And Health Benefits Of Up To $730 Million.** According to EPA, “EPA projects that ACE will result in annual net benefits of $120 million to $730 million, including costs, domestic climate benefits, and health co-benefits.” [EPA, [6/19/19](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-finalizes-affordable-clean-energy-rule-ensuring-reliable-diversified-energy)]

### Reality: CPP Would Reduce Asthma, Heart Attacks, And Other Health Related Issues

**Clean Power Plan Would Avoid Projected 90,000 Asthma Attacks In Children**. [EPA, CPP by the Numbers, 8/3/15]

**Clean Power Plan Would Avoid Projected 1,700 Heart Attacks**. [EPA, CPP by the Numbers, 8/3/15]

**Clean Power Plan Would Avoid Projected 1,700 Hospital Admissions**. [EPA, CPP by the Numbers, 8/3/15]

**Clean Power Plan Would Avoid Projected 300,000 Missed School And Work Days.** [EPA, CPP by the Numbers, 8/3/15]

**ACE Would Increase Cases “Exacerbated Asthma” By 48,000.** According to the New York Times, “The Trump administration analysis also found that its plan would see 48,000 new cases of what it described as “exacerbated asthma,” and at least 21,000 new missed days of school annually by 2030 because of an increase of pollutants in the atmosphere.” [New York Times, [8/21/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/21/climate/epa-coal-pollution-deaths.html?smid=tw-nytclimate&smtyp=cur)]

**ACE Would Increase Number Of Missed School Days By 21,000**. [New York Times, [8/21/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/21/climate/epa-coal-pollution-deaths.html?smid=tw-nytclimate&smtyp=cur)]

### Reality: ACE would increase number of premature deaths

**ACE Could Result In 1,400 Premature Deaths.** According to the New York Times, “The administration’s own analysis, however, revealed on Tuesday that the new rules could also lead to as many as 1,400 premature deaths annually by 2030 from an increase in the extremely fine particulate matter that is linked to heart and lung disease, up to 15,000 new cases of upper respiratory problems, a rise in bronchitis, and tens of thousands of missed school days.” [New York Times, [8/21/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/21/climate/epa-coal-pollution-deaths.html?smid=tw-nytclimate&smtyp=cur)]

**EPA Predicted The Possibility Of An Extra Eight To 25 Deaths A Year Under ACE**. According to the New York Times, “The E.P.A.’s analysis of the new Trump administration plan does include premature death calculations based on studies that are considered less comprehensive than the Six Cities study. Those analyses start at the possibility of an extra eight to 25 deaths a year under Mr. Trump’s climate plan.” [New York Times, [8/21/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/21/climate/epa-coal-pollution-deaths.html?smid=tw-nytclimate&smtyp=cur)]

**Assistant EPA Director Called Increased Deaths Under CPP “Collateral Effects.”** According to the New York Times, “Mr. Wehrum acknowledged Tuesday that there would be ‘collateral effects’ on traditional pollutants compared to what the Clean Power Plan might have achieved. But, he said, ‘We have abundant legal authority to deal with those other pollutants directly, and we have aggressive programs in place that directly target emissions of those pollutants.’” [New York Times, [8/21/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/21/climate/epa-coal-pollution-deaths.html?smid=tw-nytclimate&smtyp=cur)]

### Reality: Trump EPA said CPP would prevent 4,500 premature deaths each year

**Trump EPA Analysis Said CPP Would Save 4,500 Premature Deaths Per Year.** According to the EPA, “A sweeping Obama-era climate rule could prevent up to 4,500 premature deaths per year by 2030, the Trump administration has found in its analysis of the plan, projecting that the plan could save more lives than the Obama administration said it would. The Trump administration’s Environmental Protection Agency is moving to repeal the plan.” [Washington Post, [11/1/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/11/01/trumps-epa-says-obamas-climate-rule-could-prevent-up-to-4500-deaths-annually-moves-to-scrap-it/?utm_term=.55c28b45a5ad)]

# Clean Energy

## Rhetoric: Clean Energy Isn’t Cheap

*The real reason why activists demand “clean energy policy” is simple: the “clean energy” sources they favor--especially solar and wind--are at present too expensive and unreliable to replace carbon-based fuels on a large scale. The only way activists can hope to have them adopted is to shove them down our throats.*

### Reality: Renewable Energy Is Becoming More Competitive

**Renewable Energy Should Be Competitive With Fossil Fuels By 2020.** According to Forbes, “The cost of renewable energy is now falling so fast that it should be a consistently cheaper source of electricity generation than traditional fossil fuels within just a few years, according to a new report from the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA). The organisation – which has more than 150 member countries – says the cost of generating power from onshore wind has fallen by around 23% since 2010 while the cost of solar photovoltaic (PV) electricity has fallen by 73% in that time. With further price falls expected for these and other green energy options, IRENA says all renewable energy technologies should be competitive on price with fossil fuels by 2020.” [Forbes, [1/13/18](https://www.forbes.com/sites/dominicdudley/2018/01/13/renewable-energy-cost-effective-fossil-fuels-2020/#35c272d74ff2)]

**Forbes: “If Renewable Energy Is Indeed Able To Undercut The Cost Of Legacy Fuels, Then Governments And Large Corporations Building New Power Plants Will Almost Certainly Turn To Green Energy.”** According to Forbes, “If renewable energy is indeed able to undercut the cost of legacy fuels, then governments and large corporations building new power plants will almost certainly turn to green energy for any new capacity, which will reduce demand for oil, natural gas and coal.” [Forbes, [1/13/18](https://www.forbes.com/sites/dominicdudley/2018/01/13/renewable-energy-cost-effective-fossil-fuels-2020/#35c272d74ff2)]

Reality: Renewable Energy Is Cheaper Than Coal

**Report: Existing Coal Is Increasingly More Expensive Than Cleaner Alternatives**. According to Energy Innovation, “America has officially entered the ‘coal cost crossover’ –where existing coal is increasingly more expensive than cleaner alternatives. Today, local wind and solar could replace approximately 74 percent of the U.S. coal fleet at an immediate savings to customers. By 2025, this number grows to 86 percent of the coal fleet.” [Energy Innovation, March [2019](https://energyinnovation.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Coal-Cost-Crossover_Energy-Innovation_VCE_FINAL.pdf)]

**New Wind And Solar Power Is Cheaper Than Existing Coal In Much Of The U.S**. According to Inside Climate News, “Not a single coal-fired power plant along the Ohio River will be able to compete on price with new wind and solar power by 2025, according to a new report by energy analysts. The same is true for every coal plant in a swath of the South that includes the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi. They’re part of the 86 percent of coal plants nationwide that are projected to be on the losing end of this cost comparison, the analysis found.” [Inside Climate News, [3/25/19](https://insideclimatenews.org/news/25032019/coal-energy-costs-analysis-wind-solar-power-cheaper-ohio-valley-southeast-colorado)]

**“Building New Wind And Solar Power Capacity Locally, Defined As Within 35 Miles For The Report, Is Often Less Expensive Than People In Those Markets Realize.”** According to Inside Climate News, “The key point is a simpler one: Building new wind and solar power capacity locally, defined as within 35 miles for the report, is often less expensive than people in those markets realize, and this is indicative of a price trend that is making coal less competitive. This shift shows how market forces are helping the country move away from fossil fuels. At the same time, coal interests have been trying to obscure or cast doubt on this trend, while seeking more government subsidies to slow their industry’s decline.”

[Inside Climate News, [3/25/19](https://insideclimatenews.org/news/25032019/coal-energy-costs-analysis-wind-solar-power-cheaper-ohio-valley-southeast-colorado)]

**Report: Shutting Down Almost Every Coal Plant And Swapping For Renewables Would Save Money**. According to Gizmodo, “Coal is dying in the U.S. Perhaps you’ve heard the reports. But even those reports don’t seem to capture how much of a dead man walking the dirtiest fossil fuel is. An analysis released Monday from Energy Innovation, a energy policy shop focused on developing policies for a clean energy transition, finds that right now, its cheaper to tear down three-quarters of American coal plants and replace them with renewables than to let them continue operating. That number will only continue to rise into the future as renewables continue on their way to becoming among the cheapest sources of energy.” [Gizmodo, [3/25/19](https://earther.gizmodo.com/shutting-down-almost-every-coal-plant-and-swapping-for-1833540557)]

Reality: Renewable Energy Provides Americans With Millions of Jobs

**Renewable Energy Employed 677,544 In The United States**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “According to USEER, the U.S. renewable energy industry provided 677,544 jobs in Q1 2016. The International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), meanwhile, recorded that renewable energy employment in the United States reached 769,000 direct and indirect jobs in 2015 (not including large-scale hydropower employment), a 6 percent increase from the previous year. The discrepancy is partly explained by IRENA’s inclusion of both direct and indirect jobs, while DOE included only direct jobs in its calculations. For instance, IRENA's value of 152,000 jobs for U.S. electricity generation from biomass only includes 15,500 direct jobs. IRENA also has significantly higher job estimates for the U.S. liquid biofuels and geothermal industries.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

## Rhetoric: Solar And Wind are given unfair subsidies

*But aren’t subsidies needed to correct some unfair advantage possessed by coal, oil, and natural gas? No. Solar and wind are the ones given an unfair advantage; per unit of energy produced, they already receive 90X more subsidies than oil and gas. And they have been subsidized for decades*. [Fox News, [5/7/15](https://www.foxnews.com/opinion/four-dirty-secrets-about-clean-energy)]

### Reality: United States Spends Billions On Oil And Gas

**United States Spent $27 Billion On Fossil Fuel Subsidies Since 2009**. According to Clean Technica, “New research has shown that the United States continues to subsidize the production and consumption of fossil fuels to the tune of $27 billion, despite repeated pledges since 2009 to phase out fossil fuel subsidies.” [Clean Technica, [6/6/18](https://cleantechnica.com/2018/06/06/us-still-subsidizing-fossil-fuels-to-tune-of-27-billion/)]

**Fossil Fuel’s Receive More Than $5 Trillion In Subsidies World-Wide.** According to Vox, “The International Monetary Fund periodically assesses global subsidies for fossil fuels as part of its work on climate, and it found in a recent working paper that the fossil fuel industry got a whopping $5.2 trillion in subsidies in 2017. This amounts to 6.4 percent of the global gross domestic product.” [Vox, [5/17/19](https://www.vox.com/2019/5/17/18624740/fossil-fuel-subsidies-climate-imf)]

## Rhetoric: Liberals Want To Force Us To Use Solar, Wind, And Biofuels, Even Though There Is No Evidence These Can Power Modern Civilization

### Reality: 17 Percent of US Energy Comes From Renewables

**17% Of US Energy Already Comes From Renewable Sources**. According to the United States Energy Information Administration, renewable energy accounted for 17.1% of US electricity generation in 2018. Hydropower had the largest share with 7%, wind was 6.6% and solar was 1.6%. [EIA, accessed [5/30/19](https://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.php?id=427&t=3)]

## Rhetoric: Grid Reliability

*This means that the wind turbines are hardly doing anything constructive; the natural gas “backup” is doing all the work. Some studies say that the wind turbines only add to CO2 emissions, since natural gas plants are far less efficient and use more fuel when they must cycle to compensate for erratic wind power.* [Fox News, [5/7/15](https://www.foxnews.com/opinion/four-dirty-secrets-about-clean-energy)]

### Reality: Renewable Energy Doesn’t Destabilize the Grid

**EE News: “Series Of Recent Studies Have Found That The U.S. Grid Could Operate Reliably With Large Amounts Of Renewable Generation.”** According to EE News, “A series of recent studies have found that the U.S. grid could operate reliably with large amounts of renewable generation. A National Renewable Energy Laboratory study from last year concluded that the Eastern Interconnection could operate with 30 percent penetrations of wind and renewable generation. A 2016 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration study found that the U.S. power sector could cut carbon emissions by 80 percent without increasing costs.” [EE News, [6/2/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060055454)]

**Existing Safeguards Could Prevent Power Supply Disruptions**. According to EE News, “Additionally, when federal electricity regulators examined the potential impacts of the Obama administration’s power-sector climate standards, they found that existing safeguards could prevent power supply disruptions.” [EE News, [6/2/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060055454)]

**Research Director Of The Harvard Electricity Policy Group: “The Blackouts And Brownouts Is Not Consistent With How We Operate The System.”** According to EE News, “Trump cast doubt on renewable energy’s ability to power the country in a high-economic-growth scenario. The president is technically correct that the United States will need all forms of energy, said William Hogan, research director of the Harvard Electricity Policy Group. But that’s because even the most optimistic scenarios don’t envision a grid powered entirely by renewables until far into the future. The question with renewables is less one of reliability and more one of cost, he said. ‘The blackouts and brownouts is not consistent with how we operate the system,’ he added.” [EE News, [6/2/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060055454)]

**Vox: “Grid Operators Have Long Been Focused On Reliability And Have Strong Legal Obligations To Keep Power Reliable.”** According to Vox, “Here the president seems to fear that the country will be forced to move quickly to all wind and solar power and that will make electricity unreliable. There are no credible mainstream assessments that predict that outcome, and the government’s own Energy Information Agency envisions many possible futures for power generation — all with a balance of sources, not just renewables. Grid operators have long been focused on reliability and have strong legal obligations to keep power reliable.” [Vox, [6/2/17](https://www.vox.com/a/annotation-trump-paris-climate-agreement-speech-victor)]

## Rhetoric: Battery Storage Is Obstacle To Renewable Energy Development

### Reality: US Renewable Energy Market Is Growing

**Lithium Ion Battery Storage Could Compete Within The Next Five Years**. According to MIT Technology Review, “Today’s battery storage technology works best in a limited role, as a substitute for ‘peaking’ power plants, according to a 2016 analysis by researchers at MIT and Argonne National Lab. These are smaller facilities, frequently fueled by natural gas today, that can afford to operate infrequently, firing up quickly when prices and demand are high. Lithium-ion batteries could compete economically with these natural-gas peakers within the next five years, says Marco Ferrara, a cofounder of Form Energy, an MIT spinout developing grid storage batteries.” [MIT Technology Review, [7/27/18](https://www.technologyreview.com/s/611683/the-25-trillion-reason-we-cant-rely-on-batteries-to-clean-up-the-grid/)]

**US Storage Capacity Is Equal To 38 Coal Plants**. According to UCSUSA, “The U.S. has about 23 gigawatts (GW) of storage capacity, approximately equal to the capacity of 38 typical coal plants.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, accessed [5/31/19](https://www.ucsusa.org/clean-energy/how-energy-storage-works)]

**Studies Show The Current Electric Grid Could Accommodate Sizeable Increase In Renewable Storage**. According to UCSUSA, “While the U.S. electric grid does not necessarily need more storage now, storage capacity will become more important as wind, solar, and other variable renewable energy resources expand in the power mix. Studies have shown that the existing grid can accommodate a sizeable increase in variable generation [3], but there are many exciting technologies in development that could help us store energy in the future and support an even greater amount of renewable energy on the grid.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, accessed [5/31/19](https://www.ucsusa.org/clean-energy/how-energy-storage-works)]

**Electric Vehicle Industry Has Spurred Advancements In Battery Storage Technology**. “Advancements in battery technologies have been made largely due to the expanding electric vehicle (EV) industry. As more developments are made with EVs, battery cost should continue to decline [18]. Electric vehicles could also have an impact on energy storage through vehicle-to-grid technologies, in which their batteries can be connected to the grid and discharge power for others to use.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, accessed [5/31/19](https://www.ucsusa.org/clean-energy/how-energy-storage-works)]

**Renewable Energy Standard Would Boost Deployment Of Storage Technologies**. “The deployment of storage technologies can also be advanced through renewable electricity standards (RES). Some states recognize storage technologies as acceptable renewable generation in their RES, and other states award Renewable Energy Credits (REC) to energy generation from storage devices that were charged by renewables.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, accessed [5/31/19](https://www.ucsusa.org/clean-energy/how-energy-storage-works)]

### US Grid Storage Doubled In 2018; Expected To Double In 2019

**US Grid Energy Storage Doubled In 2018**. According to PV Magazine, “According to IHS Markit, the U.S. grid-tied energy storage market is poised to nearly double this year, to 712 MW from 376 MW last year (note: This forecast does not include behind-the-meter storage). The market research company says that will see the United States overtake South Korea, the world’s largest grid-tied energy storage market in 2017 and 2018.” [PV Magazine, [5/22/19](https://www.pv-magazine.com/2019/05/22/us-energy-storage-market-set-to-almost-double-this-year/)]

**IHS Expects Almost 5 GW Of Energy Storage – 90% Of It Lithium-Ion Batteries – To Be Deployed In The United States Up To 2023**. According to PV Magazine, “And that is just the beginning. IHS expects almost 5 GW of energy storage – 90% of it lithium-ion batteries – to be deployed in the United States up to 2023.” [PV Magazine, [5/22/19](https://www.pv-magazine.com/2019/05/22/us-energy-storage-market-set-to-almost-double-this-year/)]

**US Energy Storage Market Expected To Double In 2019.** According to Wind Power Engineering, “The U.S. energy storage market nearly doubled in 2018 and is expected to double again in 2019. This is according to Wood Mackenzie Power & Renewables and the Energy Storage Association’s (ESA), ‘U.S. Energy Storage Monitor 2018 Year-in-Review.’” [Wind Power Engineering, [4/4/19](https://www.windpowerengineering.com/electrical/power-storage/u-s-energy-storage-market-to-double-two-years-running/)]

## Rhetoric: India and China Won’t Adhere to paris agreement

### Reality: China And India Have Committed To Cutting Emissions Under Paris Agreement

**China And India Have Committed To Cutting Emissions Under Paris Agreement**. According to the Guardian, “Both China and India have committed to emissions targets under the Paris agreement. China has committed to lower the carbon intensity of its economy by 60 to 65% below 2005 levels by 2030. India committed to reduce the emissions intensity of its economy by 33-35% below 2005 level over the same period.” [Guardian, [8/15/18](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/aug/15/enough-with-the-fairy-tales-about-the-paris-agreement-its-time-for-facts)]

**India And China On Track To Meet Paris Targets Before 2030**. According to the Guardian, “Backed by government policies such as renewable energy support, plans to retire old coal generators, carbon pricing and energy efficiency standards, both countries are on track to achieve these targets well in advance of 2030. For example, India is projected to meet its 2030 target to get 40% of its electricity generation from non-fossil fuel sources eight years early.” [Guardian, [8/15/18](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/aug/15/enough-with-the-fairy-tales-about-the-paris-agreement-its-time-for-facts)]

**Chinese Government Investing Heavily In Renewables Due To The Reduced Demand For Coal**. According to the New York Times, “The country appears to be on track to hit that target. Analysts now expect China’s once-insatiable demand for coal to level off by the mid-2020s, and the government is investing heavily in cleaner sources like solar, wind and nuclear. China also now sells more electric cars and buses than the rest of the world combined.” [New York Times, [12/7/18](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/12/07/climate/world-emissions-paris-goals-not-on-track.html)]

**China Creating Demand For Electric Vehicles Used By Buses And Taxis**. According to the Washington Post, “In the past decade, China has spent huge sums propping up electric-vehicle manufacturers, setting production quotas for plug-ins and doling out incentives for electric-car buyers. But it also has used the state’s clout to generate demand for its domestic electric-vehicle manufacturers in less obvious but important niches that the government could influence easily. Think buses and taxis.” [Washington Post, [6/2/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/with-state-subsidies-and-a-firm-hand-china-races-ahead-with-electric-transport/2019/06/01/2bec456e-7af1-11e9-a66c-d36e482aa873_story.html?utm_term=.266677c5ae6a)]

## Rhetoric: India and China Won’t Use Renewables

*For every ton of reduced pollution the United States emits, China and India produce almost 10 more tons. This means it doesn’t really matter how much America reduces its greenhouse gases because China and India cancel out any and all progress we make.* [Daily Signal, [8/24/18](https://www.dailysignal.com/2018/08/24/new-report-shows-us-not-countries-promoting-climate-change-activism-reducing-emissions-the-most/)]

### Reality: China And India Among The Largest Markets For Renewable Energy

**China And India Among The Largest Markets For Renewable Energy**. According to the Financial Times, “While developed economies have been leaders in the development of renewable power, much of the recent momentum has come from developing nations — and from China and India in particular, which are now the biggest and the third-biggest renewable electricity markets, respectively.” [Financial Times, [9/24/18](https://www.ft.com/content/a42e23be-8900-11e8-affd-da9960227309)]

**Surge In Renewable Energy Production In China And India “Fuelled By A Dramatic Reduction In The Costs Of Wind And Solar Technology**.” According to the Financial Times, “Fuelled by a dramatic reduction in the costs of wind and solar technology, both China and India have raced ahead with installing renewable power as they look to build on their impressive economic growth. The pace of this new installation of renewable power sources has cheered defenders of the Paris climate agreement even after President Donald Trump withdrew the US from the accord. “The magnitude of the technology cost deflation is way ahead of anything forecast by anyone in the world,” says Tim Buckley, director at the Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis.” [Financial Times, [9/24/18](https://www.ft.com/content/a42e23be-8900-11e8-affd-da9960227309)]

**Drop In Renewable Production From China Was Result Of Government Cutting Incentives**. According to the Financial Times, “Underpinning the growth in solar in particular has been a collapse in the cost of solar panels, both as a result of improving technology and oversupply in China. By 2017, the price of solar modules had fallen more than 80 per cent since 2009, according to the International Renewable Energy Association, while that of wind turbines had fallen by about half over the same period. There are signs, however, that the momentum could be about to slow down. The biggest risk comes from policy in Beijing, which changed in June to cut incentives for solar power. Wood Mackenzie, the energy market research company, said it expected China to add 20GW less than previously predicted as a result.” [Financial Times, [9/24/18](https://www.ft.com/content/a42e23be-8900-11e8-affd-da9960227309)]

**Renewable Energy Growth In China Would Undermine Influence Of Russian And Middle East Oil**. According to Forbes, “The continuing growth in renewable energy around the world is set to boost the power of China while undermining the influence of major oil exporters such as Russia and Middle East states like Saudi Arabia, according to a new report on the geopolitical implications of the changing energy landscape. With a leading position in renewable energy output as well as in related technologies such as electric vehicles, Beijing now finds itself in an influential position which other countries may struggle to counter.” [Forbes, [1/11/19](https://www.forbes.com/sites/dominicdudley/2019/01/11/china-renewable-energy-superpower/#7e65368c745a)]

Rhetoric: We Don't Need Solar And Wind To Save The Climate

*Sunlight and wind are inherently unreliable and energy-dilute. As such, adding solar panels and wind turbines to the grid in large quantities increases the cost of generating electricity, locks in fossil fuels, and increases the environmental footprint of energy production*. [Forbes, [5/8/18](https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelshellenberger/2018/05/08/we-dont-need-solar-and-wind-to-save-the-climate-and-its-a-good-thing-too/#c9a9997e4de1)]

*Solar and wind aren’t just insufficient, they are also unnecessary for solving climate change*. [Forbes, [5/8/18](https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelshellenberger/2018/05/08/we-dont-need-solar-and-wind-to-save-the-climate-and-its-a-good-thing-too/#c9a9997e4de1)]

Reality: Renewables Reduce Carbon Emissions

**Wind Power Is Low Carbon Energy**. According to AWEA, “Wind power is a low-carbon energy source—when a wind turbine generates electricity is produces zero carbon emissions. The development of clean wind energy avoids significant carbon dioxide (CO2) pollution.” [AWEA, accessed [6/5/19](https://www.awea.org/wind-101/benefits-of-wind/environmental-benefits)]

**UN: Renewable Energy Sources Cut Carbon Emissions, Efficiently Increase Electricity Output Worldwide**. According to the United Nations, “Renewable energy sources are the least expensive options in boosting electricity access, reducing air pollution and cutting carbon dioxide emissions worldwide, speakers stressed as the Second Committee (Economic and Financial) concluded sustainable development today. Togo’s delegate noted that more than 1 billion people around the world live without electricity, exposing them to unsafe cooking methods and indoor pollution. Stressing that one of the best options in bridging the electricity gap is renewable energies, she said her country aims to become 100 per cent reliant on them by 2030 through public‑private partnerships and individual solar kits.” [United Nations, [10/16/18](https://www.un.org/press/en/2018/gaef3501.doc.htm)]

Reality: Wind Power Has Some Of The Lowest Environmental Impacts Of Any Source Of Electricity Generation

**Wind Power Has Some Of The Lowest Environmental Impacts Of Any Source Of Electricity Generation**. According to AWEA, “Wind power has some of the lowest environmental impacts of any source of electricity generation. Unlike conventional sources, wind power significantly reduces carbon emissions, saves billions of gallons of water a year, and cuts pollution that creates smog and triggers asthma attacks. Wind farms also leave the overwhelming majority of land they’re built on undisturbed.” [AWEA, accessed [6/5/19](https://www.awea.org/wind-101/benefits-of-wind/environmental-benefits)]

Reality: Renewables Like Wind And Solar Produce Little To No Global Warming Emissions

**Renewables Like Wind And Solar Produce Little To No Global Warming Emissions**. According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, “Human activity is overloading our atmosphere with carbon dioxide and other global warming emissions. These gases act like a blanket, trapping heat. The result is a web of significant and harmful impacts, from stronger, more frequent storms, to drought, sea level rise, and extinction. In the United States, about 29 percent of global warming emissions come from our electricity sector. Most of those emissions come from fossil fuels like coal and natural gas. In contrast, most renewable energy sources produce little to no global warming emissions. Even when including ‘life cycle’ emissions of clean energy (ie, the emissions from each stage of a technology’s life—manufacturing, installation, operation, decommissioning), the global warming emissions associated with renewable energy are minimal.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, accessed [6/5/19](https://www.ucsusa.org/clean-energy/renewable-energy/public-benefits-of-renewable-power#bf-toc-0)]

**Burning Natural Gas For Electricity Releases As Much As 2 Pounds Of Carbon Dioxide; Coal 3.6 Pounds; Wind Releases .004 Pounds; Solar, 0.2**. According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, “The comparison becomes clear when you look at the numbers. Burning natural gas for electricity releases between 0.6 and 2 pounds of carbon dioxide equivalent per kilowatt-hour (CO2E/kWh); coal emits between 1.4 and 3.6 pounds of CO2E/kWh. Wind, on the other hand, is responsible for only 0.02 to 0.04 pounds of CO2E/kWh on a life-cycle basis; solar 0.07 to 0.2; geothermal 0.1 to 0.2; and hydroelectric between 0.1 and 0.5.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, accessed [6/5/19](https://www.ucsusa.org/clean-energy/renewable-energy/public-benefits-of-renewable-power#bf-toc-0)]

Rhetoric: Electric Cars Increase Pollution

*Electric cars won’t save the planet without a clean energy overhaul – they could increase pollution*. [Conversation, [6/3/19](https://theconversation.com/electric-cars-wont-save-the-planet-without-a-clean-energy-overhaul-they-could-increase-pollution-118012)]

Reality: EVs Lifecycles Have Lower Emissions That Gasoline Or Diesel Vehicles

**DOE: EVs Typically Produce Fewer Life Cycle Emissions Than Conventional Vehicles**. According to the Department of Energy, “Life cycle emissions include all emissions related to fuel and vehicle production, processing, distribution, use, and recycling/disposal. For example, for a conventional gasoline vehicle, emissions are produced when petroleum is extracted from the ground, refined to gasoline, distributed to stations, and burned in vehicles. Like direct emissions, life cycle emissions include a variety of harmful pollutants and GHGs. All vehicles produce substantial life cycle emissions, and calculating them is complex. However, EVs typically produce fewer life cycle emissions than conventional vehicles because most emissions are lower for electricity generation than burning gasoline or diesel.” [Department of Energy, Reducing Pollution with Electric Vehicles, accessed [6/5/19](https://www.energy.gov/eere/electricvehicles/reducing-pollution-electric-vehicles)]

# Jobs And Economic Growth

## Rhetoric: Trump Administration Would Save Coal Industry

TRUMP: “We love our coal miners.  Great people… I actually, in one case, I went to a group of miners in West Virginia -- you remember, Shelley -- and I said, how about this:  Why don’t we get together, we'll go to another place, and you'll get another job; you won't mine anymore.  Do you like that idea?  They said, no, we don’t like that idea…I said, if that's what you want to do, that's what you're going to do. I made them this promise:  We will put our miners back to work.” [Remarks, [3/28/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/28/remarks-president-trump-signing-executive-order-create-energy)]

### Reality: Trump Can’t Bring Back Coal Industry

**NYT: Coal’s Decline Seems Impervious To Trump’s Promises**. According to the New York Times, “The fateful turn of events in Appalachian mining towns like Bobtown, isolated between craggy bluffs and wooded hills 70 miles south of Pittsburgh, illustrates the seemingly relentless downturn of the coal industry. While President Trump has offered some regulatory relief to the industry, market forces still dictate a gloomy future — one largely shaped by the glut of cheap natural gas yielded by the drilling boom in shale fields near here and across much of the nation.” [New York Times, [1/24/18](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/24/business/energy-environment/coal-miners.html)]

**Coal Producer Robert Murray Said Trump Can't Bring Industry Back To Where It Was.** According to an article in Fox Business, “President Trump has vowed to bring back coal mining jobs, but the CEO of one of America’s largest coal companies says that’s impossible. ‘You can’t bring [the coal industry] back to where it was,’ Robert Murray told the FOX Business Network’s Maria Bartiromo. ‘[Former President Obama] closed 411 coal-fired plants, this Clean Power Plan which [Trump] ended yesterday, would have closed 56 more plants.’” [Fox Business, [3/29/17](http://www.foxbusiness.com/features/2017/03/29/big-coal-producer-robert-murray-trump-cant-bring-industry-back-to-where-it-was.html)]

**NYT: “Coal Executives, However, Optimism And Expansion Plans Remain Guarded.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “For coal executives, however, optimism and expansion plans remain guarded. Regulatory relief could restore 10 percent of their companies’ lost market share at most, they say — nowhere near enough to return coal to its dominant position in power markets and put tens of thousands of coal miners to work.” [New York Times, [3/28/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/28/business/energy-environment/trump-coal-executive-order-impact.html?_r=0)]

**Spokesman For Cloud Peak Energy: “At The End Of The Day, Coal Will Still Have To Compete With A Host Of Other Fuels.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “‘At the end of the day, coal will still have to compete with a host of other fuels,’ said Rick Curtsinger, a spokesman for Cloud Peak Energy, one of the country’s leading coal producers. ‘Utilities’ long-term decisions are based on economics and the need for long-term certainty.’” [New York Times, [3/28/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/28/business/energy-environment/trump-coal-executive-order-impact.html?_r=0)]

**Executive Vice President Of Southwestern Energy: “It’s The Market That Drives.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “In addition, relaxing restrictions on flaring methane and hydraulic fracturing on federal lands could help some producers increase production. But shale oil and gas production in the United States is mostly done on private lands. Oil prices have fallen by half over the last three years, limiting the demand to drill on more federal land, at least for the moment. ‘It will depend on price,’ said Mark Boling, the executive vice president of Southwestern Energy, a major natural gas and oil producer. ‘It’s the market that drives.” [New York Times, [3/28/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/28/business/energy-environment/trump-coal-executive-order-impact.html?_r=0)]

* **“Mr. Boling Said The Administration’s Action Would Have No Impact On His Company’s Immediate Plans.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “Mr. Boling said the administration’s action would have no impact on his company’s immediate plans. And he expects the industry to continue efforts to capture more leaking methane, a powerful greenhouse gas, because of innovations in leak detection and repair equipment. ‘We still plan to drive methane emissions down because we think it’s part of our core business to be as efficient as possible in removing natural gas from the ground and getting it to our customers,’ he said. ‘We are definitely going to do that.’” [New York Times, [3/28/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/28/business/energy-environment/trump-coal-executive-order-impact.html?_r=0)]

**“Even Some Utilities That Did Not Support The Clean Power Plan Say They Will Continue To Make Long-Term Investments To Meet Their Customers’ Demands.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “Even some utilities that did not support the Clean Power Plan say they will continue to make long-term investments to meet their customers’ demands, which in many states include a greener energy mix. ‘We think the rule went beyond E.P.A.’s statutory authority and infringed on the rights of the states to manage the generating fleet,’ said Leo Denault, chief executive of Entergy, which has been working to lower its carbon emissions since the early 2000s. ‘That said, the potential of it rolling back does not change our commitment to being environmentally responsible.’” [New York Times, [3/28/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/28/business/energy-environment/trump-coal-executive-order-impact.html?_r=0)]

* **Chief Executive Of Entergy: “The Potential Of It Rolling Back Does Not Change Our Commitment To Being Environmentally Responsible.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “Even some utilities that did not support the Clean Power Plan say they will continue to make long-term investments to meet their customers’ demands, which in many states include a greener energy mix. ‘We think the rule went beyond E.P.A.’s statutory authority and infringed on the rights of the states to manage the generating fleet,’ said Leo Denault, chief executive of Entergy, which has been working to lower its carbon emissions since the early 2000s. ‘That said, the potential of it rolling back does not change our commitment to being environmentally responsible.’” [New York Times, [3/28/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/28/business/energy-environment/trump-coal-executive-order-impact.html?_r=0)]

**Chief Executive Of American Electric Power: Said They Would Still Have To Compete Against Natural Gas And Renewables When It Came Time To Replace Them**. According to an article in the New York Times, “Nicholas K. Akins, chief executive of American Electric Power, said that although federal policies under Mr. Trump could help extend the life of some aging coal plants, they would still have to compete against natural gas and renewables when it came time to replace them.” [New York Times, [3/28/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/28/business/energy-environment/trump-coal-executive-order-impact.html?_r=0)]

* **“This Industry Is Moving In A Direction That Really Moves Toward A Clean Energy Economy. That’s What Our Customers Expect, That’s What Our Shareholders Expect.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “‘Our plans remain the same,’ he said. ‘We’re going to invest over the next three years $1.5 billion in renewables, $9 billion in transmission to optimize the grid. This industry is moving in a direction that really moves toward a clean energy economy. That’s what our customers expect, that’s what our shareholders expect.’” [New York Times, [3/28/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/28/business/energy-environment/trump-coal-executive-order-impact.html?_r=0)]

### Reality: Ending Clean Power Plan Would Not Bring Back Coal Jobs

**NYT: “Even Coal Executives Remain Muted In Their Optimism About The Clean Power Plan Rollback.”** According to the New York Times, “Even coal executives remain muted in their optimism about the Clean Power Plan rollback, which they say is nowhere near enough to return coal to its dominant perch atop power markets and put tens of thousands of coal miners to work.” [New York Times, [3/29/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/29/business/coal-jobs-trump-appalachia.html?smprod=nytcore-iphone&smid=nytcore-iphone-share&_r=1)]

**Trump's Executive Order Won't Save Coal Mining Jobs.** According to Bloomberg, “President Donald Trump is taking bold steps to boost the declining coal industry, but the moves won’t restore many of the jobs lost by coal miners in West Virginia, Ohio and Pennsylvania who helped the president win his job in the White House. Trump will sign an order Tuesday to dismantle the very foundations of his predecessor’s government-wide effort to combat climate change, according to details provided to Bloomberg News. It will resume the sale of coal from federal land, lift carbon dioxide limits on power plants and end Obama-era mandates that agencies consider global warming in a broad range of decisions. … Yet, as sweeping as the order is, it won’t immediately boost demand for coal, which is facing stiff competition from cheaper natural gas and a boom in wind and solar power. It comes as mining employment has been falling for decades as dozers and conveyor belts replaced humans with pickaxes and mules.” [Bloomberg, [3/27/17](https://www.bloomberg.com/politics/articles/2017-03-27/trump-s-order-won-t-resurrect-jobs-of-miners-key-to-his-campaign?utm_content=politics&utm_campaign=socialflow-organic&utm_source=twitter&utm_medium=social&cmpid%3D=socialflow-twitter-politics)]

**Tuesday Order Will Have Little Immediate Effect.** According to Politico, “Neither Pruitt nor Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke have any reinforcements nominated below them to help implement the order, leaving open the question of how quickly Trump’s order will yield any concrete results. And despite the lofty rhetoric coming out of the White House, Tuesday’s order will have relatively little immediate effect. Some efforts, like rewriting the Clean Power Plan and other regulations, will take years to complete and face vigorous legal challenges from environmental advocates and blue states all along the way.” [Politico, 3/28/17]

**Washington Post: “Coal In The Trump Age: Industry Has A Pulse, But Prospects For Jobs Are Weak.”** According to an article in the Washington Post, “The stocks of coal companies have enjoyed a ‘Trump bump,’ thanks to the president’s pledges to ‘bring the coal industry back’ and ‘put our great miners and steelworkers back to work.’ Half a dozen big companies have seized the moment to issue stock or sell bonds to raise money from investors willing to wager on the effects of a friendlier Trump administration. Peabody Energy, the nation’s biggest coal behemoth, hopes to win court approval to come out of bankruptcy in April. But the obstacles on the other side of the ledger remain daunting: Coal-fired power plants continue to shut their doors. Bountiful supplies of U.S. shale gas are keeping natural gas prices low and competitive, and renewable sources of power generation are growing rapidly. Though most experts expect U.S. coal sales and output to top last year’s levels, they also expect the decline to resume in 2018.” [Washington Post, [3/17/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/economy/coal-in-the-trump-age-industry-has-a-pulse-but-prospects-for-jobs-are-weak/2017/03/17/facc3218-0514-11e7-b9fa-ed727b644a0b_story.html?utm_term=.79450017b88b)]

**Energy Analyst At NASDAQ Advisory Services: “I Don’t Think You Will See Utilities Going Back To Investing In Coal.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “‘If the Clean Power Plan is reneged upon, I don’t think you will see utilities going back to investing in coal because they have already reduced their infrastructure and they already have commitments geared toward natural gas,” said Tamar Essner, an energy analyst at Nasdaq Advisory Services.” [New York Times, [3/28/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/28/business/energy-environment/trump-coal-executive-order-impact.html?_r=0)]

**USA Today: “Will Coal Jobs Suddenly Come Roaring Back? Don’t Bet On It. Will The Price Of Electricity Go Into Reverse? Not Likely.”** According to USA Today, “Will coal jobs suddenly come roaring back? Don’t bet on it. Will the price of electricity go into reverse? Not likely. Will increased federal land rights for oil and natural gas clear the way for more U.S. energy production? Yes, eventually. And fewer regulations for oil and natural gas could contribute to lower energy prices in the long run. Plus, lower fuel economy standards, which the Trump administration is contemplating as part of a separate review, could bolster gasoline demand.” [USA Today, [3/28/17](http://www.usatoday.com/story/money/2017/03/28/trump-energy-regulations-impact/99700640/)]

**Opinion: Trump’s Attack On Environmental Laws Won’t Save Coal Miners’ Jobs**. Accoding to an opinion piece in the LA Times, “Trump has repeatedly promised to bring jobs back to Coal Country, blaming federal regulations for the industry’s decades-long decline. That promise is akin to a politician 100 years ago pledging to restore the economic fortunes of blacksmiths and buggy whip makers. That politician would have been a fool or a liar. Trump may be both.” [LA Times, [3/29/17](http://www.latimes.com/opinion/topoftheticket/la-na-tt-coal-jobs-20170328-story.html)]

**Opinion: “Trump Claims That Killing Obama’s Climate Legacy Will Bring Back Coal Jobs. It’s A Ruse.”** According to an opinion piece in the Washington Post, “President Trump on Tuesday signed an executive order rolling back the Clean Power Plan, former president Barack Obama’s 2015 policy aimed at reducing the carbon emissions that cause climate change. He touted this as a big step in restoring American jobs — in particular, coal mining jobs, which are concentrated in areas carried by Trump in the 2016 election. But contrary to the White House spin, Tuesday’s action has little to do with improving the lives of Trump’s working-class base. It will do far more to promote the aims of the monied interests who backed his candidacy and now help shape White House policy.” [Washington Post, [3/28/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2017/03/28/trump-claims-that-killing-obamas-climate-legacy-will-bring-back-coal-jobs-its-a-ruse/?utm_term=.1aed82d71945)]

**Time: “Trump’s Pro-Coal Orders Are Doomed To Fail.”** According to an article in Time Magazine, “Donald Trump signed an executive order at the Environmental Protection Agency to undo widely-supported Obama-era climate policies. The Trump Administration is also seeking a 31 percent cut to the EPA’s budget and to eliminate most climate research programs at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. These cuts would dramatically slash funding for the nation’s leading climate research and environmental policing agencies. Between the executive order, the cuts and the Administration’s sweeping deregulatory agenda, it appears that the White House is trying to revive fossil fuels. Yet while the Administration could do a lot of damage to our health and businesses, its policies are doomed to fail because they ignore two crucial trends.” [Time Magazine, [3/29/17](http://time.com/4709796/trump-epa-climate-fossil-fuels/)]

**NYT: “Coal Miners Hope Trump’s Order Will Help. But Few Are Counting On It.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “Regulations certainly played a part in coal’s downturn, Mr. Stinson said. But only a part. Some of the fiercest coal country critics of the Obama administration have acknowledged as much. Robert E. Murray, an outspoken mining executive, recently suggested tempered expectations for a coal rebound. The Senate majority leader, Mitch McConnell, Republican of Kentucky, cautioned in November that the potential impact of a regulatory rollback would be ‘hard to tell.’ There are too many other, more decisive factors behind the decline in central Appalachian coal mining, said Sam Petsonk, a lawyer for Mountain State Justice, a legal aid organization in Charleston, W.Va.” [New York Times, [3/28/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/28/us/coal-miners-hope-trumps-order-will-help-but-few-are-counting-on-it.html)]

**Forbes: “Mass Employment In Coal Mining Is Never Coming Back, No Matter Trump's Promises Or Regulations.”** According to an article in Forbes, “It's an obvious truism that regulations which make a certain activity more expensive are going to reduce the amount of that activity. Supply curves do slope downwards, demand ones up, after all. Thus it is equally obvious that if we rescind those regulations creating that greater expense then, at the margin, there will be more of that activity again. And since activity is often linked to employment level we would think that Trump's rolling back some of the regulations which make coal mining more expensive will increase the employment of miners. And we would be right to think so. And yet the effect of that will be trivial because it's not in fact regulation which has been killing off mining as a source of mass employment. It's technological change and the change in regulation isn't going to affect that in the slightest.” [Forbes, [3/29/17](https://www.forbes.com/sites/timworstall/2017/03/29/mass-employment-in-coal-mining-is-never-coming-back-no-matter-trumps-promises-or-regulations/#51c7801a71e8)]

## Rhetoric: Trump Will Eliminate Job-Killers That Don’t Protect The Environment

### Reality: Clean Power Plan Would Add Half a Million Jobs

**Clean Power Plan Would Add 560,000 Jobs And Up To $52 Billion To The Gross Domestic Product.** According to the E2’s Opportunity Lost report, “The Trump Administration’s effort to unwind the Clean Power Plan (CPP) represents a failure to capitalize on the economic and environmental benefits of clean energy. Analysis shows that the CPP could create up to 560,000 jobs and add $52 billion to the gross domestic product (GDP) in 2030. From states with relatively small populations like Maine and Montana to highly populated states like Florida, the CPP could have substantial employment and economic benefits — benefits that would disappear with the Trump Administration’s repeal of the policy.” [E2, [6/21/17](https://www.e2.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/FINAL-CPP-jobs-report-6.21.17.pdf)]

### Reality: Clean Power Plan and WOTUS Rule Would Protect Environment

**Clean Power Plan Would Cut Emissions From Power Sector By 30 Percent**. According to the EPA, “Nationwide, by 2030, the Clean Power Plan will help cut carbon pollution from the power sector by approximately 30 percent from 2005 levels. It will also reduce pollutants that contribute to the soot and smog that make people sick by over 25 percent.” [Environmental Protection Agency, Clean Power Plan Benefits, accessed [4/24/17](http://www2.epa.gov/carbon-pollution-standards/fact-sheet-clean-power-plan-benefits)]

**Clean Water Rule Protects Streams And Wetlands Critical To Public Health, Communities, And Economy**. According to the EPA, “In an historic step for the protection of clean water, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Army finalized the Clean Water Rule today to clearly protect from pollution and degradation the streams and wetlands that form the foundation of the nation’s water resources. The rule ensures that waters protected under the Clean Water Act are more precisely defined and predictably determined, making permitting less costly, easier, and faster for businesses and industry. The rule is grounded in law and the latest science, and is shaped by public input. The rule does not create any new permitting requirements for agriculture and maintains all previous exemptions and exclusions.” [EPA, [5/27/15](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/clean-water-rule-protects-streams-and-wetlands-critical-public-health-communities-and)]

## Rhetoric: “Energy Dominance” Creates Jobs

**HUCKABEE:** “An energy-dominant America will bring even more hard-working Americans into the high-skill, well-paying jobs and careers the energy sector offers.” [White House Press Office, 6/28/17]

### Reality: Solar and Wind Experienced the Strongest Energy Sector Job Growth in 2016

**Solar Jobs Increased by 25 Percent; Wind Jobs Increased by 32 Percent.** The solar and wind industries experienced the strongest growth, as solar jobs rose 25% over the past year and the wind sector expanded 32%. The energy efficiency industries also experienced an upswing in jobs, adding 133,000 jobs to reach 2.2 million total jobs. [Utility Dive, [1/17/17](http://www.utilitydive.com/news/renewables-efficiency-dominate-robust-job-growth-in-energy-sector/434179/)]

### Reality: Electric Power Generation Jobs Grew by 13 Percent in 2016

**Electric Power Generation Jobs Grew by 13 Percent As Utilities Replace Infrastructure.** Electric power generation jobs [grew 13% in the last year](https://energy.gov/articles/doe-releases-second-annual-national-energy-employment-analysis-0) as utilities replaced aging infrastructure and invested in new power plants, according to [the latest Department of Energy report on job growth in the energy sector](https://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2017/01/f34/2017%20US%20Energy%20and%20Jobs%20Report_0.pdf) released last week. [Utility Dive, [1/17/17](http://www.utilitydive.com/news/renewables-efficiency-dominate-robust-job-growth-in-energy-sector/434179/)]

## Rhetoric: Clean Power Plan Would Cost $39 Billion

* **WHITE HOUSE PRESS RELEASE:** “The previous Administration’s Clean Power Plan could cost up to $39 billion a year and increase electricity prices in 41 States by at least ten percent, according to NERA Economic Consulting.” [Press Release, [3/28/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/03/28/president-trumps-energy-independence-policy)]

### Reality: NERA Study is Flawed

**2017: Trump Administration Cited To NERA Claim That Clean Power Plan Would Cost Up To $39 Billion.** “President Trump has started rolling back Obama-era environmental protections, including directing federal regulators to rewrite federal rules to reduce carbon emissions. […] A fact sheet about the March 28 executive order on Obama-era climate protections estimated the cost of the Clean Power Plan at up to $39 billion. How accurate is this estimate? Who exactly is NERA Economic Consulting? And why isn’t the White House using estimates by the Energy Information Administration (EIA) or the Environmental Protection Agency?” [Washington Post, [3/31/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2017/03/30/the-white-houses-claim-that-the-carbon-emissions-rule-could-cost-up-to-39-billion-a-year/?utm_term=.e5c136389a1e)]

* **EPI: “NERA’s Misleading Analysis Relied On Alternative Facts.”** According to the Energy and Policy Institute, “NERA’s misleading analysis relied on alternative facts, such as the claim that investments in energy efficiency result in net costs. Reviews of real world energy efficiency programs confirm that they actually generate net savings for consumers. Academic analysis has found that the Clean Power Plan could save Americans billions of dollars on electricity bills, including in states like George that voted for Trump.” [EPI, accessed [4/4/17](http://www.energyandpolicy.org/trump-cites-alternative-facts-clean-power-plan-nera-economic-consulting/)]
* **EPI: “Trump Organization Has Taken Advantage Of Energy Efficiency Programs To Save Money On Electricity Bills And Reduce Carbon Dioxide Emissions.”** According to the Energy and Policy Institute, “In fact, the Trump Organization has taken advantage of energy efficiency programs to save money on electricity bills and reduce carbon dioxide emissions at some of the buildings it has managed.” [EPI, accessed [4/4/17](http://www.energyandpolicy.org/trump-cites-alternative-facts-clean-power-plan-nera-economic-consulting/)]
* **ACCCE Sponsored NERA Report**. According to the Energy and Policy Institute, “ACCCE, which sponsored both of NERA’s misleading Clean Power Plan reports, has a dubious track record on climate change. The coal industry group is probably best known for its ties to a consulting firm that sent forged letters to members of Congress opposing a 2009 climate bill. A number of electric utilities have severed ties with ACCCE in recent years, though others like American Electric Power and Southern Company remain members.” [EPI, accessed [4/4/17](http://www.energyandpolicy.org/trump-cites-alternative-facts-clean-power-plan-nera-economic-consulting/)]

**NERA Study Is Out Of Date.** According to Media Matters, “Final Plan Has Significant Changes From Draft Plan. In the final version of the Clean Power Plan, the EPA offered states more time to adapt to the plan, allowing them an extra two years to both submit implementation plans -- from 2016 to 2018 -- and to reach compliance -- beginning 2022 rather than 2020. The EPA also changed the emission targets, making them more aggressive on a nation-wide level overall but easing statewide emission targets. Utility Dive explained: ‘Rather than setting emission reduction goals for power plants on a state-by-state basis -- which resulted in some wildly divergent expectations for different states -- the EPA elected to establish ‘uniform rates’ across the nation for all coal and gas plants, the agency wrote in the final rule.’ The plan also places a greater emphasis on renewable energy and energy efficiency, as the EPA explained in a statement to Media Matters.” [Media Matters, [8/26/15](https://mediamatters.org/research/2015/08/26/why-media-should-stop-citing-neras-flawed-study/205177)]

**MMFA: Nera Study Used Faulty Assumptions For Energy Efficiency Costs**. According to Media Matters, “The key in designing these analyses and these scenarios is really the strength of the assumptions that you put into it. So if you put really high cost assumptions into there, you're going to get high costs estimates out of the model, that's just how it works. The analytical choices that are made are the most important in terms of designing an analysis that is relevant and that is representative and that actually measures the impacts of what you're trying to measure. Source: [NRDC Switchboard, 10/18/14; Phone Call with Media Matters, 8/14/15]

### Reality: Clean Power Plan Would Result In Lower Electricity Bills

**“Rolling Back The [Clean Power Plan] Will Likely Reduce Investments In Energy Efficiency Programs, Resulting In The Loss Of Further Economic Benefits From Lower Electricity Bills And Increased Efficiency Investments.”** According to E2 Opportunity Lost report, “Additionally, rolling back the CPP will likely reduce investments in energy efficiency programs, resulting in the loss of further economic benefits from lower electricity bills and increased efficiency investments in our homes, offices, schools and other buildings. Analysis shows that incremental energy efficiency savings through the CPP could reduce annual average household electricity bills by 7 percent in 2030 compared to a case without the CPP. Policymakers should oppose any efforts to weaken or rescind the CPP because doing so would reduce the employment and economic opportunities that come with it. Policymakers should also pursue other smart clean energy policies that support greater efficiency, renewable energy, electric vehicles, and grid modernization efforts, which would further grow our nation’s economy while accelerating the urgently needed transition to a lowcarbon future.” [E2, [6/21/17](https://www.e2.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/FINAL-CPP-jobs-report-6.21.17.pdf)]

## Rhetoric: China and India WOn’t Participate, Harming US Businesses

### Reality: India And China Have Emerged As Global Leaders In Tackling Global Warming

**India And China Have Emerged As Global Leaders In Tackling Global Warming**. According to Climate Central, “Less than two years after world leaders signed off on a historic United Nations climate treaty in Paris in late 2015, and following three years of record-setting heat worldwide, climate policies are advancing in developing countries but stalling or regressing in richer ones. In the Western hemisphere, where centuries of polluting fossil fuel use have created comfortable lifestyles, the fight against warming has faltered largely due to the rise of far-right political groups and nationalist movements. As numerous rich countries have foundered, India and China have emerged as global leaders in tackling global warming.” [Climate Central, [4/24/17](http://www.climatecentral.org/news/china-india-climate-leaders-west-falters-21377)]

## Rhetoric: US Added 50,000 Coal Jobs From January 20 to June of 2017

**CHUCK TODD**: “Is he [Al Gore] right that you guys are making a false promise though to some of these fossil fuel industries?”

**PRUITT**: “Dead wrong. Because the numbers show exactly the opposite in fact since the fourth quarter of last year to most recently added almost 50,000 jobs in the coal sector. In the month of May alone, almost 7,000 jobs.” [Meet the Press, [6/4/17](http://www.nbcnews.com/meet-the-press/meet-press-june-4-2017-n768046)]

### Reality: Only 1,000 Coal Jobs Added Since Trump Became President (June 2017)

**Washington Post Fact Checker Gave Pruitt Four Pinocchios; Number of Coal Jobs Grew by 1,000, Not 50,000.** According to the Washington post Fact Checker, “On “Meet the Press,” Pruitt flatly stated that almost 50,000 jobs have been added in the coal sector. Many readers asked about this claim, noting that there are only about 50,000 jobs in coal. Here’s the Bureau of Labor Statistics data on coal jobs. As you can see, it has been in a tight range for months, with a slight gain. In the last four months of the Obama administration, September to January, there was a gain of 1,400 jobs. In the first four months of the Trump administration, there has been a gain of 1,000 jobs.” [Washington Post, [6/6/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2017/06/06/pruitts-claim-that-almost-50000-jobs-have-been-gained-in-coal/?utm_term=.28a1872391b2)]

**Washington Post: “For The Month Of May, The Gain Was 400 Jobs, Not 7,000.”** According to the Washington post Fact Checker, “So, rather than the gain of 47,000 jobs touted by Pruitt, the reality is that 1,000 coal jobs have been added since Trump became president. For the month of May, the gain was 400 jobs, not 7,000.” [Washington Post, [6/6/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2017/06/06/pruitts-claim-that-almost-50000-jobs-have-been-gained-in-coal/?utm_term=.28a1872391b2)]

**Majority Of Jobs Pruitt Cited Were For Oil And Gas**. According to the Washington post Fact Checker, “But the biggest problem with Pruitt’s statistic is that most of the gain in “mining” jobs has nothing to do with coal. Most of the new jobs were in a subcategory called “support activities for mining,” which accounted for more than 40,000 of the new jobs since October and more than 30,000 of the jobs since January. But BLS data shows about 75 percent of the jobs in the “support for mining” subcategory are in oil and gas operations.” [Washington Post, [6/6/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2017/06/06/pruitts-claim-that-almost-50000-jobs-have-been-gained-in-coal/?utm_term=.28a1872391b2)]

Rhetoric: Renewable electricity standards (RES) boost electricity prices

**Forbes: “Unreliable Nature Of Solar And Wind Makes Electricity More Expensive, New Study Finds.”** According to Forbes: “Solar panels and wind turbines are making electricity significantly more expensive, a major new study by a team of economists from the University of Chicago finds. Renewable Portfolio Standards (RPS) ‘significantly increase average retail electricity prices, with prices increasing by 11% (1.3 cents per kWh) seven years after the policy’s passage into law and 17% (2 cents per kWh) twelve years afterward,’ the economists write.” [Forbes, [4/22/19](https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelshellenberger/2019/04/22/unreliable-nature-of-solar-and-wind-makes-electricity-much-more-expensive-major-new-study-finds/#4df76c2a4f59)]

*Today, much of America’s air pollution is not of our own making. It’s blown into the West Coast from Asia. More stringent air quality regulations will do far more to export jobs out of the U.S. than they will to make our air safer to breathe*. [Washington Examiner, [4/22/19](https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/this-earth-day-thank-america-the-world-leader-in-clean-air)]

Reality: Study Used Out Date Statistics; Did Not Rule Out RES Standards

**Inside EPA: “Authors Of The Study Do Not Say That Policymakers Should Rule Out RES Standards Entirely.”** According to Inside EPA, “But the authors of the study do not say that policymakers should rule out RES standards entirely -- suggesting in part that the results “underscore the importance of research on policy and technology mechanisms to reduce the costs of renewable energy.’” [Inside EPA, [4/25/19](https://insideepaclimate.com/climate-beat/quoted-coal-sector-touts-res-cost-study-while-nrdc-cites-big-errors?utm_source=dlvr.it&utm_medium=twitter)]

**Harvard Kennedy School Of Government Energy Fellow Had ‘Serious’ Concerns About The Study, Including ‘Lots Of Potentially Confounding Variables.**’ According to Inside EPA, “The EPIC study is already drawing critiques from clean energy backers, including Harvard Kennedy School of Government energy fellow Jesse Jenkins, who in a recent Twitter thread cited ‘serious’ concerns about the study, including ‘lots of potentially confounding variables.’ Jenkins argued the study cannot be used to question any individual state RES -- given differences between such policies in different states and other factors, and he noted the study is also preliminary.” [Inside EPA, [4/25/19](https://insideepaclimate.com/climate-beat/quoted-coal-sector-touts-res-cost-study-while-nrdc-cites-big-errors?utm_source=dlvr.it&utm_medium=twitter)]

**Study Used Data Only Through 2015**. According to Inside EPA, “Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) in its April 25 rebuttal targeted several alleged shortcomings: inclusion of data only through 2015, which the group says fails to capture recent declines in renewable energy prices; attributing costs to renewables that are due to other factors; conclusions on the cost of power that appear to differ from other research; and failure to account for the benefits of renewable power other than GHG cuts. ‘These standards have brought a lot of different benefits: less soot and smog, reduced water consumption, lower wholesale electricity prices, new clean energy jobs, and stronger local green economies,’ the group says.” [Inside EPA, [4/25/19](https://insideepaclimate.com/climate-beat/quoted-coal-sector-touts-res-cost-study-while-nrdc-cites-big-errors?utm_source=dlvr.it&utm_medium=twitter)]

### Reality: Renewable Energy Is Cheaper Than Coal

**New Wind And Solar Power Is Cheaper Than Existing Coal In Much Of The U.S**. According to Inside Climate News, “Not a single coal-fired power plant along the Ohio River will be able to compete on price with new wind and solar power by 2025, according to a new report by energy analysts. The same is true for every coal plant in a swath of the South that includes the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi. They’re part of the 86 percent of coal plants nationwide that are projected to be on the losing end of this cost comparison, the analysis found.” [Inside Climate News, [3/25/19](https://insideclimatenews.org/news/25032019/coal-energy-costs-analysis-wind-solar-power-cheaper-ohio-valley-southeast-colorado)]

**“Building New Wind And Solar Power Capacity Locally, Defined As Within 35 Miles For The Report, Is Often Less Expensive Than People In Those Markets Realize.”** According to Inside Climate News, “The key point is a simpler one: Building new wind and solar power capacity locally, defined as within 35 miles for the report, is often less expensive than people in those markets realize, and this is indicative of a price trend that is making coal less competitive. This shift shows how market forces are helping the country move away from fossil fuels. At the same time, coal interests have been trying to obscure or cast doubt on this trend, while seeking more government subsidies to slow their industry’s decline.”

[Inside Climate News, [3/25/19](https://insideclimatenews.org/news/25032019/coal-energy-costs-analysis-wind-solar-power-cheaper-ohio-valley-southeast-colorado)]

**Report: Shutting Down Almost Every Coal Plant And Swapping For Renewables Would Save Money**. According to Gizmodo, “Coal is dying in the U.S. Perhaps you’ve heard the reports. But even those reports don’t seem to capture how much of a dead man walking the dirtiest fossil fuel is. An analysis released Monday from Energy Innovation, a energy policy shop focused on developing policies for a clean energy transition, finds that right now, its cheaper to tear down three-quarters of American coal plants and replace them with renewables than to let them continue operating. That number will only continue to rise into the future as renewables continue on their way to becoming among the cheapest sources of energy.” [Gizmodo, [3/25/19](https://earther.gizmodo.com/shutting-down-almost-every-coal-plant-and-swapping-for-1833540557)]

Reality: Renewable Energy Provides Americans With Millions of Jobs

**Renewable Energy Employed 677,544 In The United States**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “According to USEER, the U.S. renewable energy industry provided 677,544 jobs in Q1 2016. The International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), meanwhile, recorded that renewable energy employment in the United States reached 769,000 direct and indirect jobs in 2015 (not including large-scale hydropower employment), a 6 percent increase from the previous year. The discrepancy is partly explained by IRENA’s inclusion of both direct and indirect jobs, while DOE included only direct jobs in its calculations. For instance, IRENA's value of 152,000 jobs for U.S. electricity generation from biomass only includes 15,500 direct jobs. IRENA also has significantly higher job estimates for the U.S. liquid biofuels and geothermal industries.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

**Solar Industry Employed 373,000 Americans**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “USEER reports that the solar energy industry provided 373,807 direct jobs distributed across manufacturing, installation, distribution, and support services for solar energy, about 260,077 of which were full-time positions. According to The Solar Foundation's annual report, the solar energy industry grew 24.5 percent between November 2015 and November 2016, its fourth straight year of 20-plus percent growth. The report concluded that the solar industry provided a total of 260,077 jobs, distributed across all 50 states. Both USEER and The Solar Foundation defined a solar job as one held by an individual who spends at least 50 percent of their time on solar-related work. IRENA further reports that the solar photovoltaic subsector provided 194,000 jobs, while the solar heating/cooling subsector and the concentrated solar power (CSP) subsector provided roughly 10,000 and 4,000 jobs, respectively.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

**Wind Power Industry Provided 101,738 Jobs**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “USEER found that the wind power industry provided 101,738 jobs in Q1 2016. IRENA, meanwhile, reports that the American wind energy industry employed 88,000 Americans. The American Wind Energy Association (AWEA) corroborates IRENA’s 88,000 jobs estimate for the period, claiming that the wind power sector grew by roughly 20 percent between the end of 2014 and the end of 2015. More specifically, AWEA reports that the majority of the industry’s growth occurred in the "wind project development and construction" subsector, which employed over 38,000 Americans. AWEA further reports that the manufacturing subsector provided over 21,000 jobs, while the wind turbine servicing subsector employed over 8,800 technicians (identified by the Bureau of Labor Statistics as the fastest growing job in the United States).” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

**American Hydropower Industry Directly Employed 65,554 Americans**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “According to USEER, the American hydropower industry directly employed 65,554 Americans, 56,259 of whom worked in the traditional hydropower sector and 9,295 in the low-impact hydroelectric subsector. IRENA reported that the "small hydropower" industry directly provided approximately 8,000 jobs; it did not take into account U.S. "large hydropower" employment. In a 2016 report specifically concerning the U.S. hydroelectric industry, DOE concluded that, in 2013, the sector employed around 143,000 Americans, of which 118,000 worked in full-time operational and maintenance positions and 25,000 worked on short-term construction and upgrade projects.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

**Geothermal Power Sector Directly Provided 5,768 Jobs**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “USEER reports that the geothermal power sector directly provided 5,768 jobs in Q1 2016. Alternatively, IRENA estimated that around 35,000 Americans worked in the geothermal industry, which (in contrast to USEER’s definition) encompassed both the power and heating subsectors. In a 2016 report, the Geothermal Energy Association (GEA), Geothermal Exchange Organization (GEO), and Geothermal Resources Council (GRC) concluded that the incorporation of the full geothermal power potential of 9 Western states into the electric grid would support approximately 121,140 direct, indirect, and induced jobs. The report estimated that around 19,480 of these jobs would be full-time operational positions, and 101,300 would be temporary construction jobs lasting at least one year.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

**371 Workers Were Supported By The Wave And Ocean Power Industry**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “In 2010, the Brookings-Battelle Clean Economy Database found 371 workers were supported by the wave and ocean power industry. The Ocean Renewable Energy Coalition suggests marine and hydrokinetic energy could support 36,000 positions by 2030 in direct and indirect jobs in the United States, if its goal of installing 15 gigawatts of power is met.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

**U.S. Biomass Power Industry Employs 7,980 Americans**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “According to USEER, the U.S. biomass power industry employs 7,980 Americans who work exclusively with biomass electric generation technologies. IRENA, however, reports that "solid biomass" energy production directly provides 15,000 jobs and supports an approximate total of 152,000 jobs in the United States. "Solid biomass" excludes "traditional biomass," which refers to wood, charcoal, agricultural residues or animal dung used for residential cooking and heating, particularly in developing countries. The Biomass Power Association corroborates IRENA’s direct jobs estimate, and finds that the more than 15,500 American biomass energy employees working in 80 power-generating facilities across 20 states produce nearly 50 percent of America’s total renewable electricity.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

**5,350 Direct Jobs Were Supported In The Waste-To-Energy Industry**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “A 2016 Energy Recovery Council report suggests that in 2013, 5,350 direct jobs were supported in the waste-to-energy industry. This number includes workers who are employed on-site and off-site by owners, operators, and local governments involved in the industry. Indirectly, the industry provides another 8,600 jobs, for a total of about 14,000 jobs. A 2015 report published by the National Association of Counties calculates that an average waste-to-energy facility capable of processing 1,500 tons of waste per day provides 248 direct jobs and 52 indirect jobs during construction and 59 permanent direct jobs for the plant's operation and maintenance.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

**U.S. Renewable Fuels Industry Directly Employed 104,663 Americans**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “According to USEER, the U.S. renewable fuels industry directly employed 104,663 Americans. IRENA reports that, in 2015, the U.S. "liquid biofuels" sector provided roughly 277,000 jobs. Alternatively, the Fuels America coalition calculated that in 2014 there were 852,056 total renewable fuels jobs in the United States, 292,166 of which were direct jobs, 226,098 were induced, and 333,792 were in the supply chain. The following is a job breakdown for the three main sectors of renewable fuels.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

**Corn Ethanol Subsector Provided 28,613 Jobs**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “USEER found that the corn ethanol subsector provided 28,613 jobs. On the other hand, IRENA reports that the U.S. ethanol industry employed 227,562 Americans. According to the Renewable Fuels Association, the domestic ethanol sector supported 357,407 jobs at the end of 2015, 85,967 of which were direct and 271,440 indirect/induced. More specifically, Agricultural and Biofuels Consulting, LLP found roughly 10,400 employees working full-time directly in ethanol production facilities.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

RHETORIC: Through Industry Innovation, We’ve Seen Substantial Reductions In Greenhouse Gas Emissions

According to InsideEPA, “Despite the slowed GHG improvement, current EPA chief Andrew Wheeler has a similar message. ‘Through industry innovation, we’ve seen substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions over the last decade,’ he said in an April 11 press statement. ‘This is proof that American ingenuity can support continued emissions reductions in the years ahead without the need for regulatory overreach.’” [InsideEPA, [4/11/19](https://insideepaclimate.com/climate-beat/document-epas-final-ghg-inventory-confirms-slight-emissions-cut?utm_source=dlvr.it&utm_medium=twitter)]

Reality: Industry Believes Trump Regulation Cutting Has Gone Too Far

**Politico: “Industries That Had Decried Sweeping Obama-Era Rulemakings Are Discovering The Trump Administration Is At Times Going Too Far In The Other Direction.”** According to Politico, “President Donald Trump’s deregulatory agenda is running into opposition from an unusual place: the businesses he says he is trying to help. Industries that had decried sweeping Obama-era rulemakings are discovering the Trump administration is at times going too far in the other direction. Automakers want tighter fuel economy rules. Utilities say an EPA proposal to reconsider mercury limits could cost them $18 billion. Oil and gas drillers want the Trump administration to regulate methane pollution. And manufacturers are warning they may be cut off from export markets unless the president backs an obscure climate treaty.” [Politico, [4/4/19](https://subscriber.politicopro.com/article/2019/04/big-industries-try-to-pull-trump-back-from-the-deregulatory-brink-1314378)]

* **Politico: “Executives And Lobbyists Are Trying To Quietly Reverse Some Proposals They Say Threaten Their Businesses And Cost Jobs.”** According to Politico, “While these concerns have not provoked any major public splits with a president who has slashed corporate taxes and installed business-friendly leaders across the government, executives and lobbyists are trying to quietly reverse some proposals they say threaten their businesses and cost jobs. But they show how the Trump administration’s desire to break with former President Barack Obama may outweigh the concerns of businesses that have to navigate the complex regulatory and legal process.” [Politico, [4/4/19](https://subscriber.politicopro.com/article/2019/04/big-industries-try-to-pull-trump-back-from-the-deregulatory-brink-1314378)]

# Public Health (Climate Change)

## Rhetoric: EPA Focused On Enforcement

***Wheeler****: “Let me be clear, I am not advocating for letting people off the hook or reducing fines. Rather, I am advocating for making enforcement decisions in a timely and consistent manner.” [Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, 8/3/18]*

EPA Polluter Enforcement Hit Historic Lows In 2018

**EPA Corporate Penalties Hit 10-Year Low In 2018**. According to The Hill, “Penalties handed down to corporate polluters in 2018 by the Trump administration’s Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) were the lowest in over a decade, the agency announced in its annual report Friday. By two key measures, the agency assessed lower penalties for breaking pollution laws on an inflation-adjusted basis than any year in at least 15 years, according to the official figures. The dipped fines include a significant drop in injunctive relief — the monetary commitments polluters pledge to spend in order to remediate their pollution and keep it from recurring — and the civil penalties the EPA charged to companies.” [The Hill, [2/8/19](https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/429184-epa-polluter-enforcement-hit-historic-lows-in-2018)]

**80% Drop In Injunctive Relief In 2018**. According to The Hill, “The 2018 figures were both a drop from the alarming amounts the EPA collected in 2017. Injunctive relief in 2018 was an 80 percent decrease from the EPA’s 2017 numbers of $20 billion. Civil penalties in 2018 dropped nearly 96 percent from the agency’s 2017 numbers of $1.6 billion.” [The Hill, [2/8/19](https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/429184-epa-polluter-enforcement-hit-historic-lows-in-2018)]

Inspections Reached 10-Year Low Under Trump

**Trump EPA Inspected Fewer Industrial Facilities During 2018 Than At Any Time Over The Past Decade**. According to the Washington Post, “Under President Trump, the Environmental Protection Agency inspected fewer industrial facilities during 2018 than at any time over the past decade, according to data released by the agency Friday.” [Washington Post, [2/8/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2019/02/08/under-trump-epa-inspections-fall-year-low/?utm_term=.0e1f800e8574)]

**2018 Inspections Were Only Half Of The Peak High Set In 2010**. According to the Washington Post, “The sharp drop in inspections and evaluations last fiscal year — to roughly 10,600 — is only half the number EPA conducted at its peak in 2010, and continues a downward trend that began in 2012. Other enforcement activities at the agency experienced similar declines, according to EPA figures: The number of civil cases the division started and completed in 2018 hit a 10-year low, and the $69 million in civil penalties it leveled represents the lowest in nearly a quarter-century.” [Washington Post, [2/8/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2019/02/08/under-trump-epa-inspections-fall-year-low/?utm_term=.0e1f800e8574)]

**Budget Cuts Led To Early Declines, But Rate Accelerated Under Trump**. According to the Washington Post, “The agency relies on inspections of manufacturing facilities, oil and gas operations, and power plants to identify and crack down on polluters across the country. Steep budget cuts in recent years have led to a modest decline in these activities since 2012. But that trend has accelerated since Trump took office, in part because EPA’s leadership has said it can clean up the environment more effectively by cooperating with industry to improve the private sector’s performance.” [Washington Post, [2/8/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2019/02/08/under-trump-epa-inspections-fall-year-low/?utm_term=.0e1f800e8574)]

**EPA Emphasizes The Importance Of Conducting Regular Inspections**. According to the Washington Post, “On its own website, however, EPA emphasizes the importance of conducting regular inspections. ‘Inspections are an integral part of EPA’s compliance monitoring programs,’ the site reads. ‘They are an important tool for officially assessing compliance with environmental regulations and requirements.’” [Washington Post, [2/8/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2019/02/08/under-trump-epa-inspections-fall-year-low/?utm_term=.0e1f800e8574)]

**EPA Claimed Decline In Inspections Is Attributable To States Being Given Primary Enforcement Responsibility To Inspect Drinking Water Standards**. According to the Washington Post, “EPA spokesman John Konkus said in an email Friday that ‘approximately half’ of the decline in inspections is attributable to states being given primary enforcement responsibility to inspect drinking water standards at underground injection wells. ‘The EPA is also improving its enforcement targeting efforts,’ Konkus said, ‘so we are more successful at finding more violations using fewer inspections.’” [Washington Post, [2/8/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2019/02/08/under-trump-epa-inspections-fall-year-low/?utm_term=.0e1f800e8574)]

**Andrew Wheeler Told Senate There Was “A Lot Of Misleading Information” On Enforcement**. According to the Washington Post, “During his confirmation hearing last month, EPA acting administrator Andrew Wheeler told lawmakers that there had been “a lot of misleading information” suggesting that the agency had gone easier on polluters under Trump. He cited recent reports from environmental and governance groups that said the EPA’s enforcement had sagged.” [Washington Post, [2/8/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2019/02/08/under-trump-epa-inspections-fall-year-low/?utm_term=.0e1f800e8574)]

**Wheeler Claimed To Reverse Enforcement Trend In 2018**. According to the Washington Post, “Wheeler said the EPA had opened more criminal enforcement cases during 2018 than the year before, reversing a downward trajectory. He said enforcement actions last year resulted in removing ‘809 million pounds of pollution and waste’ from the environment. And he said the agency had worked with companies to ensure they comply with federal rules, rather than levying charges against them or imposing fines.” [Washington Post, [2/8/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2019/02/08/under-trump-epa-inspections-fall-year-low/?utm_term=.0e1f800e8574)]

Civil Penalties For Polluters Dropped Under Trump

**Washington Post: “Civil Penalties For Polluters Under The Trump Administration Plummeted During The Past Fiscal Year To The Lowest Average Level Since 1994.”** According to the Washington Post, “Civil penalties for polluters under the Trump administration plummeted during the past fiscal year to the lowest average level since 1994, according to a new analysis of Environmental Protection Agency data.” [Washington Post, [1/24/18](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/civil-penalties-for-polluters-dropped-dramatically-in-trumps-first-two-years-analysis-shows/2019/01/24/7384d168-1a82-11e9-88fe-f9f77a3bcb6c_story.html?utm_term=.7021ba2993aa)]

**WAPO: “In The Two Decades Before President Trump Took Office, EPA Civil Fines Averaged More Than $500 Million A Year, When Adjusted For Inflation. Last Year’s Total Was 85 Percent Below That Amount.”** According to the Washington Post, “In the two decades before President Trump took office, EPA civil fines averaged more than $500 million a year, when adjusted for inflation. Last year’s total was 85 percent below that amount — $72 million, according to the agency’s Enforcement and Compliance History Online database.” [Washington Post, [1/24/18](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/civil-penalties-for-polluters-dropped-dramatically-in-trumps-first-two-years-analysis-shows/2019/01/24/7384d168-1a82-11e9-88fe-f9f77a3bcb6c_story.html?utm_term=.7021ba2993aa)]

**EPA Officials Declined To Disclose Exact Numbers Due To The Shutdown**. According to the Washington Post, “EPA officials declined to disclose the exact figures for past fiscal year’s civil or criminal penalties, saying they could do so only after the partial government shutdown is over.” [Washington Post, [1/24/18](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/civil-penalties-for-polluters-dropped-dramatically-in-trumps-first-two-years-analysis-shows/2019/01/24/7384d168-1a82-11e9-88fe-f9f77a3bcb6c_story.html?utm_term=.7021ba2993aa)]

**2019 Penalties Will Rise Due To Settlement With Fiat Chrysler**. According to the Washington Post, “The agency’s numbers will undoubtedly rise in 2019 because the federal government recently reached a major settlement with Fiat Chrysler Automobiles over emissions cheating. That agreement includes a civil penalty of $305 million — a figure the EPA noted is four times more than all civil penalties it collected last fiscal year. EPA said that while its overall number of cases declined last fiscal year, ‘EPA is continuing to direct its resources to the most significant and impactful cases.’” [Washington Post, [1/24/18](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/civil-penalties-for-polluters-dropped-dramatically-in-trumps-first-two-years-analysis-shows/2019/01/24/7384d168-1a82-11e9-88fe-f9f77a3bcb6c_story.html?utm_term=.7021ba2993aa)]

**Decline In Criminal Investigators Started Under Obama; 80 More Lost Under Trump**. According to the Washington Post, “However a decline in the number of criminal investigators, which began during the Obama administration, has taken a toll. As of October, a Washington Post analysis showed, the EPA’s enforcement division was among the most affected by a broader exodus at the agency fueled by buyouts and retirements. It has lost at least 80 people since Trump entered office.” [Washington Post, [1/24/18](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/civil-penalties-for-polluters-dropped-dramatically-in-trumps-first-two-years-analysis-shows/2019/01/24/7384d168-1a82-11e9-88fe-f9f77a3bcb6c_story.html?utm_term=.7021ba2993aa)]

EPA Criminal Enforcement At 30-Year Low

**PEER: “In 2018, EPA Generated The Fewest New Criminal Case Referrals For Prosecution Than Any Year Since 1988.”** According to PEER, “Even before the government shutdown, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s criminal enforcement program was missing in action, according to new figures posted today by Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER). In 2018, EPA generated the fewest new criminal case referrals for prosecution than any year since 1988.” [PEER, [1/15/19](https://www.peer.org/news/press-releases/criminal-enforcement-collapse-at-epa.html)]

**EPA Referrals To DOJ Dropped 66% From 2011; 72% From 1988**. According to PEER, “In Fiscal Year 2018 (ending in October), EPA made only 166 referrals for prosecution to the Department of Justice. That represents a nearly 60% reduction from 2011 and a 72% decline from the level of enforcement activity twenty years ago in 1998.’” [PEER, [1/15/19](https://www.peer.org/news/press-releases/criminal-enforcement-collapse-at-epa.html)]

**PEER: “In The First Two Months Of FY 2019, The Pace Has Slowed Even Further, With EPA Making Only 24 Referrals.”** According to PEER, “In the first two months of FY 2019, the pace has slowed even further, with EPA making only 24 referrals. When the effects of the government shutdown are figured in, the current year will likely set another all-time enforcement low mark; and EPA cases resulted in only 62 convictions in FY 2018, fewer than any year dating back to 1992.” [PEER, [1/15/19](https://www.peer.org/news/press-releases/criminal-enforcement-collapse-at-epa.html)]

**PEER: EPA Cases Resulted In Only 62 Convictions In FY 2018, Fewer Than Any Year Dating Back To 1992.”** [PEER, [1/15/19](https://www.peer.org/news/press-releases/criminal-enforcement-collapse-at-epa.html)]

Reality: EPA Enforcement Slowed Under Trump

**EPA Enforcement Slowed Under Trump**. According to the New York Times, “An analysis of enforcement data by The New York Times shows that the administration has adopted a more lenient approach than the previous two administrations — Democratic and Republican — toward polluters like those in East Liverpool.” [New York Times, [12/10/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/10/us/politics/pollution-epa-regulations.html)]

**EPA Under Trump Started Fewer Civil Cases Than During A Similar Period Under Bush Or Obama**. According to the New York Times, “The Times built a database of civil cases filed at the E.P.A. during the Trump, Obama and Bush administrations. During the first nine months under Mr. Pruitt’s leadership, the E.P.A. started about 1,900 cases, about one-third fewer than the number under President Barack Obama’s first E.P.A. director and about one-quarter fewer than under President George W. Bush’s over the same time period.” [New York Times, [12/10/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/10/us/politics/pollution-epa-regulations.html)]

**EPA Sought Fewer Civil Penalties Under Trump Than Bush Or Obama During The Same Period.** According to the New York Times, “In addition, the agency sought civil penalties of about $50.4 million from polluters for cases initiated under Mr. Trump. Adjusted for inflation, that is about 39 percent of what the Obama administration sought and about 70 percent of what the Bush administration sought over the same time period.” [New York Times, [12/10/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/10/us/politics/pollution-epa-regulations.html)]

**Under Trump, EPA Enforcement Needs Approval From Washington For Air And Water Pollution Tests**. According to the New York Times, “The documents, which were reviewed by The Times, indicate that E.P.A. enforcement officers across the country no longer have the authority to order certain air and water pollution tests, known as requests for information, without receiving permission from Washington. The tests are essential to building a case against polluters, the equivalent of the radar gun for state highway troopers.” [New York Times, [12/10/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/10/us/politics/pollution-epa-regulations.html)]

Reality: Federal Disaster Relief Took Longer Under Trump Than Previous Administrations

**EE News: “The Government Has Taken Nearly Twice As Long Under Trump To Approve Or Reject Governors’ Requests For Federal Disaster Relief Than Under Former President Obama.”** According to EE News, “The government has taken nearly twice as long under Trump to approve or reject governors’ requests for federal disaster relief than under former President Obama, an E&E News analysis of government records shows. Trump has taken 26 days on average to act on 155 disaster requests since taking office. On 20 occasions, the administration took more than 60 days, according to Federal Emergency Management Agency records.” [EE News, [4/17/19](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2019/04/17/stories/1060171767)]

**EE News: “Obama Took 14 Days On Average To Make A Decision On 565 Disaster Requests Over Two Terms.”** According to EE News, “Obama took 14 days on average to make a decision on 565 disaster requests over two terms. He needed more than 60 days only once.” [EE News, [4/17/19](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2019/04/17/stories/1060171767)]

**EE News: “Former President George W. Bush Took An Average Of 13 Days During His Final Year And A Half In Office.”** According to EE News, “And former President George W. Bush took an average of 13 days during his final year and a half in office, according to FEMA records that are publicly available starting August 2007.” [EE News, [4/17/19](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2019/04/17/stories/1060171767)]

**Former FEMA Administrator: “That Does Seem To Be Excessive…You Really Try To Get Those Things Turned Around Quickly One Way Or Another.”** According to EE News, “‘That does seem to be excessive,’ former FEMA Administrator Craig Fugate said of Trump’s record. ‘You really try to get those things turned around quickly one way or another.’ The number of disasters and their cost are soaring as climate change contributes to record rainfalls, floods, hurricanes and wildfires. States are increasingly asking FEMA to pay for repairs and cleanup.” [EE News, [4/17/19](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2019/04/17/stories/1060171767)]

Rhetoric: Wheeler Said More Criminal Enforcement Cases Opened In 2018, Reversing Downward Trend

**Wheeler**: Last year, we opened more criminal enforcement cases than in 2017. That reversed a downward trend that started in 2011. So, since 2011, we have been on a steady decline. Last year, we reversed the decline for the first time.” [Andrew Wheeler Confirmation Hearing, 1/16/19]

Reality: Number Of Defendants Charged With Crimes And The Length Of Criminal Sentences Fell During 2018

**Washington Post: “Number Of Defendants Charged With Crimes And The Length Of Criminal Sentences Fell During 2018.”** According to the Washington Post, “But he avoided detailing the sharp drop in civil fines during the 2018 fiscal year. And he did not mention that while the number of criminal cases the agency opened had ticked up slightly, both the number of defendants charged with crimes and the length of criminal sentences fell during 2018.” [Washington Post, [2/8/19](https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-environment/2019/02/08/under-trump-epa-inspections-fall-year-low/?utm_term=.092fe6011e6b)]

Rhetoric: We Have The Cleanest Air

***Trump****: “"I want clean air. I want crystal clean water. And we’ve got it. We’ve got the cleanest country in the planet right now."!”*[Twitter, [10/22/18](https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/1054432329710608385)]

Reality: United States Ranked 88th In Clean Air; 29th In Water Quality

**United States Ranks 88th On Exposure To Particulate Matter**. According to PolitiFact, “The United States ranks 88th on exposure to particulate matter, which Geddes called ‘a really good indicator for health effects from air pollution.’ The scientists used satellites and ground-based measurements to collect the data for 228 countries and territories dating from 2008 to 2015. That predates Trump. In general, however, changes between 2018 scores and the baseline (roughly 10 years earlier) are mixed and small, Wendling said.” [PolitiFact, [8/23/18](https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2018/aug/23/donald-trump/united-states-not-cleanest-country/)]

**United States Ranks 29th Overall In Water Quality**. According to PolitiFact, “The United States ranks 29th overall in water quality. In drinking water, it ranks first (alongside nine other countries) and in sanitation, 31st. ‘For both drinking water and sanitation, the United States is performing okay in absolute terms, with about 3.3 disability-adjusted life-years lost per 100,000 people from risks due to unsafe drinking water, as compared to 6.4 for unsafe sanitation,’ Wendling said.” [PolitiFact, [8/23/18](https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2018/aug/23/donald-trump/united-states-not-cleanest-country/)]

Reality: Greenhouse Gas Reduction Slowed Under Trump

**GHG Reduction Slowed During Trump’s First Year In Office**. According to InsideEPA, “EPA’s final annual greenhouse gas inventory that includes data through 2017 is confirming a relatively small GHG emissions cut from the prior year, highlighting a slowdown in reductions during the early part of the Trump presidency. The final inventory, released April 11, says that national GHG emissions were 6,457 million metric tons (MMT) of carbon dioxide equivalent, which is a 35 MMT reduction from 2016, or 0.5 percent lower. The rate of decline, however, is slowing relative to 2015 and 2015, when total emissions dropped 2 percent each year.” [InsideEPA, [4/11/19](https://insideepaclimate.com/climate-beat/document-epas-final-ghg-inventory-confirms-slight-emissions-cut?utm_source=dlvr.it&utm_medium=twitter)]

**EPA Showed Decrease In Air Pollutants, But Trump Reversing Ring Effect**. According to PolitiFact, “The Environmental Protection Agency’s own research shows a continued decline in air pollutants from 1990. But experts said Trump’s deregulatory practices may have the opposite effect. ‘Deregulation of automobile emissions standards will increase air pollution, particularly in dense urban areas,’ said Elizabeth Albright, an environmental science professor at Duke University.” [PolitiFact, [8/23/18](https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2018/aug/23/donald-trump/united-states-not-cleanest-country/)]

## Rhetoric: Carbon Emissions Are Not Like Other Kinds of Air Pollution

### Reality: Carbon Pollution is Linked to Human Mortality

**Stanford Study Linked Carbon Pollution To Human Mortality.** According to Stanford University, “A Stanford scientist has spelled out for the first time the direct links between increased levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and increases in human mortality, using a state-of-the-art computer model of the atmosphere that incorporates scores of physical and chemical environmental processes. The new findings, to be published in Geophysical Research Letters, come to light just after the Environmental Protection Agency's recent ruling against states setting specific emission standards for this greenhouse gas based in part on the lack of data showing the link between carbon dioxide emissions and their health effects.” [Stanford, [1/3/08](mailto:http://news.stanford.edu/news/2008/january9/co-010908.html)]

**Study Details How For Each Increase Of 1 Degree Celsius Caused By Carbon Dioxide, The Resulting Air Pollution Would Lead Annually To About A Thousand Additional Deaths And Many More Cases Of Respiratory Illness And Asthma**. According to Stanford University, “While it has long been known that carbon dioxide emissions contribute to climate change, the new study details how for each increase of 1 degree Celsius caused by carbon dioxide, the resulting air pollution would lead annually to about a thousand additional deaths and many more cases of respiratory illness and asthma in the United States, according to the paper by Mark Jacobson, a professor of civil and environmental engineering at Stanford. Worldwide, upward of 20,000 air-pollution-related deaths per year per degree Celsius may be due to this greenhouse gas.” [Stanford, [1/3/08](mailto:http://news.stanford.edu/news/2008/january9/co-010908.html)]

**Syracuse And Harvard University Study: “Policies Intended To Address Climate Change By Reducing CO2 Emissions, That Also Decrease Emissions Of SO 2, Nox, And Primary PM2.5 , Can Have Important Human And Environmental Health Co-Benefits.”** According to a Syracuse and Harvard University study, “Carbon pollution standards that reduce CO2 emissions from existing power plants can also cut emissions of other power plant pollutants that have negative human and environmental health impacts locally and regionally. These additional power plant pollutants (or, co-pollutants) include sulfur dioxide (SO2), nitrogen oxides (NOx), particulate matter (PM) and mercury (Hg). Once emitted, SO2 contributes to the formation of fine particle pollution (PM2.5) and NOx is a major precursor to ground-level ozone (O3). For human health, these co-pollutants contribute to increased risk of premature death, heart attacks, increased incidence and severity of asthma, and other health effects. For ecosystems, these co-pollutants contribute to acid rain; the over-fertilization of many types of ecosystems, including grasslands, forests, lakes and coastal waters; ozone damage to trees and crops; and the accumulation of toxic mercury in fish (see Table 1). Therefore, policies intended to address climate change by reducing CO2 emissions, that also decrease emissions of SO 2, NOx, and primary PM2.5 , can have important human and environmental health co-benefits.” [Syracuse and Harvard University, Co-benefits of Carbon Standards, [5/27/14](http://harvardforest.fas.harvard.edu/sites/harvardforest.fas.harvard.edu/files/Carbon%20cobenefits%20study%20FINAL%20SPE%20052714.pdf)]

**More Than 120 Health Organizations Stated On The Record That “Climate Change Is A Serious Public Health Issue.”** According to a column in the New Jersey Star-Ledger, “More than 120 health organizations, including the American Academy of Pediatrics, American Lung Association, American Medical Association, American Nurses Association, American Public Health Association, American Thoracic Society and others, are on record stating: ‘Climate change is a serious public health issue. As temperatures rise, more Americans will be exposed to conditions that can result in illness and death due to respiratory illness, heat- and weather-related stress and disease carried by insects. These health issues are likely to have the greatest impact on our most vulnerable communities, including children, older adults, those with serious health conditions and the most economically disadvantaged.’” [Star Ledger (NJ), [5/15/12](http://blog.nj.com/njv_guest_blog/2012/05/climate_change_is_making_aller.html)]

* **Rutgers Allergy Specialist Leonard Bielory: “Climate Change And Its Potential Disruptive Effects Are A Fundamental Threat To Human Health.”** According to a column by Rutgers allergy specialist Leonard Bielory in the New Jersey Star-Ledger, “Climate change and its potential disruptive effects are a fundamental threat to human health. Limiting greenhouse gas pollution from new sources is a step in the right direction, recognizing that safeguards are important toward curbing climate disruption. Through common-sense protections, our nation can participate in the global need to control and reduce various greenhouse gases, including carbon emissions that add to climate disruption.” [Star Ledger (NJ), [5/15/12](http://blog.nj.com/njv_guest_blog/2012/05/climate_change_is_making_aller.html)]

Reality: Clean Power Plan Would Save As Much As $93 Billion In Health Costs

**EPA: Clean Power Plan Would Save As Much As $93 Billion In Health Costs**. According to the EPA, “The Clean Power Plan will lead to climate and health benefits worth an estimated $55 billion to $93 billion in 2030, including avoiding 2,700 to 6,600 premature deaths and 140,000 to 150,000 asthma attacks in children.” [EPA, Clean Power Plan Fact Sheet, [6/2/14](http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-05/documents/20140602fs-overview.pdf)]

## Rhetoric: Clean Power Plan Wouldn’t Protect Public Health

Reality: CPP Would Have Prevented Thousands of Asthma Attacks, Heart Attacks and Deaths

**Instituting Clean Power Plan Would Prevent 100,000 Asthma Attacks And Up To 2,100 Heart Attacks**. According to a June 2014 report by the White House, “Putting EPA’s proposed guidelines for carbon pollution from power plants in place will not only help reduce the health impacts from climate change; it will also lead, through the measures implemented to achieve the carbon reductions, to reduction in emissions of other air pollutants that are directly harmful to human health… From the soot and smog reductions alone, for every dollar invested through the Clean Power Plan, American families will see up to $7 in health benefits. In the first year that these standards go into effect, up to 100,000 asthma attacks and up to 2,100 heart attacks will be prevented. These standards will also help more kids to be healthy enough to show up to school – with up to 72,000 fewer absences in the first year. The benefits increase each year from there.” [White House, Health Impacts of Climate Change on Americans, June [2014](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/the_health_impacts_of_climate_change_on_americans_.pdf)]

According to a June 2014 report by the White House, by 2030 the Clean power Plan would Prevent:

* 2,700 to 6,600 premature deaths;
* more than 1,800 visits to the hospital for cardiovascular and respiratory illnesses;
* 3,700 cases of bronchitis in children;
* 310,000 lost work days; and
* 180,000 school absences.

[White House, Health Impacts of Climate Change on Americans, June [2014](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/the_health_impacts_of_climate_change_on_americans_.pdf)]

Reality: Clean Power Plan Would Save As Much As $93 Billion In Health Costs

**EPA: Clean Power Plan Would Save As Much As $93 Billion In Health Costs**. According to the EPA, “The Clean Power Plan will lead to climate and health benefits worth an estimated $55 billion to $93 billion in 2030, including avoiding 2,700 to 6,600 premature deaths and 140,000 to 150,000 asthma attacks in children.” [EPA, Clean Power Plan Fact Sheet, [6/2/14](http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-05/documents/20140602fs-overview.pdf)]

### Reality: Climate Change Is Harmful To Public Health

**American Pediatricians: Climate Change Poses Health And Safety Risks To Children.**According to a column by Marlene Cimons in Think Progress, “Finally, pediatricians must become advocates to push for local, national, and international policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and for adaptation approaches to climate related events, the group said. The organization stressed that doctors should speak to elected officials about the serious risks to children posed by climate change.” [Think Progress, [10/26/15](http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/10/26/3715928/pediatricians-kids-climate-change-report/)]

**Children Are More Susceptible To Air Pollution**. According to the American Lung Association 2012 State of the Air report, “In addition, the body’s defenses that help adults fight off infections are still developing in young bodies. Children have more respiratory infections than adults, which also seems to increase their susceptibility to air pollution.” [American Lung Association, State of the Air Report, [2014](http://www.stateoftheair.org/2014/health-risks/health-risks-children.html)]

**American Public Health Association, “Populations Already At Increased Risk From Death And Disease Such As Communities Of Color, The Elderly, Young Children, And The Poor, Will Bear The Burden Of Disease And Death From Climate Change.”** According to the American Public Health Association, “Populations already at increased risk from death and disease such as communities of color, the elderly, young children, and the poor, will bear the burden of disease and death from climate change.” [APHA, [2/19/15](https://www.apha.org/~/media/files/pdf/fact%20sheets/aphaclimchg_phissue_4d.ashx)]

### Reality: Air Pollution Responsible For 200,000 Premature Deaths Per Year

**Massachusetts Institute Of Technology: Air Pollution Causes About 200,000 Early Deaths A Year.** According to a press release from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Researchers from MIT’s Laboratory for Aviation and the Environment have come out with some sobering new data on air pollution’s impact on Americans’ health. The group tracked ground-level emissions from sources such as industrial smokestacks, vehicle tailpipes, marine and rail operations, and commercial and residential heating throughout the United States, and found that such air pollution causes about 200,000 early deaths each year.” [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Press Release, [8/29/13](http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2013/study-air-pollution-causes-200000-early-deaths-each-year-in-the-us-0829.html)]

**MIT Study: Power Generation Responsible For 52,000 Premature Deaths Per Year**. According to a press release from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Emissions from road transportation are the most significant contributor, causing 53,000 premature deaths, followed closely by power generation, with 52,000.” [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Press Release, [8/29/13](http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2013/study-air-pollution-causes-200000-early-deaths-each-year-in-the-us-0829.html)]

* **MIT: “Largest Impact Was Seen In The East-Central United States And In The Midwest: Eastern Power Plants Tend To Use Coal With Higher Sulfur Content Than Western Plants**.” According to a press release from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Pollution from electricity generation still accounted for 52,000 premature deaths annually. The largest impact was seen in the east-central United States and in the Midwest: Eastern power plants tend to use coal with higher sulfur content than Western plants.” [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Press Release, [8/29/13](http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2013/study-air-pollution-causes-200000-early-deaths-each-year-in-the-us-0829.html)]
* **Road Emissions: 53,000 Premature Deaths**. According to a press release from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Emissions from road transportation are the most significant contributor, causing 53,000 premature deaths, followed closely by power generation, with 52,000.” [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Press Release, [8/29/13](http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2013/study-air-pollution-causes-200000-early-deaths-each-year-in-the-us-0829.html)]

**BU Environmental Health Professor: “A Public-Health Burden Of This Magnitude Clearly Requires Significant Policy Attention, Especially Since Technologies Are Readily Available To Address A Significant Fraction Of These Emissions.”** According to a press release from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, “Jonathan Levy, a professor of environmental health at Boston University, says Barrett’s calculations for the overall number of premature deaths related to combustion emissions agree with similar conclusions by the Environmental Protection Agency. The group’s results — particularly the breakdown of emissions by state — provide valuable data in setting future environmental policy, he says. ‘A public-health burden of this magnitude clearly requires significant policy attention, especially since technologies are readily available to address a significant fraction of these emissions,’ says Levy, who was not involved in the research. ‘We have certainly invested significant societal resources to address far smaller impacts on public health.’” [Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Press Release, [8/29/13](http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2013/study-air-pollution-causes-200000-early-deaths-each-year-in-the-us-0829.html)]

**Study: Air Pollution Could Increase Risk Of Stillbirth.**According to an article in the Guardian, “Exposure to air pollution may increase the risk of stillbirth, new research suggests. Stillbirths, classed as such if a baby is born dead after 24 weeks of pregnancy, occur in one in every 200 births. Around 11 babies are stillborn every day in the UK, with approximately 3,600 cases a year. Researchers have called for tighter curbs on car exhausts and industrial waste emissions to reduce the risk of air pollutants after their research concluded that exposure to ambient air pollution heightens the risk of stillbirth.” [Guardian, [5/24/16](http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/may/24/air-pollution-could-increase-risk-of-stillbirth-study-suggests)]

**Study: EPA Standards Not Strong Enough For Fetal Health.**According to an article in E&E News, “Even small amounts of air pollution may cause women to give birth prematurely and could lead to lifelong neurological and respiratory ailments in children, according to new research from Johns Hopkins University. While scientists have long said air pollution can have a negative impact on prenatal health, the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health study says current U.S. EPA standards may not be stringent enough. The more fine particles -- from car exhaust, power plants and other industrial sources -- enter the lungs, the more likely pregnant women will suffer from a condition called intrauterine inflammation.” [E&E News, [4/28/16](http://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2016/04/28/stories/1060036431)]

**Preterm Births Linked To Air Pollution Cost Billions In The U.S.**According to an article in TIME, “Air pollution leads to 16,000 premature births in the United States each year, leading to billions of dollars in economic costs, according to new research. Researchers behind the study, published in the journal Environmental Health Perspectives, found that preterm births associated with particulate matter—a type of pollutant—led to more than $4 billion in economic costs in 2010 due to medical care and lost productivity that results from disability. And, like many other public health issues, affected populations tend to be concentrated in low-income areas home to large numbers of minorities.” [TIME, [3/29/16](http://time.com/4274355/air-pollution-preterm-birth/?xid=tcoshare)]

### Reality: Children and Elderly More Susceptible To Air Pollution

**ALA: Children Spend More Time Outside, Consequently Inhale More Polluted Air Than Adults.** According to American Lung Association, State of the Air Report, “…the body’s defenses that help adults fight off infections are still developing in young bodies. Children have more respiratory infections than adults, which also seems to increase their susceptibility to air pollution. Furthermore, children don’t behave like adults, and their behavior also affects their vulnerability. They are outside for longer periods and are usually more active when outdoors. Consequently, they inhale more polluted outdoor air than adults typically do.” [American Lung Association, State of the Air Report, [2016](http://www.lung.org/assets/documents/healthy-air/state-of-the-air/sota-2016-full.pdf)]

**ALA: “Nearly 22.3 Million Adults Age 65 And Over And More Than 39.1 Million Children Under 18 Years Old Live In Counties That Received An F For At Least One Pollutant.”** According to American Lung Association, State of the Air Report, “Nearly 22.3 million adults age 65 and over and more than 39.1 million children under 18 years old live in counties that received an F for at least one pollutant. More than 2.4 million seniors and more than 4.9 million children live in counties failing all three tests.” [American Lung Association, State of the Air Report, [2016](http://www.lung.org/assets/documents/healthy-air/state-of-the-air/sota-2016-full.pdf)]

**ALA: Nearly 22.3 Million Adults Over 65 And More Than 39.1 Million Children Under 18 Live In Counties That Received An F For At Least One Pollutant.** According to American Lung Association, State of the Air Report, “Nearly 22.3 million adults age 65 and over and more than 39.1 million children under 18 years old live in counties that received an F for at least one pollutant” [American Lung Association, State of the Air Report, [2016](http://www.lung.org/assets/documents/healthy-air/state-of-the-air/sota-2016-full.pdf)]

* **ALA: “More than 2.4 million seniors and more than 4.9 million children live in counties failing all three tests.”** [American Lung Association, State of the Air Report, [2016](http://www.lung.org/assets/documents/healthy-air/state-of-the-air/sota-2016-full.pdf)]

**ALA: “Nearly 441,000 Children And Close To 1.2 Million Adults With Asthma Live In Counties Failing All Three Tests.”** According to American Lung Association, State of the Air Report, “Nearly 3.6 million children and close to 11.4 million adults with asthma live in counties of the United States that received an F for at least one pollutant. Nearly 441,000 children and close to 1.2 million adults with asthma live in counties failing all three tests.” [American Lung Association, State of the Air Report, [2016](http://www.lung.org/assets/documents/healthy-air/state-of-the-air/sota-2016-full.pdf)]

**White House: Climate Change Will Put Vulnerable Populations At Greater Risk Including Elderly And Children.** According to a June 2014 report by the White House, “We know climate change will put vulnerable populations at greater risk – including the elderly, our kids, and people already suffering from burdensome allergies, asthma, and other illnesses. Pre-existing health conditions make older adults susceptible to the cardiac and respiratory impacts of air pollution. Higher rates of diabetes, obesity, or asthma in some communities may place them at greater risk of climate-related health impacts. Children, who breathe more air relative to their size than adults, are also at higher risk of worsened asthma and respiratory symptoms from air pollution.” [White House, Health Impacts of Climate Change on Americans, June [2014](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/the_health_impacts_of_climate_change_on_americans_.pdf)]

**American Public Health Association, “Populations Already At Increased Risk From Death And Disease Such As Communities Of Color, The Elderly, Young Children, And The Poor, Will Bear The Burden Of Disease And Death From Climate Change.”** According to the American Public Health Association, “Populations already at increased risk from death and disease such as communities of color, the elderly, young children, and the poor, will bear the burden of disease and death from climate change.” [APHA, [2/19/15](https://www.apha.org/~/media/files/pdf/fact%20sheets/aphaclimchg_phissue_4d.ashx)]

# National Security

## Rhetoric: Green New Deal Undermines Grid Reliability

**Wheeler:** “I am concerned that they really don’t seem to value a stable electricity source, grid reliability. For human health and the environment here at the agency, I have to be very concerned about that because it’s the electricity system that supplies our drinking water system and runs it,” Wheeler said. “It’s not really addressed in their Green Deal.” [Vox, [2/15/19](https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2019/2/15/18224844/green-new-deal-epa-andrew-wheeler)]

### Reality: Renewable Energy Doesn’t Destabilize the Grid

**EE News: “Series Of Recent Studies Have Found That The U.S. Grid Could Operate Reliably With Large Amounts Of Renewable Generation.”** According to EE News, “A series of recent studies have found that the U.S. grid could operate reliably with large amounts of renewable generation. A National Renewable Energy Laboratory study from last year concluded that the Eastern Interconnection could operate with 30 percent penetrations of wind and renewable generation. A 2016 National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration study found that the U.S. power sector could cut carbon emissions by 80 percent without increasing costs.” [EE News, [6/2/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060055454)]

**Existing Safeguards Could Prevent Power Supply Disruptions**. According to EE News, “Additionally, when federal electricity regulators examined the potential impacts of the Obama administration’s power-sector climate standards, they found that existing safeguards could prevent power supply disruptions.” [EE News, [6/2/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060055454)]

**Research Director Of The Harvard Electricity Policy Group: “The Blackouts And Brownouts Is Not Consistent With How We Operate The System.”** According to EE News, “Trump cast doubt on renewable energy’s ability to power the country in a high-economic-growth scenario. The president is technically correct that the United States will need all forms of energy, said William Hogan, research director of the Harvard Electricity Policy Group. But that’s because even the most optimistic scenarios don’t envision a grid powered entirely by renewables until far into the future. The question with renewables is less one of reliability and more one of cost, he said. ‘The blackouts and brownouts is not consistent with how we operate the system,’ he added.” [EE News, [6/2/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060055454)]

**Vox: “Grid Operators Have Long Been Focused On Reliability And Have Strong Legal Obligations To Keep Power Reliable.”** According to Vox, “Here the president seems to fear that the country will be forced to move quickly to all wind and solar power and that will make electricity unreliable. There are no credible mainstream assessments that predict that outcome, and the government’s own Energy Information Agency envisions many possible futures for power generation — all with a balance of sources, not just renewables. Grid operators have long been focused on reliability and have strong legal obligations to keep power reliable.” [Vox, [6/2/17](https://www.vox.com/a/annotation-trump-paris-climate-agreement-speech-victor)]

### Reality: Climate Change Will Require Action to prevent serious impacts on bases

**Department Of Defense Recognizes Changing Climate As A National Security Issue With Impacts On Missions, Operational Plans, And Installations**. According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “The effects of a changing climate are a national security issue with potential impacts to Department of Defense (DoD or the Department) missions, operational plans, and installations. Our 2018 National Defense Strategy prioritizes long-term strategic competition with great power competitors by focusing the Department’s efforts and resources to: 1) build a more lethal force, 2) strengthen alliances and attract new partners, and 3) reform the Department’s processes. To achieve these goals, DoD must be able to adapt current and future operations to address the impacts of a variety of threats and conditions, including those from weather and natural events. To that end, DoD factors in the effects of the environment into its mission planning and execution to build resilience.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

**Department Of Defense Is Adapting To Climate Impacts In Construction And Design**. According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “DoD is also updating various built and natural infrastructure design standards to better adapt to climate impacts. The Coastal Assessment Regional Scenario Working Group released a report in April 2016 that provided a database with regionalized sea level scenarios for three future time horizons (2035, 2065, and 2100) for 1,774 DoD sites worldwide. The database also contains extreme water levels statistics (storm surge without waves and wave run up) for four types of annual chance events (1, 2, 5 and 20 percent) based on historical tide gauge data. This information can be used to establish base flood elevation and potential future flood inundation areas of concern for installations in coastal and tidal areas. The Military Services and the Defense Logistics Agency approach installation resiliency through the integration of weather and climate considerations into existing plans and processes, using partnerships with other federal agencies, state governments, local governments, nongovernmental organizations, and local communities to increase preparedness and resilience.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

### Reality: Climate Change and Sea-Level Rise Threaten Coastal Bases

**Navy Region Mid-Atlantic And The Greater Hampton Roads Area In Virginia Is One Of The Most Vulnerable To Flooding In The U.S.** According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Navy Region Mid-Atlantic and the greater Hampton Roads area is one of the most vulnerable to flooding military operational installation areas in the United States. Sea level rise, land subsidence, and changing ocean currents have resulted in more frequent nuisance flooding and increased vulnerability to coastal storms. As a result, and to better mitigate these issues, the Region has engaged in several initiatives and partnerships to address the associated challenges.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

**Southwest Vulnerable To Drought, Which Can Have Broad Implication For Infrastructure, Testing Activities, And Training Time**. According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Drought can negatively impact U.S. military installations in various ways, particularly in the Southwest. For example, dry conditions from drought impact water supply in areas dependent on surface water. Additionally, droughts dry out vegetation, increasing wildfire potential/severity. Specific to military readiness, droughts can have broad implications for base infrastructure, impair testing activities, and along with increased temperature, can increase the number of black flag day prohibitions for testing and training. Drought can contribute to heat-related illnesses, including heat exhaustion and heat stroke, outlined by the U.S. Army Public Health Center. Energy consumption may increase to provide additional cooling for facilities.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

**Severe Weather Severely Limits The Operations And Activities At Naval Base Guam**. According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Weather conditions over the Mediterranean Sea currently impact intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR), personnel recovery/casualty evacuation and logistics flights from Europe to the African continent; potentially increasing no-go flight days. At Naval Base Guam, recurrent flooding limits capacity for a number of operations and activities including Navy Expeditionary Forces Command Pacific, submarine squadrons, telecommunications, and a number of other specific tasks supporting mission execution. Additionally, recurrent flooding impacts operations and activities of contingency response groups at Andersen Air Force Base, as well as mobility response, communications, combat, and security forces squadrons.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

**Naval Base Coronado In California Is Subject To Extreme Flooding During Tropical Storms**. According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Navy Base Coronado experiences isolated and flash flooding during tropical storm events, particularly in El Niño years. Upland Special Areas are subject to flash floods. The main installation reports worsening sea level rise and storm surge impacts that include access limitations and other logistic related impairments.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

### Reality: Climate Change Threatens Areas Subject To Drought And Wildfires

**Several Sites Have Experienced Drought, Causing Ruptured Utility Lines, Cracked Road Surfaces, And Wide Soil Cracks**. According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Several DoD sites in the DC area (including Joint Base Anacostia Bolling, Joint Base Andrews, U.S. Naval Observatory/Naval Support Facility, and Washington Navy Yard) periodically experienced drought conditions –extreme in 2002 and severe from 2002 through 2018. In addition, Naval Air Station Key West experienced drought in 2015 and 2011, ranging from extreme to severe, respectively. These examples highlight that drought conditions may occur in places not typically perceived as drought regions. Drought conditions have caused significant reduction in soil moisture at several Air Force bases resulting in deep or wide cracks in the soil, at times leading to ruptured utility lines and cracked road surfaces.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

**Desertification At Military Bases ‘Could Affect The Suitability Of The Landscape For Military Maneuvers And Off-Road Use.’** According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Desertification poses a number of challenges related to training and maneuvers. Desertification results in reductions in vegetation cover leading to increases in the amount of runoff from precipitation events. Greater runoff contributes to: higher erosion rates, increased stream sediment loads, and deposition of sediment in unwanted areas. This reduces the effectiveness of flood risk management infrastructure while increasing the potential for siltation of water supply reservoirs. Following rain, eroded soil may be less suitable for native vegetation, resulting in bare land or revegetation with non-native, weedy species. In cases where this results in the expansion of shrub-lands, this could affect the suitability of the landscape for military maneuvers and off-road use. [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

**Army Bases From New Mexico To California Were Identified As Vulnerable To Current And Future Desertification.** According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Army installations Camp Roberts in San Miguel, California, and White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico were identified as vulnerable to current and future desertification, which 7 accelerates erosion and increases soil fragility, possibly limiting future training and testing exercises. Air Force bases in western states, including Kirtland, Creech, Nellis, and Hill were also identified as vulnerable to current and future desertification.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

**Wildfires On Military Bases Are Cause For Concern Due To Testing Activities That Involve Ignition.** According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Due to routine training and testing activities that are significant ignition sources, wildfires are a constant concern on many military installations. As a result, the DoD spends considerable resources on claims, asset loss, and suppression activities due to wildfire. While fire is a key ecological process with benefits for both sound land management and military capability development, other climatic factors including increased wind and drought can lead to an increased severity of wildfire activity. This could result in infrastructure and testing/training impacts.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

### Reality: Climate Change Threatens Military Bases In Cold Areas and The Arctic

**Thawing Permafrost On Military Bases Can Cause Structural Ability Issues To Structures And Requires Costly Mitigation Efforts**. According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Permafrost presents risks for critical built infrastructure. Soil strength, ground subsidence, and stability are primarily affected by the phase change of ground ice to water at or near 0°C and when the soil thermal regime changes (by human activity, infrastructure emplacement, or systemic shifts related to weather). Such subsidence may be rapid and catastrophic (days), very slow and systematic (decades), or somewhere in between. Whether rapid or slow, thawing permafrost decreases the structural stability to foundations, buildings, and transportation infrastructure and requires costly mitigation responses that disrupt planning, operations, and budgets. In addition, thawing permafrost exposes coasts to increased erosion.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

**Thawing Permafrost Threatens Alaska Particularly, Where Permafrost Underlays 85 Percent Of The State.** According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Permafrost underlays about 85 percent of Alaska; it is thickest north of the Brooks Range and gradually diminishes southward. Permafrost thaw is relevant to DoD training and testing needs. Thermokarst, which is a type of landscape that results from thawing permafrost, increases wetland areas and creates more challenging terrain. In Fort Greeley, Alaska, Army training ranges are built on, or are being planned in permafrost-dominated areas. Predicting where this phenomenon occurs and how permafrost might change is vital to maintaining training operations and assessing impending environmental management challenges.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

**Climate-Related Effects Impact Accessibility And Activity In The Arctic**. According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Climate-related effects impact accessibility and activity in the Arctic. The Northern Sea Route generally opens for four weeks each year – usually the month of September – and has the potential for increased Arctic maritime traffic. The demand for Arcticspecific search and rescue (SAR) resources will grow as Arctic activity increases. There is need for further military support to civil authorities to enable the peaceful opening of the Arctic as access increases. The role of United States Europe Command (USEUCOM) in the high north will expand with enhanced opportunities for cooperation with 9 allies and partners and growth in the number and frequency of live training exercises in the region. In the Arctic, acquisition and supply chain requirements are considerably longer and are much costlier. DoD will continue to partner with Federal departments and agencies, state, local, and tribal agencies, other nations, and the private sector on services as appropriate.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

### Reality: Extreme Weather Made Worse By Climate Change Has Already Caused Significant Damage To Military Bases

**August 2013: Monsoon Flooded More Than 160 Buildings, Led To Months Of Clean Up And Repair**. According to the Department of Defense Climate-Related Risk to DoD Infrastructure Initial Vulnerability Assessment Survey (SLVAS) Report, “In August 2013, a late summer monsoon rain storm struck Fort Irwin. This storm brought several inches of rain in a short period of time. Storm water flowed into the main cantonment area from the mountains around the post causing great damage to property. More than 160 buildings in the cantonment area were flooded and sections of Fort Irwin’s extensive training area also sustained major storm damage. Training structures were toppled and supporting electronic target and communications systems were damaged. Weeks of effort were required to clean storm debris from the cantonment area’s roads and parking lots. Soldiers, Civilians, and contractors all pitched in clear debris from roads and buildings, and. Many buildings were closed for repair for months.” [Department of Defense, [1/24/18](https://climateandsecurity.files.wordpress.com/2018/01/tab-b-slvas-report-1-24-2018.pdf)]

**West Point Has Experienced Flooding ‘Numerous Times In The Past 30 Years.** According to the Department of Defense Climate-Related Risk to DoD Infrastructure Initial Vulnerability Assessment Survey (SLVAS) Report, “While less than 5 percent of the West Point Military Reservation is within 0-3 feet of mean sea level, that portion of the installation includes transportation and wastewater treatment infrastructure. Due to its physical/geographic location, flooding has occurred at West Point numerous times in the past 30 years. During Superstorm Sandy, some sections of the installation reported significant inundation.” [Department of Defense, [1/24/18](https://climateandsecurity.files.wordpress.com/2018/01/tab-b-slvas-report-1-24-2018.pdf)]

**Extreme Weather Impacts Damaged Cape Lisburne Long Rand Radar Station In Alaska, And Cost $46.8 Million.** According to the Department of Defense Climate-Related Risk to DoD Infrastructure Initial Vulnerability Assessment Survey (SLVAS) Report, “Arctic sea ice is in constant change, growing in the fall and winter and receding in the spring and summer. The proximity of Air Force long range radar on the North Slope of Alaska to the Arctic shoreline makes them vulnerable to accelerated shoreline erosion from the duration and extent of sea ice fluctuations, increasing water temperatures, thawing of permafrost soils, and the effects of wave action. The rock seawall at the Cape Lisburne Long Rand Radar Station on the northwest Alaska coast line protects the installation’s gravel airstrip from tidal and storm driven wave action. Over the past decade the runway’s seawall has been depleted and eroded by wave action and extreme weather events. The damaged rock reinforcement became ineffective, and the 5,450 linear foot wall had to be replaced at a cost of $46.8 million.” [Department of Defense, [1/24/18](https://climateandsecurity.files.wordpress.com/2018/01/tab-b-slvas-report-1-24-2018.pdf)]

**March 2018: Military Exercises In Colorado Led To Wildfires That Caused Evacuation Of 250 Homes And Spread To Over 3,000 Acres**. According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “In March 2018 two related wildfires broke out in Colorado during an infantry and helicopter training exercise for an upcoming deployment. Later determined to be due to live fire training, gusty winds and dry conditions allowed the fire to spread, reaching about 3,300 acres in size, destroying three homes, and causing the evacuation of 250 homes.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

**Vandenberg Air Force Base In California Has Had Two Major Wildfires In 2016 And 2017 Burning Nearly 1,400 Acres In Total.** According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “A wildfire in November 2017 burned 380 acres on Vandenberg Air Force Base in southern California. While no structures were burned, the fire prompted evacuation of some personnel. Firefighters from the U.S. Forest Service, Santa Barbara County, and other localities assisted the Vandenberg Fire Department in managing the fire. The Canyon Wildfire at Vandenberg in September 2016 burned over 10,000 acres and came very close to two Space Launch Complexes. A scheduled rocket launch had to be delayed. Several facilities on the south part of the base were operating on generators due to the loss of electrical power lines.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

**Joint Base Langley Eustis In Virginia Has Experienced 14 Inches In Seal Level Rise Since 1930.** According to the Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense, “Vulnerabilities to installations include coastal and riverine flooding. Coastal flooding may result from storm surge during severe weather events. Over time, gradual sea level changes magnify the impacts of storm surge, and may eventually result in permanent inundation of property. Increasing coverage of land from nuisance flooding during high tides, also called “sunny day” flooding, is already affecting many coastal communities. Joint Base Langley-Eustis (JBLE-Langley AFB), Virginia, has experienced 14 inches in sea level rise since 1930 due to localized land subsidence and sea level rise. Flooding at JBLE-Langley, with a mean sea level elevation of three feet, has become more frequent and severe.” [Department of Defense, [1/2019](https://partner-mco-archive.s3.amazonaws.com/client_files/1547826612.pdf)]

# Rejecting, Misinterpreting, and Undermining Science

Rhetoric: Most Of The Threats From Climate Change Are 50 To 75 Years Out

Wheeler: “Most of the threats from climate change are 50 to 75 years out," while unsafe drinking water is killing people right now. [CBS, [3/20/19](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/epa-administrator-andrew-wheeler-exclusive-interview/)]

Reality: Wheeler Statement Contradicted By National Climate Assessment Nine Times

**Wheeler Statement Contradicted By National Climate Assessment Nine Times**. According to CNN, “An analysis by the environmental advocacy group the Sierra Club, released Monday, found nine instances in which Wheeler's statements about the delayed impact of climate change were directly contradicted in the National Climate Assessment, a government-sponsored climate analysis authored by scientists from 13 federal agencies that was released in November. (there is no link to this analysis because they gave it to us exclusively)” [CNN, [4/22/19](https://www.cnn.com/2019/04/22/politics/sierra-club-climate-change-scn/index.html)]

* **Sea Level Rise**. According to CNN, “Sea level rise "has already increased the frequency of high tide flooding by a factor of 5 to 10 for several U.S. coastal communities," according to the National Climate Assessment. The report says that the rise has contributed to coastal flooding since the 1960s.” [CNN, [4/22/19](https://www.cnn.com/2019/04/22/politics/sierra-club-climate-change-scn/index.html)]
* **Higher Temperatures**. According to CNN, “Between 1901 and 2016, the global average temperatures ‘have increased by 1.8 degrees Fahrenheit,’ and there is no evidence that the rise in temperature has been caused by any ‘natural explanation,’ according to the report. ‘The evidence consistently points to human activities, especially emissions of greenhouse or heat-trapping gases, as the dominant cause,’ the report states.” [CNN, [4/22/19](https://www.cnn.com/2019/04/22/politics/sierra-club-climate-change-scn/index.html)]
* **Hotter Years**. According to CNN, “Each decade has been the hottest on record in succession over the past 30 years. Seventeen of the 18 hottest years on record have occurred since 2001, according to the report.” [CNN, [4/22/19](https://www.cnn.com/2019/04/22/politics/sierra-club-climate-change-scn/index.html)]
* **More Wildfires**. According to CNN, “Areas burned by wildfires covered ‘twice what would have burned if climate change had not occurred’ from 1984 to 2015. The area that was burned by wildfires between 1916 and 2003 ‘was more closely related to climate factors than to fire suppression, local fire management, or other non-climate factors,’ the report states. Trump was highly critical of the Interior Department and California’s government during the California wildfires in fall 2018. He publicly blamed ‘gross mismanagement’ for the devastating wildfires, saying it was largely caused by poor ‘forest management’ in tweets.” [CNN, [4/22/19](https://www.cnn.com/2019/04/22/politics/sierra-club-climate-change-scn/index.html)]
* **Harm To Coral Reefs**. According to CNN, “The report found that global warming has led to ‘coral diseases’ and ‘mass bleaching’ off Puerto Rico, the US Virgin Islands, Florida, Hawaii and the US-affiliated Pacific Islands. These diseases ‘threaten reef ecosystems.’” [CNN, [4/22/19](https://www.cnn.com/2019/04/22/politics/sierra-club-climate-change-scn/index.html)]
* **Damage To Military Assets**. According to CNN, “Climate change is ‘already affecting’ the Department of Defense’s infrastructure, according to the report, by ‘damaging roads, runways, and waterfront infrastructure.’” [CNN, [4/22/19](https://www.cnn.com/2019/04/22/politics/sierra-club-climate-change-scn/index.html)]
* **Clean Water**. According to CNN, “Wheeler said that access to clean drinking water worldwide was ‘the biggest environmental threat.’ Climate change is affecting the water infrastructure that keeps water in our country clean. ‘Changes in the frequency and intensity of climate extremes,’ compared with the 20th century, are ‘deteriorating water infrastructure,’ the report states.” [CNN, [4/22/19](https://www.cnn.com/2019/04/22/politics/sierra-club-climate-change-scn/index.html)]
* **Relocation Of Indigenous Communities**. According to CNN, “The report found that ‘climate-related impacts’ are causing some US indigenous communities to ‘consider or actively pursue community re-location as an adaptation strategy.’ Because they are struggling with severe effects of climate change, the residents are considering uprooting their communities, which could make it harder to maintain ‘cultural and community continuity,’ the report notes.” [CNN, [4/22/19](https://www.cnn.com/2019/04/22/politics/sierra-club-climate-change-scn/index.html)]
* **Injury, Illness And Death**. According to CNN, “Climate change is affecting the health and well-being of the American people, according to the report. ‘Climate-related changes in weather patterns and associated changes in air, water, food and the environment’ are ‘causing injuries, illnesses and death,’ the report states. While access to clean drinking water is a major issue in the United States and around the world, under Wheeler, the agency changed two policies to weaken regulatory protections for water.” [CNN, [4/22/19](https://www.cnn.com/2019/04/22/politics/sierra-club-climate-change-scn/index.html)]

Rhetoric: Midwest Was Very Cold In The Winter, So There Is No Global Warming

**Trump**: In the beautiful Midwest, windchill temperatures are reaching minus 60 degrees, the coldest ever recorded. In coming days, expected to get even colder. People can’t last outside even for minutes. What the hell is going on with Global Waming? Please come back fast, we need you! [Twitter, [1/28/19](https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump/status/1090074254010404864?lang=en)]

Reality: Trump is cherry picking cold weather to ignore the larger picture of a warming planet

**Associated Press: “While The Midwest Is In The Grip Of A Chill That’s Likely To Set Records, Earth Is Still Considerably Warmer Than It Was 30 Years Ago And Especially 100 Years Ago.”** According to the Associated Press, “While the Midwest is in the grip of a chill that’s likely to set records, Earth is still considerably warmer than it was 30 years ago and especially 100 years ago. The lower 48 states make up only 1.6 percent of the globe and five western states are warmer than normal. The Earth as a whole — and it is global warming, not U.S. warming — on Tuesday is 0.54 degrees (0.3 degrees Celsius) warmer than the 1979 to 2000 average and 1.6 degrees warmer than it was on average about 100 years ago, according to data from the University of Maine’s Climate Reanalyzer and NASA.” [Associated Press, [1/29/19](https://www.apnews.com/c7c1b544bf154a08b2e01209495b68d4)]

**Northern Illinois University Climate Scientist: “This Is Simply An Extreme Weather Event And Not Representative Of Global Scale Temperature Trends.”** According to the Associated Press, “‘This is simply an extreme weather event and not representative of global scale temperature trends,’ said Northern Illinois University climate scientist Victor Gensini, who is in the midst of some of the worst subfreezing cold. ‘The exact opposite is happening in Australia right now.’” [Associated Press, [1/29/19](https://www.apnews.com/c7c1b544bf154a08b2e01209495b68d4)]

**Professor Of Climate Change Communications At George Mason University: “Trump Is Cherry Picking Cold Weather To Ignore The Larger Picture Of A Warming Planet.”** According to the Associated Press, “Trump is cherry picking cold weather to ignore the larger picture of a warming planet, said John Cook, a professor of climate change communications at George Mason University. ‘This myth is like arguing that nighttime proves the sun doesn’t exist,’ Cook said.” [Associated Press, [1/29/19](https://www.apnews.com/c7c1b544bf154a08b2e01209495b68d4)]

## Rhetoric: Carbon Was Not Primary Contributor To Global Warming

Manmade Carbon Pollution Is Responsible For Climate Change

**NASA: Humans Have Increased Atmospheric CO2 Concentration By More Than A Third Since The Industrial Revolution Began**. According to NASA, “Carbon dioxide (CO2). A minor but very important component of the atmosphere, carbon dioxide is released through natural processes such as respiration and volcano eruptions and through human activities such as deforestation, land use changes, and burning fossil fuels. Humans have increased atmospheric CO2 concentration by more than a third since the Industrial Revolution began. This is the most important long-lived "forcing" of climate change.” [NASA, Climate Change Facts, accessed [4/27/17](mailto:https://climate.nasa.gov/causes/)]

**1,300 Independent Scientific Experts 95 Percent Probability That Human Activities Over The Past 50 Years Have Warmed Our Planet**. According to NASA, “In its Fifth Assessment Report, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a group of 1,300 independent scientific experts from countries all over the world under the auspices of the United Nations, concluded there’s a more than 95 percent probability that human activities over the past 50 years have warmed our planet. The industrial activities that our modern civilization depends upon have raised atmospheric carbon dioxide levels from 280 parts per million to 400 parts per million in the last 150 years. The panel also concluded there’s a better than 95 percent probability that human-produced greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide have caused much of the observed increase in Earth’s temperatures over the past 50 years.” [NASA, Climate Change Facts, accessed [4/27/17](mailto:https://climate.nasa.gov/causes/)]

**Study Linked Manmade Emissions To Climate Change.** According to an article in Think Progress, “These results confirm widely believed notions in the scientific community that manmade climate change is damaging natural systems worldwide. According to the study, the frozen water areas of the planet and marine systems showed the highest share of impact cases, with at least medium confidence, to manmade emissions. Most effects linked to manmade climate change held at least a medium confidence level, although higher confidence levels were recorded too.” [Think Progress, [12/23/15](http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/12/23/3734910/global-warming-link-clear/)]

**Carbon Pollution Causes Climate Change**; **Power Plants Are Responsible for 40 Percent of Carbon Pollution in the U.S.**Carbon pollution causes climate change, which worsens harmful air pollution. Fossil fuel-fired power plants are responsible for 40 percent of man-made carbon dioxide emissions in the U.S.  [NRDC, [12/1/14](http://www.nrdc.org/air/pollution-standards/); EPA Overview of Greenhouse Gases, Accessed [7/10/15](http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/gases/co2.html)]

**US Carbon Emissions Would Flatten Or Increase By 2020 If CPP Is Repealed**. According to Inside Climate News, “Climate Advisers, a Washington consultancy, predicts that U.S. carbon emissions, which have been falling, will begin to flatten or increase by 2020 if the Trump administration succeeds in repealing the Clean Power Plan and other Obama-era regulations.” [Inside Climate News, [4/25/17](https://insideclimatenews.org/news/25042017/donald-trump-climate-change-clean-power-plan-paris-agreement)]

## Rhetoric: The Impact of Human Activity on Climate Change is Unknown

### Reality: Overwhelming Consensus That Climate Change Very Likely Due to Human Activities

**97 Percent Of Climate Scientists Agree That Climate Trends Likely Due To Human Activity**. According to the National Aeronautic and Space Administration, “Ninety-seven percent of climate scientists agree that climate-warming trends over the past century are very likely due to human activities, and most of the leading scientific organizations worldwide have issued public statements endorsing this position. The following is a partial list of these organizations, along with links to their published statements and a selection of related resources.” [NASA, Scientific Consensus, accessed [2/5/15](http://climate.nasa.gov/scientific-consensus)]

**IPCC: “Human Influence On The Climate System Is Clear.”** According to the IPCC 2014 Synthesis Report, “Human influence on the climate system is clear, and recent anthropogenic emissions of greenhouse gases are the highest in history. Recent climate changes have had widespread impacts on human and natural systems.” [IPCC Fifth Assessment Synthesis Report, [11/1/14](http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/)]

**IPCC: “Anthropogenic Greenhouse Gas Emissions…Extremely Likely To Have Been The Dominant Cause Of The Observed Warming Since The Mid-20th Century.”** According to the IPCC 2014 Synthesis Report, “Anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions have increased since the pre-industrial era, driven largely by economic and population growth, and are now higher than ever. This has led to atmospheric concentrations of carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide that are unprecedented in at least the last 800,000 years. Their effects, together with those of other anthropogenic drivers, have been detected throughout the climate system and are extremely likely to have been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century.” [IPCC Fifth Assessment Synthesis Report, [11/1/14](http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/syr/)]

**18 Scientific Agencies: “Climate Change Is Occurring, And Rigorous Scientific Research Demonstrates That The Greenhouse Gases Emitted By Human Activities Are The Primary Driver.”** According to a letter from 18 scientific organizations to members of the United States Senate, “Observations throughout the world make it clear that climate change is occurring, and rigorous scientific research demonstrates that the greenhouse gases emitted by human activities are the primary driver. These conclusions are based on multiple independent lines of evidence, and contrary assertions are inconsistent with an objective assessment of the vast body of peer-reviewed science. Moreover, there is strong evidence that ongoing climate change will have broad impacts on society, including the global economy and on the environment. For the United States, climate change impacts include sea level rise for coastal states, greater threats of extreme weather events, and increased risk of regional water scarcity, urban heat waves, western wildfires, and the disturbance of biological systems throughout the country. The severity of climate change impacts is expected to increase substantially in the coming decades.” [Letter, 18 Scientific Agencies to United States Senate Members, [10/21/09](http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/ssi/climate-change-statement-from.pdf)]

*Signatories Included:*American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Chemical Society, American Geophysical Union, American Institute of Biological Sciences, American Meteorological Society, American Society of Agronomy, American Society of Plant Biologists, American Statistical Association, Association of Ecosystem Research Centers, Botanical Society of America, Crop Science Society of America, Ecological Society of America, Natural Science Collections Alliance, Organization of Biological Field Stations, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Society of Systematic Biologists, Soil Science Society of America, University Corporation for Atmospheric Research. [Letter, 18 Scientific Agencies to United States Senate Members, [10/21/09](http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/ssi/climate-change-statement-from.pdf)]

**American Metrological Society: “It Is Clear From Extensive Scientific Evidence That The Dominant Cause Of The Rapid Change In Climate Of The Past Half Century Is Human-Induced Increases In The Amount Of Atmospheric Greenhouse Gases.”** According to the American Meteorological Society, “Climate is always changing. However, many of the observed changes noted above are beyond what can be explained by the natural variability of the climate. It is clear from extensive scientific evidence that the dominant cause of the rapid change in climate of the past half century is human-induced increases in the amount of atmospheric greenhouse gases, including carbon dioxide (CO2), chlorofluorocarbons, methane, and nitrous oxide. The most important of these over the long term is CO2, whose concentration in the atmosphere is rising principally as a result of fossil-fuel combustion and deforestation.” [American Meteorological Society, August [2012](http://www.ametsoc.org/policy/2012climatechange.pdf)]

**American Association For The Advancement Of Science: “Scientific Evidence Is Clear: Global Climate Change Caused By Human Activities Is Occurring Now, And It Is A Growing Threat To Society.”** According to a statement for the Board of Directors for the American Association for the Advancement of Science, “The scientific evidence is clear: global climate change caused by human activities is occurring now, and it is a growing threat to society. Accumulating data from across the globe reveal a wide array of effects: rapidly melting glaciers, destabilization of major ice sheets, increases in extreme weather, rising sea level, shifts in species ranges, and more. The pace of change and the evidence of harm have increased markedly over the last five years. The time to control greenhouse gas emissions is now.” [American Association for the Advancement of Science, Statement Approved by Board of Directors, [12/9/06](http://www.aaas.org/news/press_room/climate_change/mtg_200702/aaas_climate_statement.pdf)]

## Rhetoric: The Climate Is Always Changing

**Trump**: “I think something's happening. Something's changing, and it'll change back again.” [NPR, [12/12/18](https://www.npr.org/2018/12/12/676198899/climate-scientist-says-argument-the-climate-is-always-changing-is-wrong)]

### Reality: Humans Responsible for Warming

**FactCheck.Org: “Burning Of Coal, Oil, And Gas, And Clearing Of Forests Have Increased The Concentration Of Carbon Dioxide In The Atmosphere By More Than 40% Since The Industrial Revolution.”** According to FactCheck.org, “‘The burning of coal, oil, and gas, and clearing of forests have increased the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere by more than 40% since the Industrial Revolution, and it has been known for almost two centuries that this carbon dioxide traps heat,’ the team explains in the Third National Climate Assessment report. The report adds, ‘Multiple lines of independent evidence confirm that [these] human activities are the primary cause of the global warming of the past 50 years.’” [FactCheck.org, [11/2/16](http://www.factcheck.org/2016/11/the-candidates-on-climate-change/)]

**IPCCC: Extremely Likely That Human Activities Caused More Than Half Of The Observed Increase In GMST [Global Mean Surface Temperature] From 1951 To 2010**. According to FactCheck.org, “The U.N.’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s fifth assessment report in 2013 said: ‘It is extremely likely that human activities caused more than half of the observed increase in GMST [global mean surface temperature] from 1951 to 2010. This assessment is supported by robust evidence from multiple studies using different methods.’ ‘Extremely likely,’ according to the IPCC report, means that the likelihood of an outcome is between 95 percent and 100 percent certain.” [FactCheck.org, [11/23/16](http://www.factcheck.org/2016/11/trump-on-climate-change/)]

**EPA: Majority Greenhouse Gas From Fossil Fuels**. According to the EPA, “Over the past century, human activities have released large amounts of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. The majority of greenhouse gases come from burning fossil fuels to produce energy, although deforestation, industrial processes, and some agricultural practices also emit gases into the atmosphere.” [EPA, Climate Change Basic Information, [1/19/17](https://19january2017snapshot.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-change-basic-information_.html)]

**EPA: “Greenhouse Gases Act Like A Blanket Around Earth, Trapping Energy In The Atmosphere And Causing It To Warm.”** According to the EPA, “Greenhouse gases act like a blanket around Earth, trapping energy in the atmosphere and causing it to warm. This phenomenon is called the greenhouse effect and is natural and necessary to support life on Earth. However, the buildup of greenhouse gases can change Earth’s climate and result in dangerous effects to human health and welfare and to ecosystems. The choices we make today will affect the amount of greenhouse gases we put in the atmosphere in the near future and for years to come.” [EPA, Climate Change Basic Information, [1/19/17](https://19january2017snapshot.epa.gov/climatechange/climate-change-basic-information_.html)]

**United Nations: Human Influence Responsible For Warming During 20th Century**. According to an article in the New York Times, “Runaway growth in the emission of greenhouse gases is swamping all political efforts to deal with the problem, raising the risk of ‘severe, pervasive and irreversible impacts’ over the coming decades, according to a draft of a major new United Nations report…‘Human influence has been detected in warming of the atmosphere and the ocean, in changes in the global water cycle, in reduction in snow and ice, and in global mean-sea-level rise; and it is extremely likely to have been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century,’ the draft report said. ‘The risk of abrupt and irreversible change increases as the magnitude of the warming increases.’” [New York Times, [8/26/14](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/27/science/earth/greenhouse-gas-emissions-are-growing-and-growing-more-dangerous-draft-of-un-report-says.html)]

## Rhetoric: EPA Plays Important Role In Producing Sound Science

### Reality: Trump Budget Would Cut EPA Workforce By One-Fifth

**Trump Budget Would Cut EPA Workforce By More Than 20 Percent**. According to an article in the Washington Post, “Thursday’s proposal by the White House would slash the EPA’s budget by 31 percent — nearly one third — from its current level of $8.1 billion to $5.7 billion. It would cut 3,200 positions, or more than 20 percent of the agency’s current workforce of about 15,000.” [Washington Post, [3/16/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/budget-reflects-trumps-vow-to-cut-epa-in-almost-every-form/2017/03/15/0611db20-09a5-11e7-a15f-a58d4a988474_story.html?utm_term=.5220446cb11c)]

**Trump Budget Would Eliminate 3,200 Positions Within The EPA**. According to an article in the Washington Post, “Thursday’s proposal by the White House would slash the EPA’s budget by 31 percent — nearly one third — from its current level of $8.1 billion to $5.7 billion. It would cut 3,200 positions, or more than 20 percent of the agency’s current workforce of about 15,000.” [Washington Post, [3/16/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/budget-reflects-trumps-vow-to-cut-epa-in-almost-every-form/2017/03/15/0611db20-09a5-11e7-a15f-a58d4a988474_story.html?utm_term=.5220446cb11c)]

* **EPA Employed As Many As 15,000**. According to EE News, “In figures provided by EPA, as of Dec. 7, the agency has 14,667 ‘on-boards,’ or employees who are currently working for the agency. An additional 174 people have been hired by EPA but have not yet reported to work, while 79 ‘non-competitive appointments’ -- hires from special classified applicants such as veterans, those with disabilities and returning Peace Corps volunteers -- are pending. Finally, 164 certificates have been issued to managers to make a hire from a list of qualified applicants. Together, that would bring EPA’s staff level to 15,084 employees, once all applicants make it through the process.” [EE News, [12/14/15](http://www.eenews.net/stories/1060029480)]

**Trump Budget Would Eliminate More Than 50 Programs**. According to an article in the Washington Post, “It also would eliminate ‘more than 50 EPA programs.’ Among them: the Energy Star program, which aims to improve energy efficiency and save consumers money; infrastructure assistance to Alaska Native villages and the Mexico border; a grant program that helps cities and states combat air pollution; and an office that focuses on environmental justice issues.” [Washington Post, [3/16/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/budget-reflects-trumps-vow-to-cut-epa-in-almost-every-form/2017/03/15/0611db20-09a5-11e7-a15f-a58d4a988474_story.html?utm_term=.5220446cb11c)]

**Trump Budget Proposal Would Eliminate Funding For Clean Power Plan**. According to an article in the Washington Post, “The proposed budget, if enacted, would discontinue funding for the Clean Power Plan — the signature Obama administration effort to combat climate change by regulating carbon dioxide emissions from power plants.” [Washington Post, [3/16/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/budget-reflects-trumps-vow-to-cut-epa-in-almost-every-form/2017/03/15/0611db20-09a5-11e7-a15f-a58d4a988474_story.html?utm_term=.5220446cb11c)]

**Trump Budget “Discontinues Funding For The Clean Power Plan, International Climate Change Programs, Climate Change Research And Partnership Programs, And Related Efforts.”** According to a White House budget synopsis, “Discontinues funding for the Clean Power Plan, international climate change programs, climate change research and partnership programs, and related efforts—saving over $100 million for the American taxpayer compared to 2017 annualized CR levels. Consistent with the President’s America First Energy Plan, the Budget reorients EPA’s air program to protect the air we breathe without unduly burdening the American economy.” [White House, America First A Budget Blueprint to Make America Great Again, [3/16/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/omb/budget/fy2018/2018_blueprint.pdf)]

**Trump Budget Would Eliminate Environmental Justice Office**. According to an article in the Washington Post, “It also would eliminate ‘more than 50 EPA programs.’ Among them: the Energy Star program, which aims to improve energy efficiency and save consumers money; infrastructure assistance to Alaska Native villages and the Mexico border; a grant program that helps cities and states combat air pollution; and an office that focuses on environmental justice issues.” [Washington Post, [3/16/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/budget-reflects-trumps-vow-to-cut-epa-in-almost-every-form/2017/03/15/0611db20-09a5-11e7-a15f-a58d4a988474_story.html?utm_term=.5220446cb11c)]

### Reality: Trump Advisors are Climate Science Deniers

**Tillerson Believed “The Risk Of Climate Change Does Exist, And The Consequences Could Be Serious Enough That Action Should Be Taken.”** According to an article in the Washington Post, “Secretary of state nominee Rex Tillerson on Wednesday said he believes ‘the risk of climate change does exist, and the consequences could be serious enough that action should be taken.’ But while the Obama administration and other world leaders have aggressively pursued efforts to slash carbon dioxide emissions and stave off global warming, the former ExxonMobil chief executive expressed little such urgency when testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Capitol Hill.” [Washington Post, [1/11/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/01/11/tillerson-says-u-s-should-maintain-its-seat-at-table-on-fighting-global-climate-change/?utm_term=.35692b02e046)]

* **Tillerson Not Sure What Action Should Be Taken To Combat Climate Change.** Asked by Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) about his personal position on climate change, Tillerson said he formed his views ‘over about 20 years as an engineer and a scientist, understanding the evolution of the science.’ Ultimately, he said, he concluded that increasing greenhouse-gas concentrations in the atmosphere are having an effect on the earth’s climate. But he added, ‘Our ability to predict that effect is very limited,’ and precisely what actions nations should take ‘seems to be the largest area of debate existing in the public discourse.’” [Washington Post, [1/11/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/01/11/tillerson-says-u-s-should-maintain-its-seat-at-table-on-fighting-global-climate-change/?utm_term=.35692b02e046)]

**Perry Said ‘Some’ Climate Change Caused By Man**. At his confirmation hearing Rick Perry said, “Second, let me speak to the issue of climate change. I believe the climate is changing. I believe some of it is naturally occurring, but some of it is caused by man-made activity. The question is how we address it in a thoughtful way, that doesn't compromise economic growth. It affects the affordability of energy, or American jobs.” [Confirmation Hearing, 1/19/17]

* **NPR: “Perry Has Been A Vocal Skeptic Of Climate Change.”** According to NPR State Impact, “Perry has been a vocal skeptic of climate change.” [NPR, State Impact, accessed [11/21/16](https://stateimpact.npr.org/texas/tag/rick-perry/)]
* **Perry Believed Climate Change Was A Hoax**. According to an article by CBS News, “Republican presidential candidate Rick Perry said Wednesday morning that he does not believe in global warming science and suggested it is grounded in scientists manipulating data for financial gain. The Texas governor was appearing at a New Hampshire breakfast event with business leaders Wednesday morning when he said ‘there are a substantial number of scientists who have manipulated data so that they will have dollars rolling into their projects.’” [CBS News, [8/17/11](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/rick-perry-suggests-global-warming-is-a-hoax/)]

## Rhetoric: Climate Change Not Responsible for Extreme Weather

**Trump:** “If you go back into the 1930s and the 1940s, and you take a look, we’ve had storms over the years that have been bigger than this. ‘If you go back into the teens, you’ll see storms that were as big or bigger. So we did have two horrific storms, epic storms, but if you go back into the ‘30s and ‘40s, and you go back into the teens, you’ll see storms that were very similar and even bigger, OK?” [CNN, [9/14/17](http://www.cnn.com/2017/09/14/politics/trump-climate-change-hurricanes/index.html)]

### Reality: Man Made Climate Change Likely Causing Increase In Extreme Hurricanes

**NOAA: Human Activates May Have Already Made Changes To Atlantic Hurricanes**. According to the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, “It is premature to conclude that human activities–and particularly greenhouse gas emissions that cause global warming–have already had a detectable impact on Atlantic hurricane or global tropical cyclone activity. That said, human activities may have already caused changes that are not yet detectable due to the small magnitude of the changes or observational limitations, or are not yet confidently modeled (e.g., aerosol effects on regional climate).” [NOAA, Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, accessed [8/29/17](https://www.gfdl.noaa.gov/global-warming-and-hurricanes/)]

**Anthropogenic Warming Likely To Increase Intensity Of Hurricanes By As Much As 11%**. According to the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, “Anthropogenic warming by the end of the 21st century will likely cause tropical cyclones globally to be more intense on average (by 2 to 11% according to model projections for an IPCC A1B scenario). This change would imply an even larger percentage increase in the destructive potential per storm, assuming no reduction in storm size.” [NOAA, Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, accessed [8/29/17](https://www.gfdl.noaa.gov/global-warming-and-hurricanes/)]

**Increased Hurricane Activity Linked To Higher Surface Temperatures Caused By Man Made Carbon Emissions**. According to the National Climate Assessment, “The recent increases in activity are linked, in part, to higher sea surface temperatures in the region that Atlantic hurricanes form in and move through. Numerous factors have been shown to influence these local sea surface temperatures, including natural variability, human-induced emissions of heat-trapping gases, and particulate pollution. Quantifying the relative contributions of natural and human-caused factors is an active focus of research.” [National Climate Assessment, Extreme Weather, [2014](http://nca2014.globalchange.gov/highlights/report-findings/extreme-weather#submenu-highlights-overview)]

**Warming Water Would Provide Fuel For More Intense Hurricanes**. According to NASA, “The one way in which global warming could impact hurricanes is by making them more intense. More heat and water in the atmosphere and warmer sea surface temperatures could provide more fuel to increase the wind speeds of tropical storms.” [NASA, Earth Observatory, accessed [8/28/17](https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/RisingCost/rising_cost5.php)]

**NOAA: “Better Than Even Odds That Anthropogenic Warming Over The Next Century Will Lead To An Increase In The Occurrence Of Very Intense Tropical Cyclone.”** According to the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, “There are better than even odds that anthropogenic warming over the next century will lead to an increase in the occurrence of very intense tropical cyclone in some basins–an increase that would be substantially larger in percentage terms than the 2-11% increase in the average storm intensity. This increase in intense storm occurrence is projected despite a likely decrease (or little change) in the global numbers of all tropical cyclones.” [NOAA, Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, accessed [8/29/17](https://www.gfdl.noaa.gov/global-warming-and-hurricanes/)]

**Warming Climate Could Increase The Intensity Of Storms**. According to NASA, “But even as a warming climate might decrease the overall number of storms that form, it could increase the number of intense storms. As temperatures continue to rise, more and more water vapor could evaporate into the atmosphere, and water vapor is the fuel for storms. ‘If we are creating an atmosphere more loaded with humidity, any storm that does develop has greater potential to develop into an intense storm,’ says [George Tselioudis, a research scientist at NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) and Columbia University].” [NASA, Earth Observatory, accessed [8/28/17](https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/RisingCost/rising_cost5.php)]

Reality: Climate Change Likely to Increase Flooding

**Climate Change Would Impact Coastal Flooding Due To Sea Level Rise And Increases In Heavy Rainfall**. According to the National Climate Assessment, “Coastal flooding is predominantly caused by storm surges that accompany hurricanes and other storms that push large seawater domes toward the shore. Storm surge can cause deaths, widespread infrastructure damage, and severe beach erosion. Storm-related rainfall can also cause inland flooding and is responsible for more than half of the deaths associated with tropical storms. Climate change affects coastal flooding through sea level rise and storm surge, and increases in heavy rainfall during storms.” [National Climate Assessment, Extreme Weather, [2014](http://nca2014.globalchange.gov/highlights/report-findings/extreme-weather#submenu-highlights-overview)]

**Flooding Is Predicted To Intensify In US; Including Regions That See Decline In Precipitation.** According to the National Climate Assessment, “Flooding may intensify in many U.S. regions, even in areas where total precipitation is projected to decline. A flood is defined as any high flow, overflow, or inundation by water that causes or threatens damage. Floods are caused or amplified by both weather- and human-related factors. Major weather factors include heavy or prolonged precipitation, snowmelt, thunderstorms, storm surges from hurricanes, and ice or debris jams. Human factors include structural failures of dams and levees, altered drainage, and land-cover alterations (such as pavement).” [National Climate Assessment, Extreme Weather, [2014](http://nca2014.globalchange.gov/highlights/report-findings/extreme-weather#submenu-highlights-overview)]

**NASA: “Melting Glaciers And Ice Caps Will Likely Cause Sea Levels To Rise, Which Would Make Coastal Flooding More Severe When A Storm Comes Ashore.”** According to NASA, “Even if tropical storms don’t change significantly, other environmental changes brought on by global warming could make the storms more deadly. Melting glaciers and ice caps will likely cause sea levels to rise, which would make coastal flooding more severe when a storm comes ashore. In their 2001 report, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change stated that global warming should cause sea levels to rise 0.11 to 0.77 meters (0.36 to 2.5 feet) by 2100.” [NASA, Earth Observatory, accessed [8/28/17](https://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/Features/RisingCost/rising_cost5.php)]

**Anthropogenic Warming Would Likely Cause 15% Increase In Rainfall**. According to the Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, “Anthropogenic warming by the end of the 21st century will likely cause tropical cyclones to have substantially higher rainfall rates than present-day ones, with a model-projected increase of about 10-15% for rainfall rates averaged within about 100 km of the storm center.” [NOAA, Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory, accessed [8/29/17](https://www.gfdl.noaa.gov/global-warming-and-hurricanes/)]

# Paris Agreement

## Rhetoric: Paris Climate Accord Is a Bad Deal Like TPP and Iran

### Reality: Coal Companies Want To Stay In Paris Agreement

**Politico: Coal Industry Is Divided Over Whether President Donald Trump Should Pull The U.S. Out Of The Paris Climate Change Agreement**. According to an article in Politico, “The coal industry is divided over whether President Donald Trump should pull the U.S. out of the Paris climate change agreement — with some producers hoping they could gain some economic leverage if he chooses to stay.” [Politico, [3/30/17](http://www.politico.com/story/2017/03/trump-paris-climate-pact-coal-companies-236730)]

* **Peabody Energy, Arch Coal And Cloud Peak Energy Indicated They Would Not Publicly Oppose Staying In Paris Climate Accord**. According to an article in Politico, “The top three U.S. coal producers — Peabody Energy, Arch Coal and Cloud Peak Energy — indicated in recent meetings with White House officials that they would not publicly object to sticking with the international accord, particularly if the administration can secure more financial support for technology to reduce pollution from the use of coal, according to industry officials and sources close to the administration.” [Politico, [3/30/17](http://www.politico.com/story/2017/03/trump-paris-climate-pact-coal-companies-236730)]
* **“Peabody, Arch And Cloud Peak Hope To See Their Policy Priorities Reflected In The Reworked Domestic Climate Plan That The Trump Administration Would Probably Submit.”** According to an article in Politico, “Peabody, Arch and Cloud Peak hope to see their policy priorities reflected in the reworked domestic climate plan that the Trump administration would probably submit if it decides to stay in the 2015 Paris deal, the sources said. Together the three companies mine more than 42 percent of the coal produced in the U.S., according to the Energy Information Administration.” [Politico, [3/30/17](http://www.politico.com/story/2017/03/trump-paris-climate-pact-coal-companies-236730)]

**Exxon To White House: Stay In Paris Climate Accord.** According to Politico, “Exxon Mobil argued in a recent letter to the White House that the U.S. should stay in the Paris climate change agreement, echoing its past support for the international pact. Peter Trelenberg, Exxon’s environmental policy manager sought to appeal to Republicans’ free-market sensibilities in the letter to White House energy adviser George David Banks. ‘It is prudent that the United States remain a party to the Paris Agreement to ensure a level playing field, so that global energy markets remain as free and competitive as possible,’ Trelenberg wrote. The letter was sent last week, but Exxon released it publicly today. Exxon also argued that technology to reduce emissions from fossil fuels, like carbon capture and storage, ‘holds significant potential.’” [Politico, [3/28/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/03/exxon-to-white-house-stay-in-paris-climate-deal-085523)]

### Reality: Secretary of State Tillerson Previously Publicly Supported Paris Agreement

**Tillerson Supported Climate Deal While At Exxon.** According to EE News, “Secretary of State Tillerson supported Paris in his previous job as CEO of Exxon Mobil Corp. and called for a ‘seat at the table’ on climate negotiations during his Senate confirmation hearing.” [EE News, [4/18/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/stories/1060053205/search?keyword=cohn)]

* **Exxon Continued Support Of Paris Climate Accord After Tillerson’s Exit**. According to an article in the Washington Post, “Tillerson’s former company, ExxonMobil, argued to the White House recently that the United States should stay in the agreement and that it does not pose a competitiveness risk to domestic energy industries.” [Washington Post, [4/19/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/04/19/top-trump-advisors-at-odds-over-paris-climate-deal/?utm_term=.98ed936c9e04)]

**Tillerson Recently “Went Silent” On Climate Deal.** According to EE News, “That position won him some bipartisan praise — but he has gone silent since, not only on Paris but on a host of issues that similarly fall under his purview as chief U.S. diplomat.” [EE News, [4/18/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/stories/1060053205/search?keyword=cohn)]

**Tillerson Said United States Should Maintain “Seat At The Table” In International Climate Talks**. According to an article in the Washington Post, “But Secretary of State Rex Tillerson argued in his Senate confirmation hearing that the United States should maintain a ‘seat at the table’ in international climate talks.” [Washington Post, [4/19/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/04/19/top-trump-advisors-at-odds-over-paris-climate-deal/?utm_term=.98ed936c9e04)]

**Tillerson: “I Think We're Better Served By Being At That Table Than Leaving That Table.”** At his confirmation hearing Rex Tillerson said, “As I indicated earlier in a response, I think having a seat at the table to address this issue on a global basis, and it is -- it is important that -- I think it's 190 countries or there about -- have signed on to being to take action. I think we're better served by being at that table than leaving that table.” [Rex Tillerson Confirmation Hearing, 1/11/17]

**Tillerson On Climate Action: “That Countries That Attempt To Influence This By Acting Alone, Are Probably Only Harming Themselves.”** At his confirmation hearing Rex Tillerson said, “As I’ve stated before in my statements around climate change and responses to it, that it will require a global response. And that countries that attempt to influence this by acting alone, are probably only harming themselves.” [Rex Tillerson Confirmation Hearing, 1/11/17]

**Tillerson: “I Think It's Important That The U.S. Maintain A Seat At That Table So That We Can Also Judge The Level Of Commitment Of The Other 189 Or So Countries That Are Around That Table And -- And Again, Adjust Our Own Course.”** At his confirmation hearing Rex Tillerson said, “So the global approach, was an important step and I think also as I indicated in response to a question earlier, I think it's important that the U.S. maintain a seat at that table so that we can also judge the level of commitment of the other 189 or so countries that are around that table and -- and again, adjust our own course, accordingly.” [Rex Tillerson Confirmation Hearing, 1/11/17]

### Reality: Senior Advisors Jared Kushner and Gary Cohn Supported Agreement

**Kushner Viewed As Moderate On Climate Change**. According to EE News, “After the president himself, perhaps the most influential voices in the West Wing right now belong to his son-in-law, Kushner, and daughter Ivanka Trump. And they have long been viewed as moderating voices, especially on climate change.” [EE News, [4/18/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/stories/1060053205/search?keyword=cohn)]

**Kushner And Ivanka Trump Worked To Remove References To The Paris Accord From A Previous Executive Order Trump Signed**. According to EE News, “[Kushner and Ivanka] have seen their influence increase in recent weeks as Trump has distanced himself from chief strategist Bannon, who threatened to eclipse his independent image. They’re seen as more supportive of global engagement than Bannon and other adherents to Trump’s ‘America First’ doctrine. They also have been credited with working to remove references to the Paris accord from a previous executive order Trump signed gutting most of former President Obama’s climate change regulations.” [EE News, [4/18/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/stories/1060053205/search?keyword=cohn)]

**Kushner Considered A Moderating Influence On The President For Climate Issues**. According to an article in the Wall Street Journal, “One White House official said both Mr. Kushner and Ms. Trump have been considered a moderating influence on the White House's position on climate change and environmental issues. The move is the latest sign of influence Mr. Trump's daughter and Mr. Kushner have in a White House that has seen internal divisions on a variety of issues, including foreign policy.” [Wall Street Journal, [2/23/17](https://www.wsj.com/articles/ivanka-trump-jared-kushner-pushed-to-remove-language-critical-of-climate-deal-from-executive-order-1487889272?mod=e2tw)]

**Cohn Is Considered To Be Supportive Of Paris Climate Accord**. According to an article in the Washington Post, “Others, including National Economic Council head Gary Cohn, who held a White House meeting about a possible carbon tax, Ivanka Trump and her husband, Jared Kushner, are also considered supportive of the deal.” [Washington Post, [4/19/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/04/19/top-trump-advisors-at-odds-over-paris-climate-deal/?utm_term=.98ed936c9e04)]

**Cohn Has Not Taken Public Stance On Paris Deal – But Is Believed To Side With Kushner And Tillerson**. According to an article in Climate Change News, “Cohn – a registered Democrat – has not himself taken a public position on the Paris agreement, but he is said to have sided with Kushner and Tillerson on the issue.” [Climate Change News, [4/18/17](http://www.climatechangenews.com/2017/04/18/seven-men-will-decide-americas-role-paris-climate-deal/)]

**Goldman Sachs Made Public Calls For Climate Action While Cohn Was COO**. According to an article in Climate Change News, “During Cohn’s tenure as chief operating officer of Goldman Sachs, the investment bank made repeated public calls for strong climate action. The bank also lobbied the White House to deliver a strong climate deal just before the Paris negotiations.” [Climate Change News, [4/18/17](http://www.climatechangenews.com/2017/04/18/seven-men-will-decide-americas-role-paris-climate-deal/)]

### Reality: US Would Violate International Law If Country Missed Paris Targets

**US Would Violate International Law If Country Missed Paris Targets**. According to an article in Scientific American, “If the United States failed to meet its obligations, which are being negotiated starting now at the U.N. climate conference underway in Marrakech, Morocco, it would be breaking international law.” [Scientific American, [11/10/16](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/could-trump-simply-withdraw-u-s-from-paris-climate-agreement/)]

### Reality: Trump Flip-Flopped on Paris Agreement

**Trump Said He Had “Open Mind” On Paris Climate Accord**. According to an article in The Guardian, “Asked by the New York Times whether he would pull the US out of the Paris climate accord, which has been signed by 196 nations, Trump said: ‘I’m looking at it very closely. I have an open mind to it.’” [Guardian, [11/22/16](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/nov/22/donald-trump-paris-climate-deal-change-open-mind)]

**Trump Previously Pledged To Cancel Deal**. According to an article in The Guardian, “Donald Trump pledged to cancel the Paris climate agreement, endorsed drilling off the Atlantic coast and said he would allow the Keystone XL pipeline to be built in return for “a big piece of the profits” for the American people.” [Guardian, [5/26/16](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/may/26/donald-trump-environmental-policy-climate-change-keystone-xl)]

### Reality: Trump Can’t Pull Out Of Paris Agreement Until 2020

**Earliest Trump Could Take The U.S. Out Of Paris Agreement Would Be Nov. 4, 2020**. According to FiveThirtyEight, “If he does move forward with his campaign promises, Trump can’t pull the U.S. out of the Paris agreement right away. Article 28 of the Paris climate agreement allows parties to the accord to withdraw, but only three years after it has entered into force, and even then, the withdrawal would not take effect until one year after official notice was given. That means the earliest that Trump could take the U.S. out of the agreement would be Nov. 4, 2020. (Suggestions that he might renegotiate the deal are just talk — the deal is done.).” [FiveThirtyEight, [11/11/16](http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/trump-doesnt-have-to-end-agreements-to-set-back-climate-progress/)]

### Reality: More Than 100 Countries Pledged To Cut Global Carbon Emissions

**118 Countries Have Ratified Paris Climate Change Agreement**. [United Nations, accessed [12/22/16](http://unfccc.int/paris_agreement/items/9485.php)]

**Paris Climate Accord “Aims To Strengthen The Ability Of Countries To Deal With The Impacts Of Climate Change.”** According to the United Nations, “The Paris Agreement’s central aim is to strengthen the global response to the threat of climate change by keeping a global temperature rise this century well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase even further to 1.5 degrees Celsius. Additionally, the agreement aims to strengthen the ability of countries to deal with the impacts of climate change. To reach these ambitious goals, appropriate financial flows, a new technology framework and an enhanced capacity building framework will be put in place, thus supporting action by developing countries and the most vulnerable countries, in line with their own national objectives. The Agreement also provides for enhanced transparency of action and support through a more robust transparency framework.” [United Nations, accessed [12/22/16](http://unfccc.int/paris_agreement/items/9485.php)]

**November 2016: UN Nations Passed Climate Change Accord To Limit World Wide Global Warming**. According to the Associated Press, “The Paris Agreement to combat climate change became international law on Friday — a landmark deal about tackling global warming amid growing fears that the world is becoming hotter even faster than scientists expected. So far, 96 countries, accounting for just over two-thirds of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions, have formally joined the accord, which seeks to limit global warming to 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit). More countries are expected to come aboard in the coming weeks and months.” [Associated Press, [11/4/16](http://bigstory.ap.org/article/c34c95e5a3a84a8d88df6633af177bff/paris-climate-agreement-becomes-international-law)]

**Paris Accord Created Framework For Countries To Cut Global Emissions**. According to the Associated Press, “While the Paris agreement is legally binding, the emissions reductions that each country has committed to are not. Instead, the agreement seeks to create a transparent system that will allow the public to monitor how well each country is doing in meeting its goals in hopes that this will motivate them to transition more quickly to clean, renewable energy like wind, solar and hydropower.” [Associated Press, [11/4/16](http://bigstory.ap.org/article/c34c95e5a3a84a8d88df6633af177bff/paris-climate-agreement-becomes-international-law)]

**Paris Deal Required Countries To Develop Climate Action Plans**. According to the Associated Press, “The agreement also requires governments to develop climate action plans that will be periodically revised and replaced with new, even more ambitious, plans. Many of these details will begin to be addressed at the COP22 climate change meeting that begins next week in Marrakech, Morocco.” [Associated Press, [11/4/16](http://bigstory.ap.org/article/c34c95e5a3a84a8d88df6633af177bff/paris-climate-agreement-becomes-international-law)]

## Rhetoric: Paris Would Result in the Loss of 400,000 Jobs

**Americans for Tax Reform**: “The Paris debacle was also slated to reduce U.S. GDP by over $2.5 trillion, and result in an average shortfall of nearly 400,000 jobs by 2035.” [ATR, [5/31/17](https://www.atr.org/obamas-paris-agreement-all-cost-and-no-benefit-us)]

### Study Produced by Heritage Foundation

**Heritage Study Was Co-Authored By David Kreutzer.** According to the Heritage Foundation, Policies adapted from domestic regulations emphasized in the Paris agreement will affect a variety of aspects of the American economy. As a result of the plan, one can expect that by 2035, there will be: An overall average shortfall of nearly 400,000 jobs; An average manufacturing shortfall of over 200,000 jobs; A total income loss of more than $20,000 for a family of four; An aggregate gross domestic product (GDP) loss of over $2.5 trillion; and Increases in household electricity expenditures between 13 percent and 20 percent. “[Heritage, [4/13/16](http://www.heritage.org/environment/report/consequences-paris-protocol-devastating-economic-costs-essentially-zero)]

* **David Kreutzer, Top Aide To Pruitt, Spent Years At The Conservative Heritage Foundation Where He Was A “Vociferous Critic Of Climate Science.”** “Mr. Kreutzer, a top E.P.A. aide to Mr. Pruitt, spent years at the conservative Heritage Foundation, where he was a vociferous critic of climate science. Mr. Kreutzer is pressing a hard-line stance against climate policies, such as legally challenging court-ordered regulation of carbon dioxide pollution. What he has said: On a panel in January about carbon dioxide emissions, fellow panelists suggested that increased carbon dioxide emissions could be beneficial to the planet. The crowd’s laughter prompted Mr. Kreutzer to snap, “You’re laughing because you’re ignorant.” [New York Times, [3/27/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/27/us/politics/climate-change-denialists-in-charge.html?_r=1)]

**Heritage Foundation A Former ExxonMobil Grantee.** “With that scientifically challenged position, it’s no wonder ALEC invites speakers for its conferences from such notorious climate science denier groups as the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow, the Heartland Institute and, of course, the Heritage Foundation — all former ExxonMobil grantees. While ExxonMobil and other major carbon producers Chevron and Peabody Energy remain steadfast ALEC members, more than 100 corporations have severed ties with the organization for a variety of reasons, including its stance on climate change.” [Huffington Post, [7/13/16](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/elliott-negin/exxonmobil-is-still-fundi_b_10955254.html)]

## Rhetoric: Paris Could Cost America as Many as 2.7 Million Jobs by 2025

**TRUMP**: “Compliance with the terms of the Paris Accord and the onerous energy restrictions it has placed on the United States could cost America as much as 2.7 million lost jobs by 2025 according to the National Economic Research Associates.” [Remarks by President Trump, [6/1/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/01/statement-president-trump-paris-climate-accordhttps://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/01/statement-president-trump-paris-climate-accord)]

### NERA Conclusion Based on Highly Unrealistic Assumptions

**Washington Post Fact Check: “Trump Cited A Slew Of Statistics From A Study That Was Funded By The U.S. Chamber Of Commerce And The American Council For Capital Formation.”** According to the Washington Post, “Trump cited a slew of statistics from a study that was funded by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the American Council for Capital Formation, foes of the Paris Accord. So the figures must be viewed with a jaundiced eye. Moreover, the study assumed a scenario that no policy analyst expects — that the United States takes drastic steps to meet the Obama pledge of a 26 to 28 percent reduction in emissions by 2025.” [Washington Post, [6/1/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/fact-checker/wp/2017/06/01/fact-checking-president-trumps-claims-on-the-paris-climate-change-deal/?utm_term=.f0239c9d47e2)]

**Study Based On “Highly Unrealistic And Unnecessarily Expensive Pathway” To Achieving US Targets**. According to the World Resources Institute, “The Chamber Energy Institute’s claims are based on a highly unrealistic and unnecessarily expensive pathway to achieving the U.S. 2025 target.” [WRI, [4/26/17](http://www.wri.org/blog/2017/04/us-chamber-commerces-energy-institute-misleads-climate-action-costs-3-things-know)]

**WRI: “NERA Study Assumes That Innovation In Clean Energy Slows Considerably, Which Makes Climate Action Appear Artificially Costly.”** According to the World Resources Institute, “NERA’s estimates of 2040 economic impacts apply only to a future in which businesses, entrepreneurs and scientists fail to innovate over the coming decades. If, instead, innovation continues at its recent pace or accelerates due to the additional incentives for clean energy innovation in a decarbonizing world, the economic benefits would be far better.” [WRI, [4/26/17](http://www.wri.org/blog/2017/04/us-chamber-commerces-energy-institute-misleads-climate-action-costs-3-things-know)]

**WRI: “Full NERA Study Shows That The United States Can Achieve Its 2025 Targets At A Relatively Low Cost.”** According to the World Resources Institute, “While the article by the Chamber Energy Institute focuses on one scenario from the NERA study, the full study also includes an alternative pathway to achieving the U.S. 2025 target that combines regulatory measures with a national carbon market. In contrast to the scenario described above that mandates in which sectors emissions reductions must occur, a carbon market encourages emissions reductions to take place whenever and wherever they can be achieved most cost-effectively.” [WRI, [4/26/17](http://www.wri.org/blog/2017/04/us-chamber-commerces-energy-institute-misleads-climate-action-costs-3-things-know)]

# Regulatory Process

Rhetoric: Supreme Court Said CPP Was Unlawful

*Wheeler: “A majority of Congress formally disapproved of the CPP, and the Supreme Court stayed its implementation —an unprecedented intervention by the nation’s highest court.” [Pittsburgh Post-Gazette,* [*8/21/18*](http://www.post-gazette.com/opinion/Op-Ed/2018/08/21/A-better-way-to-ensure-clean-reliable-energy/stories/201808220021)*]*

*Rhetoric: “CPP is an overreach of EPA’s authority under the Clean Air Act. Instead of regulating individual sources, it tried to set national energy policy, the mix of our generation base.” [White House Talking Points,* [*8/21/18*](https://www.eenews.net/assets/2018/08/21/document_ew_01.pdf)*]*

Reality: Three Supreme Court Cases Ruled EPA Could Regulate Carbon

**2014 Supreme Court: EPA Can Regulate Greenhouse Gas Emissions**. According to an article in the Washington Post, “The Supreme Court on Monday mostly validated the Environmental Protection Agency’s plans to regulate major sources of greenhouse-gas emissions such as power plants and factories but said the agency had gone too far in interpreting its power. The court’s bifurcated opinion on one hand criticized the agency for trying to rewrite provisions of the Clean Air Act. But it nevertheless granted the Obama administration and environmentalists a big victory by agreeing that there are other ways for the EPA to reach its goal of regulating the gases that contribute to global warming.” [Washington Post, [6/23/14](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/supreme-court-limits-epas-ability-to-regulate-greenhouse-gas-emissions/2014/06/23/c56fc194-f1b1-11e3-914c-1fbd0614e2d4_story.html?utm_term=.6471ba6b5807)]

**2011: “Supreme Court Directly Addressed EPA’s Authority To Establish Carbon Pollution Standards For Existing Power Plants.”** According to EDF, “In 2011, the Supreme Court directly addressed EPA’s authority to establish carbon pollution standards for existing power plants under Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act.. In American Electric Power Co. v. Connecticut” [EDF, [5/30/14](http://blogs.edf.org/climate411/2014/05/30/the-supreme-court-has-been-clear-epa-has-authority-to-address-carbon-pollution/)]

**Supreme Court Ruled Clean Air Act Could Be Used To Regulate Carbon Dioxide In 2007 Massachusetts Versus EPA**. According to the Department of Justice, “In this case, the Supreme Court found that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) can regulate greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide, as ‘air pollutants’ under the Clean Air Act. In section 202(a)(1) of the Clean Air Act, Congress stated that EPA is to issue standards applicable to the emission of ‘air pollutants’ from new motor vehicles, which in EPA’s ‘judgment cause, or contribute to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare…’” [DOJ, EDS Cases in the Supreme Court, accessed [3/9/17](https://www.justice.gov/enrd/massachusetts-v-epa)]

**No Merits Decision Was Made By DC Circuit Court**. According to EE News, “In other words, because the Supreme Court's order envisions one side petitioning the court for certiorari to review a D.C. Circuit decision, there's a possibility the Supreme Court will have to handle such a petition before the stay can be dissolved. But without a merits decision from the D.C. Circuit, anyone seeking Supreme Court action could be in the unusual position of appealing the court's potential remand order — a procedural move the justices would not typically weigh in on.” [EE News, [5/8/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060054177/)]

**Utility Dive: DC Circuit Court Reminded EPA Of Statutory Obligation To Regulate Greenhouse Gases**. According to Utility Dive, “But the court’s order, in addition to requiring monthly reports from the federal government, included a stark reminder that the Trump administration will need to replace the rule — not simply rescind it. The court’s order reminded the Trump administration of the 2009 endangerment finding, which means the EPA has an ‘affirmative statutory obligation to regulate greenhouse gases.’” [Utility Dive, [8/9/17](https://www.utilitydive.com/news/dc-circuit-extends-delay-on-clean-power-plan-litigation/448928/)]

## Rhetoric: CPP “Inconsistent” With The Clean Air Act

**EPA: CPP Appears To Be Inconsistent With The Clean Air Act**. “The CPP, issued by the Obama administration, was premised on a novel and expansive view of Agency authority that the Trump administration now proposes to determine is inconsistent with the Clean Air Act. In fact, the CPP was put on hold in February 2016, when the U.S. Supreme Court issued an unprecedented, historic stay of the rule.” [EPA, Press Release, [10/10/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-takes-another-step-advance-president-trumps-america-first-strategy-proposes-repeal)]

### Reality: Three Supreme Court Cases Ruled EPA Could Regulate Carbon

**2014 Supreme Court: EPA Can Regulate Greenhouse Gas Emissions**. According to an article in the Washington Post, “The Supreme Court on Monday mostly validated the Environmental Protection Agency’s plans to regulate major sources of greenhouse-gas emissions such as power plants and factories but said the agency had gone too far in interpreting its power. The court’s bifurcated opinion on one hand criticized the agency for trying to rewrite provisions of the Clean Air Act. But it nevertheless granted the Obama administration and environmentalists a big victory by agreeing that there are other ways for the EPA to reach its goal of regulating the gases that contribute to global warming.” [Washington Post, [6/23/14](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/supreme-court-limits-epas-ability-to-regulate-greenhouse-gas-emissions/2014/06/23/c56fc194-f1b1-11e3-914c-1fbd0614e2d4_story.html?utm_term=.6471ba6b5807)]

**2011: “Supreme Court Directly Addressed EPA’s Authority To Establish Carbon Pollution Standards For Existing Power Plants.”** According to EDF, “In 2011, the Supreme Court directly addressed EPA’s authority to establish carbon pollution standards for existing power plants under Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act.. In American Electric Power Co. v. Connecticut” [EDF, [5/30/14](http://blogs.edf.org/climate411/2014/05/30/the-supreme-court-has-been-clear-epa-has-authority-to-address-carbon-pollution/)]

**Supreme Court Ruled Clean Air Act Could Be Used To Regulate Carbon Dioxide In 2007 Massachusetts Versus EPA**. According to the Department of Justice, “In this case, the Supreme Court found that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) can regulate greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide, as ‘air pollutants’ under the Clean Air Act. In section 202(a)(1) of the Clean Air Act, Congress stated that EPA is to issue standards applicable to the emission of ‘air pollutants’ from new motor vehicles, which in EPA’s ‘judgment cause, or contribute to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare…’” [DOJ, EDS Cases in the Supreme Court, accessed [3/9/17](https://www.justice.gov/enrd/massachusetts-v-epa)]

# Clean Water

## Rhetoric: Stream Protection Rule Duplicative And “Unnecessary”

**Trump Administration: Stream Protection Rule Duplicated Existing Protections In The Clean Water Act And “Is Unnecessary…”** “H.J. Res. 38 would nullify the Stream Protection Rule, 81 Fed. Reg. 93066 (Dec. 20, 2016), a final rule recently promulgated by the Department of the Interior, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement. The bill disapproves a rule that would establish onerous requirements for coal mining operations, and impose significant compliance burdens on America’s coal production. The disapproved rule also duplicates existing protections in the Clean Water Act and is unnecessary given the other Federal and State regulations already in place. The Administration is committed to reviving America’s coal mining communities, which have been hurting for too long. […] If these bills were presented to the President in their current form, his advisors would recommend that he sign them into law.” [White House, Statement of Administration Policy, [2/01/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/02/01/statement-administration-policy)]

### Reality: Stream Protection Rule Is Vital For Public Health And Safe Drinking Water

**Office Of Surface Mining: Without Stream Protection Rule, Elevated Levels Of Contaminants In Drinking Water Found In Coal Mining Regions Would Persist.** “Water and air quality are primary drivers of public health changes in coal mining regions. Arsenic, selenium, and sulfates are drinking water contaminants found to be elevated near mining regions. Under the No Action Alternative, no further regulations or corrective measures in addition to those already in place would be implemented. Therefore, ongoing public health and safety trends would continue. The annual quantity of coal demanded and associated production is anticipated to be approximately 10 percent lower in 2040 than in 2020, even without implementation of the Alternatives (i.e., under the No Action Alternative). This reduction in production would reduce adverse impacts of ongoing coal mining activities on water resources under the No Action Alternative.” [Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Environmental Impact Statement, [November 2016](https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=OSM-2010-0021-0748)]

**Stream Protection Rule Limited Mountaintop Removal Mining Operations To Those That Did Not Damage Natural Watercourses Within The Permit Or Adjacent Areas.** “As proposed, final paragraph (b)(9) requires that, for mountaintop removal mining operations that seek a variance from approximate original contour restoration requirements, the applicant demonstrate that the proposed operation will not damage natural watercourses within the permit or adjacent areas. Further, the paragraph specifies at least four criteria—final paragraphs (b)(9)(i) through (iv)—that must be met for a regulatory authority to determine that no damage will occur to natural watercourses. Together, these four criteria ensure that a mountaintop removal mining operation will not damage watercourses any more than a surface mining operation without an approximate original contour variance. In essence, they define ‘damage’ in the context of section 515(c)(4)(D) of SMCRA.” [Final text of the Stream Protection Rule, Federal Register, [12/20/16](https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=OSM-2010-0018-10631)]

* **Study: “Higher Birth-Defect Rates Are Present In Mountaintop Mining Areas.”** “The study hypothesis is that higher birth-defect rates are present in mountaintop mining areas. National Center for Health Statistics natality files were used to analyze 1996–2003 live births in four Central Appalachian states (N=1,889,071). Poisson regression models that control for covariates compare birth defect prevalence rates associated with maternal residence in county mining type: mountaintop mining areas, other mining areas, or non-mining areas. The prevalence rate ratio (PRR) for any birth defect was significantly higher in mountaintop mining areas compared to non-mining areas (PRR=1.26, 95% CI=1.21, 1.32), after controlling for covariates. Rates were significantly higher in mountaintop mining areas for six of seven types of defects: circulatory/respiratory, central nervous system, musculoskeletal, gastrointestinal, urogenital, and ‘other’.” [Environmental Research, *The association between mountaintop mining and birth defects among live births in central Appalachia, 1996–2003,* Published [August 2011](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0013935111001484)]

### Reality: Rule Would Protect 6,000 Miles Of Stream And 52,000 Acres of Forest Over 20 Years

**Stream Protection Rule Would Protect 6,000 Miles Of Streams and 52000 Acres of Forests Over The Next 20 Years.** “After an extensive and transparent public process that spanned multiple years, the U.S. Department of the Interior today released final regulations to prevent or minimize impacts to surface water and groundwater from coal mining. The final rule updates 33-year old regulations and establishes clear requirements for responsible surface coal mining that will protect 6,000 miles of streams and 52,000 acres of forests over the next two decades, preserving community health and economic opportunities while meeting the nation’s energy needs.” [U.S. Department of the Interior, Press Release, [12/19/16](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/interior-department-finalizes-stream-protection-rule-safeguard-communities-coal-mining)]

**Under Stream Protection Rule Fewer Stream Miles Would Be Adversely Affected; 292 Downstream Stream Miles And 2,811 Acres Of Forest Would Be Improved Annually.** “Overall, OSM asserted that changes in mining practices resulting from the Stream Protection Rule will likely reduce adverse impacts on the environment and human health. For some categories of impacts, OSM was able to quantify benefits in terms of biophysical changes. For example, the agency projected that the proposed rule would improve water quality because fewer stream miles will be adversely affected (i.e., 4 stream miles will not be filled annually, 29 stream miles will be restored annually; 1 downstream stream mile that does not experience adverse water quality impacts will be preserved annually; and 292 downstream stream miles will be improved annually). Similarly, stream restoration and reforestation provisions of the proposal were estimated to result in 2,811 acres of forest improved annually and 20 acres of forest preserved annually.” [Congressional Research Service, [1/11/17](https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20170111_R44150_aeb8ad15c32441ec3bdb6788400bda94f4aa8d86.pdf)]

### Reality: Stream Protection Rule Updated Regulations That Were More Than 30 Years Old

**Stream Protection Rule Updated 33-Year Old Regulations.** “After an extensive and transparent public process that spanned multiple years, the U.S. Department of the Interior today released final regulations to prevent or minimize impacts to surface water and groundwater from coal mining. The final rule updates 33-year old regulations and establishes clear requirements for responsible surface coal mining that will protect 6,000 miles of streams and 52,000 acres of forests over the next two decades, preserving community health and economic opportunities while meeting the nation’s energy needs.” [U.S. Department of the Interior, Press Release, [12/19/16](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/interior-department-finalizes-stream-protection-rule-safeguard-communities-coal-mining)]

## Rhetoric: Stream Protection Rule A “Major Threat” To Jobs

**Trump: Stream Protection Regulation A “Major Threat To Your Jobs;” Repealing It Would Save “Many Thousands American Jobs, Especially In The Mines…”** “President Trump on Thursday signed legislation ending a key Obama administration coal mining rule. The bill quashes the Office of Surface Mining’s Stream Protection Rule, a regulation to protect waterways from coal mining waste that officials finalized in December. […] At the signing, Trump called the regulation ‘another terrible job killing rule’ and said ending it would save ‘many thousands American jobs, especially in the mines, which, I have been promising you — the mines are a big deal.’ ‘This is a major threat to your jobs and we’re going to get rid of this threat,’ he added. ‘We’re going to fight for you.’” [The Hill, [2/16/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/319938-trump-signs-bill-undoing-obama-coal-mining-rule)]

### Reality: Stream Protection Rule Would Have Little Impact of Jobs

**Office of Surface Mining: Stream Protection Rule Would Add An Average Of 156 Full Time Jobs.** “The final SPR economic impacts are small relative to the size of the coal industry: • Employment will increase an average of 156 full time jobs. • Coal production may decline by an average annual 0.08% from baseline, accompanied by an approximately 1% increase in average annual coal prices.” [Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Stream Protection Rule Fact Sheet, [1/09/17](https://www.osmre.gov/programs/rcm/docs/sprFactSheet.pdf)]

**Congressional Research Service: Stream Protection Rule Would Cut 260 Coal Jobs Per Year On Average, While Adding 250 Jobs On Average Each Year.** “Production-related reductions in annual employment demand were anticipated to range from 41 to 590 jobs below baseline projections, but they would be partially offset by annual employment demand increases ranging from 210 to 270 jobs above baseline projections. Some of the expected increased demand for coal-related labor would be for new highly skilled jobs (e.g., engineers and biologists), while others are expected to require similar skills as currently used by the industry (e.g., bulldozer operations). Overall, the proposed rule was expected to reduce coal related employment by 260 jobs on average each year due to decreased coal mined, while an additional 250 jobs will be created from increased compliance activity on average each year.” [Congressional Research Service, [1/11/17](https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20170111_R44150_aeb8ad15c32441ec3bdb6788400bda94f4aa8d86.pdf)]

### Reality: Even Without The Rule, Coal Production And Jobs Will Continue To Fall

**Congressional Research Service: Absent The Stream Protection Rule, U.S. Coal Production Predicted To Decrease By 162 Million Tons Between 2020 and 2040.** “Absent the proposed rule, OSM’s forecast for U.S. coal production showed a decrease of 162 million tons between 2020 and 2040, representing a 15% decrease during that period. The proposed rule was expected to affect coal production and consumption patterns across the United States over and above baseline conditions.” [Congressional Research Service, [1/11/17](https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20170111_R44150_aeb8ad15c32441ec3bdb6788400bda94f4aa8d86.pdf)]

**Congressional Research Service: Absent The Stream Protection Rule, More Than 15,000 Full Time Coal Jobs Will Be Eliminated Between 2020 and 2040.** “Coal industry employment was projected to decrease by over 15,000 full-time equivalents (FTEs, i.e., one full-time worker employed for one year) between 2020 and 2040, even absent the proposed rule, compared with 90,000 persons employed in 2012. OSM estimated that changes in coal industry employment resulting from the proposed rule will combine with these ongoing trends. Production-related reductions in annual employment demand were anticipated to range from 41 to 590 jobs below baseline projections, but they would be partially offset by annual employment demand increases ranging from 210 to 270 jobs above baseline projections.” [Congressional Research Service, [1/11/17](https://www.everycrsreport.com/files/20170111_R44150_aeb8ad15c32441ec3bdb6788400bda94f4aa8d86.pdf)]

**American Association For The Advancement Of Science: Repealing Stream Protection Rule “Unlikely To Unleash A Mining Boom.”** “The rule had been watered down in its final form, they say, and would not have barred one of the most destructive mining practices in Appalachia: blasting away mountaintops to uncover coal seams and piling the debris in adjacent stream valleys. And because the rule's demise won't do much to ease the economic headwinds buffeting the United States's coalfields, it is unlikely to unleash a mining boom.” [American Association for the Advancement of Science, Science Magazine, [2/17/17](http://science.sciencemag.org/content/355/6326/674)]

## Rhetoric: WOTUS Rule Is “Destructive” And A “Disaster” For Farmers

**Trump: Waters Of The U.S. Rule “Very Destructive And Horrible;” Has Been A “Disaster” For Farmers And Ranchers.** “On Tuesday afternoon, Trump was surrounded by farmers, housing developers and county commissioners in the Roosevelt Room as he signed the order. ‘The EPA so-called Waters of the United States rule is one of the worst examples of federal regulation, and it has truly run amok, and is one of the rules most strongly opposed by farmers, ranchers and agricultural workers all across our land,’ Trump said. ‘It’s prohibiting them from being allowed to do what they’re supposed to be doing. It has been a disaster.’ Trump said the law meant that regulators had jurisdiction over puddles and ditches, but activists say this wasn’t allowed under the rule. ‘With today’s executive order I’m directing the EPA to take action paving the way for the elimination of this very destructive and horrible rule,’ Trump said.” [NBC News, [3/01/17](http://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/trump-signs-executive-order-begin-water-rule-rollback-n726781)]

### Reality: One in Three Americans Get Drinking Water From Streams Protected by WOTUS

**Nearly 117 Million Americans – One In Three People – Get Drinking Waters From Streams That Were Not Protected Before the WOTUS Rule.** “People need clean water for their health: About 117 million Americans – one in three people – get drinking water from streams that lacked clear protection before the Clean Water Rule. America’s cherished way of life depends on clean water, as healthy ecosystems provide wildlife habitat and places to fish, paddle, surf, and swim. Clean and reliable water is an economic driver, including for manufacturing, farming, tourism, recreation, and energy production. The health of our rivers, lakes, bays, and coastal waters are impacted by the streams and wetlands where they begin.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, News Release, [5/27/15](https://web.archive.org/web/20160408193528/https:/yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/0/62295CDDD6C6B45685257E52004FAC97)]

**WOTUS Rule Protected Streams And Wetlands Scientifically Shown To Have The Greatest Impact Of Downstream Water Quality.** “Protection for about 60 percent of the nation’s streams and millions of acres of wetlands has been confusing and complex as the result of Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006. The Clean Water Rule protects streams and wetlands that are scientifically shown to have the greatest impact on downstream water quality and form the foundation of our nation’s water resources. EPA and the U.S. Army are ensuring that waters protected under the Clean Water Act are more precisely defined, more predictable, easier for businesses and industry to understand, and consistent with the law and the latest science.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Clean Water Rule Factsheet, accessed [7/19/17](https://archive.epa.gov/epa/sites/production/files/2015-05/documents/fact_sheet_summary_final_1.pdf)]

## Rhetoric: EPA Ignored Farmers And Ranchers In Drafting WOTUS Rule

**American Farm Bureau Federation President Zippy Duvall: The EPA “Failed To Listen To Farmers’ And Ranchers’ Concerns When Drafting The Rule[.]”** “On Tuesday, Trump ordered his new head of the Environmental Protection Agency, Scott Pruitt, to scale back the agency’s interpretation of the Clean Water Act. […] ‘The Environmental Protection Agency failed to listen to farmers’ and ranchers’ concerns when drafting the rule and instead created widespread confusion for agriculture,’ said Zippy Duvall, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, an advocacy group for U.S. agriculture that had pushed hard against the rule.” [Los Angeles Times, [3/01/17](http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-waters-agriculture-20170301-story.html)]

### Reality: More Than 400 Meetings Were Held, More Than 1 Million Comments Collected

**EPA And Army Corps Of Engineers Held More Than 400 Meetings And Held A 207-Day Comment Period That Resulted In More Than 1 Million Comments That Shaped The Rule.** “After releasing the proposed rule last year, the agencies held more than 400 meetings with stakeholders across the country to provide information, hear concerns, and answer questions. EPA officials visited farms in Arizona, Colorado, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, New York, Pennsylvania, Texas, and Vermont. The 207-day public comment period on the proposed rule resulted in more than one million comments. All of this public input helped to shape the final Clean Water Rule.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Agriculture Factsheet, accessed [7/19/17](https://archive.epa.gov/epa/sites/production/files/2015-05/documents/fact_sheet_agriculture_final.pdf)]

### Reality: Rule Did Not Change Any Exemptions for Farming and Ranching

**WOTUS Rule Did Not Change Any Of The Clean Water Act’s Farming Or Ranching Exemptions; Rule Did Not Add Any New Permitting Requirements On Agriculture.** “Additionally, Congress has exempted certain discharges, and the rule does not affect any of the exemptions from CWA section 404 permitting requirements provided by CWA section 404(f), including those for normal farming, ranching, and silviculture activities. CWA section 404(f); 40 CFR 232.3; 33 CFR 323.4. This rule not only maintains current statutory exemptions, it expands regulatory exclusions from the definition of ‘waters of the United States’ to make it clear that this rule does not add any additional permitting requirements on agriculture. The rule also does not regulate shallow subsurface connections nor any type of groundwater, erosional features, or land use, nor does it affect either the existing statutory or regulatory exemptions from NPDES permitting requirements, such as for agricultural stormwater discharges and return flows from irrigated agriculture, or the status of water transfers.” [Clean Water Rule: Definition of “Waters of the United States,” [6/29/15](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2015/06/29/2015-13435/clean-water-rule-definition-of-waters-of-the-united-states)]

## Rhetoric: Under WOTUS “Every Puddle” Or Ditch Could Be Classified As Navigable Waters

**Trump: WOTUS Rule Meant “Nearly Every Puddle Or Every Ditch On A Farmers Land” Could Be Classified As Navigable Waters; Trump: “It Was A Massive Power Grab.”** “President Trump on Tuesday instructed the Environmental Protection Agency and Army Corps of Engineers to review and reconsider a 2015 rule known as the Waters of the United States rule, a move that could ultimately make it easier for agricultural and development interests to drain wetlands and small streams. Standing in the Oval Office surrounded by farmers, home builders and county commissioners, Trump said his directive was ‘paving the way for the elimination of this very destructive and horrible rule’ that should have only applied to ‘navigable waters’ affecting ‘interstate commerce.’ ‘But a few years ago, the EPA decided that ‘navigable waters’ could mean nearly every puddle or every ditch on a farmer’s land, or everywhere else that they decide,’ the president said. ‘It was a massive power grab.’” [Washington Post, [2/28/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/02/27/trump-to-direct-rollback-of-obama-era-water-rule-tuesday/?utm_term=.2c371701fc56)]

### Reality: WOTUS Rule Does Not Regulate Puddles, Most Ditches, Or Farm Ponds

**EPA And Army Corps of Engineers: Farm Ponds, Irrigation Ponds, And Puddles Not Considered “Waters Of The United States.”** “The following are not ‘waters of the United States’ even where they otherwise meet the terms of paragraphs (a)(4) through (8) of this section. […] (i) Artificially irrigated areas that would revert to dry land should application of water to that area cease; (ii) Artificial, constructed lakes and ponds created in dry land such as farm and stock watering ponds, irrigation ponds, settling basins, fields flooded for rice growing, log cleaning ponds, or cooling ponds; (iii) Artificial reflecting pools or swimming pools created in dry land; (iv) Small ornamental waters created in dry land; (v) Water-filled depressions created in dry land incidental to mining or construction activity, including pits excavated for obtaining fill, sand, or gravel that fill with water; (vi) Erosional features, including gullies, rills, and other ephemeral features that do not meet the definition of tributary, non-wetland swales, and lawfully constructed grassed waterways; and (vii) Puddles.” [Clean Water Rule: Definition of “Waters of the United States,” [6/29/15](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2015/06/29/2015-13435/clean-water-rule-definition-of-waters-of-the-united-states)]

**EPA And Army Corps of Engineers: Certain Ditches Excluded From WOTUS Rule.** “The agencies add exclusions for waters and features previously identified as generally exempt (e.g., exclusion for certain ditches that are not located in or drain wetlands) in preamble language from Federal Register documents by the Corps on November 13, 1986, and by EPA on June 6, 1988. This is the first time these exclusions have been established by rule. The agencies for the first time also establish by rule that certain ditches are excluded from jurisdiction, including ditches with ephemeral flow that are not a relocated tributary or excavated in a tributary, and ditches with intermittent flow that are not a relocated tributary, or excavated in a tributary, or drain wetlands.” [Clean Water Rule: Definition of “Waters of the United States,” [6/29/15](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2015/06/29/2015-13435/clean-water-rule-definition-of-waters-of-the-united-states)]

* **EPA: “Most Ditches” Not Regulated By WOTUS Rule.** “FACT: THE CLEAN WATER RULE DOES NOT REGULATE MOST DITCHES Rule Text § 230.3(s)(2)(iii): ‘The following are not ‘waters of the United States… the following ditches: (A) Ditches with ephemeral flow that are not a relocated tributary or excavated in a tributary. (B) Ditches with intermittent flow that are not a relocated tributary, excavated in a tributary, or drain wetlands. (C) Ditches that do not flow, either directly or through another water, into [a traditional navigable water, interstate water, or the territorial seas.]’” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Clean Water Rule Factsheet, accessed [7/19/17](https://archive.epa.gov/epa/sites/production/files/2015-05/documents/fact_sheet_fact_check_clean_water_rule.pdf)]

### Reality: Rule Does Not Protect Waters Not Historically Covered by the Clean Water Act

**EPA: WOTUS “Does Not Protect Any Types Of Waters That Have Not Historically Been Covered By The Clean Water Act.”** “Protection for about 60 percent of the nation’s streams and millions of acres of wetlands has been confusing and complex since Supreme Court decisions in 2001 and 2006. The Clean Water Rule protects the streams and wetlands that are scientifically shown to have the greatest impact on downstream water quality and form the foundation of our nation’s water resources. EPA and the U.S. Army are ensuring that waters protected under the Clean Water Act are more precisely defined, easier for businesses and industry to understand, and consistent with the law and the latest science. The rule does not protect any types of waters that have not historically been covered by the Clean Water Act. It also does not interfere with or change private property rights, or address land use.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Communities Factsheet, accessed [7/19/17](https://archive.epa.gov/epa/sites/production/files/2015-05/documents/fact_sheet_communities_final_0.pdf)]

# Obama Record

## Rhetoric: “What’s So Great” About the Obama Record?

**Pruitt:** “What did they achieve? With respect to water you had Flint and Gold King. With respect to Superfund sites you have 1322, approximately, Superfund sites across the country which is more than when President Obama came in. Air attainment? Still at 40 percent non-attainment in this country, with respect to Ozone. Roughly 130 to 140 million people living in non-attainment. What’s so great about that record?” [WDAY, [5/10/17](http://www.climatedepot.com/2017/05/11/epas-pruitt-hammers-obama-environmental-record-what-did-they-achieve-flint-and-gold-king/)]

Reality: Obama EPA Outpaced Action By /Trump Administration

**Trump EPA Delayed Or Withdrew 33 More Rules Than The Obama EPA In His First 8 Months**. Pruitt’s EPA has delayed or withdrawn 47 rules in his first eight months compared to 14 delayed or withdrawn by the Obama EPA in the same time frame. [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

**Trump EPA Trailed Obama In Proposing Significant Rules**. During the first eight months of the Obama administration the EPA proposed 19 significant rules, compared to only 2 by the Pruitt/Trump EPA. [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

**Trump EPA Trailed Obama Administration In Finalizing Rules In First Eight Months**. During the first eight months of the Obama administration the EPA finalized 15 rules, compared to only 6 by the Pruitt/Trump EPA. [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

### Reality: Obama EPA Took Historic Steps To Limit Greenhouse Gas Emissions

**2016: EPA Finalized Update To The Cross-State Air Pollution Rule**. According to the EPA, “On September 7, 2016, the EPA finalized an update to the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) for the 2008 ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) by issuing the final CSAPR Update.  Starting in May 2017, this rule will reduce summertime (May - September) nitrogen oxides (NOX) emissions from power plants in 22 states in the eastern U.S., providing up to $880 million in benefits and reducing ground-level ozone exposure for millions of Americans.  The rule will reduce air quality impacts of ozone pollution that crosses state lines and will help downwind areas meet and maintain the 2008 ozone air quality standard.” [EPA, [9/7/16](https://www.epa.gov/airmarkets/final-cross-state-air-pollution-rule-update)]

**2013: Obama Administration Published New Estimates Of Social Cost Of Carbon**. According to the New York Times, “In May, to little fanfare, the Obama administration published new estimates of the “social cost of carbon,” a dollars-and-cents measure of the future damage — from floods, pandemics, depressed agricultural productivity — that releasing each additional ton of heat-trapping carbon dioxide into the atmosphere would cost.” [New York Times, [9/10/13](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/11/business/counting-the-cost-of-fixing-the-future.html)]

**2011: EPA Finalized National Standards To Reduce Mercury And Other Toxic Air Pollution From Coal- And Oil-Fired Power Plants**. According to EPA, “On December 16, 2011, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) finalized the first national standards to reduce mercury and other toxic air pollution from coal- and oil-fired power plants. More than 20 years after the 1990 Clean Air Act Amendments, some power plants still do not control emissions of toxic pollutants, even though pollution control technology is widely available.” [EPA, accessed [5/24/17](https://www.epa.gov/mats/cleaner-power-plants)]

**2010: Obama Administration****Strengthened National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) For Sulfur Dioxide.**According to EPA, “On June 2, 2010, EPA strengthened the primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for sulfur dioxide (SO2). The revised standard will improve public health protection, especially for children, the elderly, and people with asthma. These groups are susceptible to the health problems associated with breathing SO2. EPA revised the primary SO2 standard by establishing a new 1-hour standard at a level of 75 parts per billion (ppb). EPA’s evaluation of the scientific information and the risks posed by breathing SO2 indicate that this new 1-hour standard will protect public health by reducing people’s exposure to high short-term (5-minutes to 24-hours) concentrations of SO2.” [EPA, [6/2/10](https://www.epa.gov/so2-pollution/2010-primary-national-ambient-air-quality-standards-naaqs-sulfur-dioxide#rule-summary)]

**2010: EPA And DOT****Issued ‘Tailpipe’ Rule To Limit Greenhouse Gas Emission From Cars**. According to the New York Times, “The federal government took its first formal step to regulate global warming pollution on Thursday by issuing final rules for greenhouse gas emissions for automobiles and light trucks. The move ends a 30-year battle between regulators and automakers but sets the stage for what may be a bigger fight over climate-altering emissions from stationary sources like power plants, steel mills and refineries. The new tailpipe rules, jointly written by the Transportation Department and the Environmental Protection Agency, set emissions and mileage standards that would translate to a combined fuel economy average for new vehicles of 35.5 miles per gallon by 2016. Most drivers will see lower mileage figures in actual driving.” [New York Times, [4/1/10](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/02/science/earth/02emit.html)]

**2009: EPA Issued Endangerment Finding**. According to the EPA, “On December 7, 2009, the Administrator signed two distinct findings regarding greenhouse gases under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act: Endangerment Finding: The Administrator finds that the current and projected concentrations of the six key well-mixed greenhouse gases—carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF6)—in the atmosphere threaten the public health and welfare of current and future generations.” [EPA, accessed [5/24/17](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/endangerment-and-cause-or-contribute-findings-greenhouse-gases-under-section-202a-clean)]

**EPA Cut Emissions 70 Percent While GDP Grew 246 Percent.**According to the EPA, “From 1970 to 2015, aggregate national emissions of the six common pollutants alone dropped an average of 70 percent while gross domestic product grew by 246 percent. This progress reflects efforts by state, local and tribal governments; EPA; private sector companies; environmental groups and others.” [EPA, accessed [5/24/17](https://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview/progress-cleaning-air-and-improving-peoples-health)]

### Reality: Obama EPA Introduced Plans To Curt Harmful Air Emissions By 2030

**2016: United States Joined Paris Climate Accord.**According to the Obama White House, “Last December, more than 190 countries adopted the Paris Agreement, the most ambitious climate change agreement in history. In order for the agreement to take effect and enter into force, at least 55 countries representing at least 55 percent of global emissions need to formally join the Agreement. Today, the United States and China deposited with United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon their respective instruments to join the Paris Agreement, marking a significant contribution towards the early entry into force of the Paris Agreement.” [Whtie House Archives, [9/3/16](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2016/09/03/president-obama-united-states-formally-enters-paris-agreement)]

**2015: Obama Announced Clean Power Plan To Curb Climate Change**. According to the Washington Post, “President Obama delivered a passionate plug for his Clean Power Plan to cut carbon emissions from electricity plants, saying ‘there is such a thing as being too late when it comes to climate change.’ The White House sought to hit back at those who have said that the plan unveiled formally today by the Environmental Protection Agency would kills jobs in the coal industry and raise costs to consumers of electricity. ‘We’ve heard these same stale arguments before,’ Obama said in remarks to supporters in the East Room of the White House Monday afternoon.” [Washington Post, [8/3/15](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2015/08/03/president-delivers-impassioned-plug-for-his-clean-power-plan/?utm_term=.1b5ec619d75a)]

### Reality: Obama EPA Issued Rules To Protect Clean Water

**2015: Obama Administration Issued Clean Water Rule**. According to the New York Times, “President Obama…announced a sweeping new clean water regulation meant to restore the federal government’s authority to limit pollution in the nation’s rivers, lakes, streams and wetlands. The rule, which would apply to about 60 percent of the nation’s bodies of water, comes as part of a broader effort by Mr. Obama to use his executive authority to build a major environmental legacy, without requiring new legislation from the Republican-controlled Congress.” [New York times, [5/27/15](https://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/28/us/obama-epa-clean-water-pollution.html)]

**2015: EPA Published Waters Of The United States Rule To Protect Wetlands**. According to Politico, “The Obama administration announced new protections Wednesday for thousands of waterways and wetlands, pushing ahead despite a fierce counterattack from powerhouse industries like agriculture, oil and home-building — and their supporters in Congress. On its face, the Waters of the United States rule is largely a technical document, defining which rivers, streams, lakes and marshes fall under the jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Army Corps of Engineers. But opponents condemn it as a massive power grab by Washington, saying it will give bureaucrats carte blanche to swoop in and penalize landowners every time a cow walks through a ditch. And it comes amid years of complaints from Republicans about President Barack Obama’s regulatory agenda, which has encompassed everything from power plants and health insurers to Internet providers and for-profit colleges.” [Politico, [5/27/15](http://www.politico.com/story/2015/05/epa-waterways-wetlands-rule-118319)]

### Reality: Obama EPA Took Steps To Ensure Safe Mining and Disposal Of Coal

**2015: Obama Interior Department Issued Moratorium On New Federal Coal Leases**. According to the Washington Post, “The Obama administration on Friday ordered a moratorium on new leases for coal mined from federal lands as part of a sweeping review of the government’s management of vast amounts of taxpayer-owned coal throughout the West. Interior Secretary Sally Jewell announced the temporary halt, saying it was time for a re-examination of the decades-old coal-leasing program, from health and environmental impacts to whether U.S. citizens are getting a fair return for the hundreds of millions of tons of government-owned coal that are mined and sold each year.” [Washington Post, [1/15/16](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2016/01/14/obama-administration-set-to-announce-moratorium-on-some-new-federal-coal-leases/?utm_term=.58026d7997bd)]

**2010: EPA Announced First Ever National Rules To Ensure Safe Disposal Of Coal Ash**. According to EPA, “The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency today is proposing the first-ever national rules to ensure the safe disposal and management of coal ash from coal-fired power plants. Coal combustion residuals, commonly known as coal ash, are byproducts of the combustion of coal at power plants and are disposed of in liquid form at large surface impoundments and in solid form at landfills. The residuals contain contaminants like mercury, cadmium and arsenic, which are associated with cancer and various other serious health effects. EPA’s risk assessment and damage cases demonstrate that, without proper protections, these contaminants can leach into groundwater and can migrate to drinking water sources, posing significant health public concerns.” [EPA, [5/4/10](https://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/a7b2ee8e45551c138525735900404444/4eca022f6f5c501185257719005dfb1b%21OpenDocument)]

**2009: Administration Curbed Permitting Of Mountain Top Removal Coal Mining**. According to Scientific American, “The Obama administration announced a plan today for curbing the use of streamlined federal permitting for mountaintop coal mining and boosting efforts to protect rivers and streams from mining debris. The administration stopped short of prohibiting mountaintop operations, opting instead to curb what it considers the mining technique’s most environmentally damaging aspects with an agreement among the Interior Department, the Army Corps of Engineers and U.S. EPA.” [Scientific American, [6/11/09](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/obama-restricts-mountaintop-removal/)]

### Reality: Obama Administration Issued Historic Energy And Fuel Efficiency Standards

**2015: DOE Announced Largest Energy Efficiency Standard In History**. According to the Department of Energy, “The U.S. Department of Energy today announced historic new efficiency standards for commercial air conditioners and furnaces. Developed with industry, utilities, and environmental groups, these standards will save more energy than any other standard issued by the Department to date. Over the lifetime of the products, businesses will save $167 billion on their utility bills and carbon pollution will be reduced by 885 million metric tons.” [Department of Energy, [12/17/15](https://energy.gov/articles/energy-department-announces-largest-energy-efficiency-standard-history)]

**2012: Obama Finalized Historic Fuel Efficiency Standards**. According to the White House, “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 Archives, [8/28/12](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2012/08/28/obama-administration-finalizes-historic-545-mpg-fuel-efficiency-standard)]

### Reality: Obama EPA Announced First Ever Standards To Cut Methane Emissions From Oil And Gas Drilling

**2016: EPA** **Announced First Ever Standards To Cut Methane Emissions From Oil And Gas**. According to EPA, “As a further step in the Obama Administration’s commitment to take action on climate change and protect public health, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is announcing comprehensive steps to address methane emissions from both new and existing sources in the oil and gas sector.  For new, modified and reconstructed sources, EPA is finalizing a set of standards that will reduce methane, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and toxic air emissions in the oil and natural gas industry. EPA is also starting the process to control emissions from existing sources by issuing for public comment an Information Collection Request (ICR) that requires companies to provide the information that will be necessary for EPA to reduce methane emissions from existing oil and gas sources.” [EPA, [5/12/16](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-releases-first-ever-standards-cut-methane-emissions-oil-and-gas-sector)]

#### Reality: Obama Administration protected offshore areas from oil and gas drilling

**2016: Obama Banned Oil Drilling In Large Areas Of Atlantic And Arctic Oceans**. According to the Washington Post, “President Obama moved to solidify his environmental legacy Tuesday by withdrawing hundreds of millions of acres of federally owned land in the Arctic and Atlantic Ocean from new offshore oil and gas drilling. Obama used a little-known law called the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to protect large portions of the Chukchi and Beaufort seas in the Arctic and a string of canyons in the Atlantic stretching from Massachusetts to Virginia. In addition to a five-year moratorium already in place in the Atlantic, removing the canyons from drilling puts much of the eastern seaboard off limits to oil exploration even if companies develop plans to operate around them.” [Washington Post, [12/20/16](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2016/12/20/president-obama-expected-to-ban-oil-drilling-in-large-areas-of-atlantic-and-arctic-oceans/?utm_term=.220aeab6f38f)]

**2016: Obama Administration****Published Rules On Offshore Drilling To Prevent Repeat Of BP Oil Spill In Gulf.**According to the New York Times, “The Obama administration on Thursday unveiled a final set of regulations on offshore oil and gas drilling that are aimed at preventing the kind of equipment failures that caused the disastrous 2010 oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. The publication of the rules, which the administration released in draft form last year, is timed just ahead of the sixth anniversary of the April 20explosion on a BP oil rig that killed 11 and sent millions of barrels of oil into the gulf. The new rules come as the Obama administration has proposed opening up some pristine Arctic waters off Alaska to new drilling, angering environmentalists.” [New York Times, [4/15/16](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/15/us/politics/us-issuesnew-rules-on-offshore-oil-and-gas-drilling.html)]

**2015: Obama Administration Blocked Construction Of Controversial Keystone Pipeline**. According to the New York Times, “President Obama announced on Friday that he had rejected the request from a Canadian company to build the Keystone XL oil pipeline, ending a seven-year review that had become a symbol of the debate over his climate policies. Mr. Obama’s denial of the proposed 1,179-mile pipeline, which would have carried 800,000 barrels a day of carbon-heavy petroleum from the Canadian oil sands to the Gulf Coast, comes as he seeks to build an ambitious legacy on climate change.” [New York Times, [11/7/15](https://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/07/us/obama-expected-to-reject-construction-of-keystone-xl-oil-pipeline.html)]

### Reality: Obama Created More National Monuments Than Any President

**Obama Designated 34 National Monuments, More Than Any Other President**. According to Business Insider, “On January 12, President Barack Obama created five new national monuments, bringing his total to 34 — more than any other president.” [Business Insider, [1/16/17](http://www.businessinsider.com/every-piece-of-land-obama-has-protected-2017-1)]

### Reality: Inspector General Said Agency Acted Responsibly In Gold King Mine

**2017: EPA Inspector General Said Agency Acted Reasonably And Lawfully Before And After The 2015 Gold King Mine Spill**. According to Politico, “EPA’s inspector general today said the agency acted reasonably and lawfully before and after the 2015 Gold King mine spill that dumped 3 million gallons of polluted water into Colorado’s Animas River.” [Politico, [6/12/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/06/ig-report-largely-clears-epa-on-gold-king-spill-response-088920)]

**Report Concluded “On-Site EPA Officials And Contractors Were ‘Qualified, Experienced Individuals With Relevant Expertise.”** According to Politico, “The 40-page report, conducted following two congressional requests, concludes that on-site EPA officials and contractors were ‘qualified, experienced individuals with relevant expertise,’ and noted that while the release was harmful, that single mine already discharged the same amount of water every 10 days.” [Politico, [6/12/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/06/ig-report-largely-clears-epa-on-gold-king-spill-response-088920)]

**IG Report Said EPA Decision Not To Directly Test Mine Was “Reasonable.”** According to Politico, “The report says that EPA’s decision not to directly test the mine’s water level was ‘reasonable’ because of the safety risks and high costs, among other things. It said EPA properly assured the independence of the Bureau of Reclamation’s technical review of the incident.” [Politico, [6/12/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/06/ig-report-largely-clears-epa-on-gold-king-spill-response-088920)]

**IG Report Found EPA Followed Legal Requirements In Reporting Gold King Mine Spill.** According to Politico, “And despite complaints from state and local agencies that it took too long for EPA to notify them of the spill, the IG concluded that EPA followed the legal requirements and that there were ‘no delays’ in notifying other entities.” [Politico, [6/12/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/06/ig-report-largely-clears-epa-on-gold-king-spill-response-088920)]

## Rhetoric: Upgrade Water Infrastructure And Promote Clean Water

**Pruitt**: “We have a water infrastructure issue right now across this country. It’s not just roads and bridges,” Pruitt told a meeting of the U.S. Conference of Mayors in March. [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

Reality: EPA Has Taken Action To Slow Improvements On Clean Water

**EPA Withdrew Waters Of The United States Rule.** According to Politico, “Moved to withdraw and replace the Obama-era Waters of the United States rule, a sweeping regulation that seeks to define the waters and wetlands the federal government can regulate.”

[Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

**Rescinded Regulation To Keep Dentists From Allowing Mercury To Enter Water Supply**. According to Politico, “Rescinded a pending Obama regulation requiring dentists to keep mercury from entering the water supply — but then reissued it months later amid lawsuits.” [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

**EPA Supported White House Budget That Cut Funding From Water Cleanup**. According to Politico, “Supports a White House budget proposal that would cut funding for water cleanup projects, including those in the Chesapeake Bay, the Great Lakes and Puget Sound.” [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]