TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Regulatory Process 5](#_Toc504491321)

[Rhetoric: CPP “Inconsistent” With The Clean Air Act 5](#_Toc504491322)

[Reality: Three Supreme Court Cases Ruled EPA Could Regulate Carbon 5](#_Toc504491323)

[Rhetoric: Special Interest Groups Use Sue And Settle To Circumvent Regulatory Process 5](#_Toc504491324)

[Reality: Sue And Settle Is Appropriate, Both As A Legal Question And A Regulatory Tool 5](#_Toc504491325)

[Paris Agreement 7](#_Toc504491326)

[Rhetoric: Paris Climate Accord Is a Bad Deal Like TPP and Iran 7](#_Toc504491327)

[Reality: Coal Companies Want To Stay In Paris Agreement 7](#_Toc504491328)

[Reality: Secretary of State Tillerson Previously Publicly Supported Paris Agreement 8](#_Toc504491329)

[Reality: Senior Advisors Jared Kushner and Gary Cohn Supported Agreement 8](#_Toc504491330)

[Reality: US Would Violate International Law If Country Missed Paris Targets 9](#_Toc504491331)

[Reality: Trump Flip-Flopped on Paris Agreement 9](#_Toc504491332)

[Reality: Trump Can’t Pull Out Of Paris Agreement Until 2020 10](#_Toc504491333)

[Reality: More Than 100 Countries Pledged To Cut Global Carbon Emissions 10](#_Toc504491334)

[Rhetoric: MIT Updated Studies After Trump Administration Used Data 11](#_Toc504491335)

[MIT Study Was Updated in 2016 11](#_Toc504491336)

[Rhetoric: Paris Would Result in the Loss of 400,000 Jobs 11](#_Toc504491337)

[Pruitt Cited Industry Backed Heritage Foundation Study 11](#_Toc504491338)

[Rhetoric: Paris Could Cost America as Many as 2.7 Million Jobs by 2025 12](#_Toc504491339)

[NERA Conclusion Based on Highly Unrealistic Assumptions 12](#_Toc504491340)

[Rhetoric: Paris Does Not Achieve “Good Environmental Outcomes” 13](#_Toc504491341)

[Goal of Paris Agreement To Slow Warming Temperatures By Two Degrees Celsius 13](#_Toc504491342)

[Paris Commitments Would Cover 97 Percent of Greenhouse Gas Emissions 13](#_Toc504491343)

[Rhetoric: China and India Are Not Required to Take Action Until 2030 14](#_Toc504491344)

[Reality: China And India Have Taken Steps To Reduce Emissions 14](#_Toc504491345)

[Rhetoric: We Don’t Need Paris Because Our CO2 Reductions Are At Pre-1994 Levels 14](#_Toc504491346)

[Reality: US Reducing Dependence On Fossil Fuels Due To Market Conditions 14](#_Toc504491347)

[Reality: Drop In CO2 Levels Due To Increase In Natural Gas and Efficiency Gains 15](#_Toc504491348)

[Rhetoric: We Were Never Going to Make the Target In Paris Agreement 15](#_Toc504491349)

[Reality: Targets Set By Paris Were Flexible 15](#_Toc504491350)

[Reality: Trump Repealed Measures Aimed At Reducing Emissions 15](#_Toc504491351)

[RhetorIc: Small Business “Euphoria” over Trump’S Decision On Paris 16](#_Toc504491352)

[Reality: Small And Large Business Urged Trump To Keep Paris Agreement In Place 16](#_Toc504491353)

[Rhetoric: Administration Had Clear Position on Climate Change 16](#_Toc504491354)

[Reality: Climate Change Wasn’t Discussed When Deciding Paris 16](#_Toc504491355)

[Reality: EPA Administrator And White House Spokesman Did Not Know Trump Position 17](#_Toc504491356)

[Reality: Cohn And Conway Would Not Say If Trump Believed In Climate Change 18](#_Toc504491357)

[Reality: White House Officials Did Not Know Trump Position On Climate Change 18](#_Toc504491358)

[Rhetoric: US Will Push for A Better Deal on Paris 18](#_Toc504491359)

[Reality: Pruitt Missed “First Opportunity to Push for A Better Deal” 19](#_Toc504491360)

[Reality: US Cannot Renegotiate Paris Accord 19](#_Toc504491361)

[Public Health (Climate Change) 19](#_Toc504491362)

[Rhetoric: Carbon Emissions Are Not Like Other Kinds of Air Pollution 19](#_Toc504491363)

[Reality: Carbon Pollution is Linked to Human Mortality 19](#_Toc504491364)

[Reality: Clean Power Plan Would Save As Much As $93 Billion In Health Costs 20](#_Toc504491365)

[Rhetoric: Clean Power Plan Wouldn’t Protect Public Health 21](#_Toc504491366)

[Reality: CPP Would Have Prevented Thousands of Asthma Attacks, Heart Attacks and Deaths 21](#_Toc504491367)

[Reality: Clean Power Plan Would Save As Much As $93 Billion In Health Costs 21](#_Toc504491368)

[Reality: Climate Change Is Harmful To Public Health 21](#_Toc504491369)

[Reality: Air Pollution Responsible For 200,000 Premature Deaths Per Year 22](#_Toc504491370)

[Reality: Children and Elderly More Susceptible To Air Pollution 23](#_Toc504491371)

[Jobs And Economic Growth 24](#_Toc504491372)

[Rhetoric: Trump Administration Would Save Coal Industry 24](#_Toc504491373)

[Reality: Trump Can’t Bring Back Coal Industry 24](#_Toc504491374)

[Reality: Ending Clean Power Plan Would Not Bring Back Coal Jobs 26](#_Toc504491375)

[Rhetoric: Trump Will Eliminate Job-Killers That Don’t Protect The Environment 28](#_Toc504491376)

[Reality: Clean Power Plan Would Add Half a Million Jobs 28](#_Toc504491377)

[Reality: Clean Power Plan and WOTUS Rule Would Protect Environment 28](#_Toc504491378)

[Rhetoric: “Energy Dominance” Creates Jobs 29](#_Toc504491379)

[Reality: Solar and Wind Experienced the Strongest Energy Sector Job Growth in 2016 29](#_Toc504491380)

[Reality: Electric Power Generation Jobs Grew by 13 Percent in 2016 29](#_Toc504491381)

[Rhetoric: Clean Power Plan Would Cost $39 Billion 29](#_Toc504491382)

[Reality: NERA Study is Flawed 29](#_Toc504491383)

[Reality: Clean Power Plan Would Result In Lower Electricity Bills 31](#_Toc504491384)

[Rhetoric: We Must Stop Bleeding Jobs And Start Growing The Economy 31](#_Toc504491385)

[Reality: EPA Has Cut Emissions While Growing Economy 31](#_Toc504491386)

[Reality: EPA Has Cut Emissions While Growing Economy 32](#_Toc504491387)

[Reality: Renewable Energy Provides Americans With Millions of Jobs 32](#_Toc504491388)

[Rhetoric: China and India WOn’t Participate, Harming US Businesses 34](#_Toc504491389)

[Reality: India And China Have Emerged As Global Leaders In Tackling Global Warming 34](#_Toc504491390)

[Rhetoric: US Added 50,000 Coal Jobs From January 20 to June of 2017 34](#_Toc504491391)

[Reality: Only 1,000 Coal Jobs Added Since Trump Became President (June 2017) 34](#_Toc504491392)

[Reality: Pruitt Misled With Coal Job Numbers 35](#_Toc504491393)

[Reality: Pruitt Exaggerated Number of US Coal Jobs 35](#_Toc504491394)

[Reality: Pruitt Claimed He Misspoke 36](#_Toc504491395)

[National Security 36](#_Toc504491396)

[Rhetoric: Renewable Energy Undermines Grid Reliability 36](#_Toc504491397)

[Reality: Renewable Energy Doesn’t Destabilize the Grid 36](#_Toc504491398)

[Cars And Fuel Economy Standards 37](#_Toc504491399)

[Rhetoric: New Review Meant To Ensure Fuel Standards Were Good For Consumers 37](#_Toc504491400)

[Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Are Good for the Environment 37](#_Toc504491401)

[Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Are Good for Our Communities 38](#_Toc504491402)

[Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Are Important to Our Public Health 38](#_Toc504491403)

[Reality: Decision To Re-Examine Fuel Economy Rules Linked to Climate Denial 38](#_Toc504491404)

[Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Standards “Costly For Automakers And The American People” 39](#_Toc504491405)

[Reality: CAFE Standards Would Save Consumers More Than $1.7 Trillion by MY 2025 39](#_Toc504491406)

[Reality: Cost Of Owning A Car Would Increase if Standards Were Rolled Back 41](#_Toc504491407)

[Reality: Automakers’ Sales Hit An All-Time High In 2016 41](#_Toc504491408)

[Reality: Car Companies “Over-Complied” With the Most Stringent GHG Standards 41](#_Toc504491409)

[Rhetoric: Renegotiating Fuel Rules Would Help Auto Workers 42](#_Toc504491410)

[Reality: Rolling Back the Standards Helps the Automakers, Not Workers 42](#_Toc504491411)

[Rhetoric: Under Trump, Automakers Are Bringing Jobs Back To America 43](#_Toc504491412)

[Reality: Automakers “Hard Pressed” And “Wary” About Creating More Jobs 43](#_Toc504491413)

[Reality: Automakers Disputed Trump’s Claim That He Persuaded Them To Keep US Jobs 43](#_Toc504491414)

[Rhetoric: Standards Were Not “Economically Feasible” 44](#_Toc504491415)

[Reality: Fuel Economy Standards Would Create An Estimated 650,000 Jobs By 2030 44](#_Toc504491416)

[Rhetoric: Midterm Review Analysis was Premature and Rushed 44](#_Toc504491417)

[Reality: EPA’s Midterm Review Was “Not Unexpected” And Accounted For Multiple Public Comment Opportunities, In Which Automakers Provided Feedback 45](#_Toc504491418)

[EPA Budget 46](#_Toc504491419)

[Rhetoric: EPA Can Fulfill Its Mission Under the Trump Budget 46](#_Toc504491420)

[Reality: House Budget Chair Called Budget ‘Untenable’ 46](#_Toc504491421)

[Reality: Republican Congressmen Question Pruitt and Budget 46](#_Toc504491422)

[Reality: OMB Director Defended Budget; Says Scott Pruitt Responsible for Job Cuts 47](#_Toc504491423)

[Rhetoric: Trump Has Been Fighting To Protect The Environment 47](#_Toc504491424)

[Reality: Trump Planned to Cut Programs That Protect Environment 47](#_Toc504491425)

[Reality: EPA Was Targeted by Trump Budget 48](#_Toc504491426)

[Rhetoric: EPA Budget Prioritizes Superfund Cleanup 48](#_Toc504491427)

[Reality: Trump Budget Would Put “Massive Dent” In Superfund Program 49](#_Toc504491428)

[Reality: Trump Budget Would Undermine Superfund Program 49](#_Toc504491429)

[Reality: Obama EPA Outpaced Pruitt On Superfund Site Decisions 49](#_Toc504491430)

[Rhetoric: EPA Is Providing Support For Research Into Cleaner Energy 50](#_Toc504491431)

[Reality: Budget Would Cut EPA Office Of Research And Development Budget 50](#_Toc504491432)

[Rhetoric: President’s Energy Policy Will Lead To Responsible And Sustainable Energy Solutions 50](#_Toc504491433)

[Reality: Clean Energy Already Employs 3 Million Americans 50](#_Toc504491434)

[Reality: Wind Energy Employs More Than 100,000 50](#_Toc504491435)

[Reality: Energy Efficiency Industry Employed 2.2 Million Americans 51](#_Toc504491436)

[Reality: Clean Power Plan Would Have Reduced Electricity Bills 51](#_Toc504491437)

[Rhetoric: Electricity Costs Will Increase Because of Clean Energy 51](#_Toc504491438)

[Reality: Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Are Competitive With Coal 51](#_Toc504491439)

[Reality: Clean Energy Helps Provide Price Stability 52](#_Toc504491440)

[Reality: U.S. Residential Electricity Prices Decline For The First Time In Many Years 52](#_Toc504491441)

[Reality: Action on Climate Change Would Save Billions, Major EPA Study Finds 52](#_Toc504491442)

[Rhetoric: Trump’s EPA Is Providing Support For Clean Energy Research 53](#_Toc504491443)

[Reality: Budget Would Cut EPA Office Of Research And Development Budget 53](#_Toc504491444)

[Clean Water 53](#_Toc504491445)

[Rhetoric: Stream Protection Rule Duplicative And “Unnecessary” 53](#_Toc504491446)

[Reality: Stream Protection Rule Is Vital For Public Health And Safe Drinking Water 53](#_Toc504491447)

[Reality: Rule Would Protect 6,000 Miles Of Stream And 52,000 Acres of Forest Over 20 Years 54](#_Toc504491448)

[Reality: Stream Protection Rule Updated Regulations That Were More Than 30 Years Old 54](#_Toc504491449)

[Rhetoric: Stream Protection Rule A “Major Threat” To Jobs 55](#_Toc504491450)

[Reality: Stream Protection Rule Would Have Little Impact of Jobs 55](#_Toc504491451)

[Reality: Even Without The Rule, Coal Production And Jobs Will Continue To Fall 55](#_Toc504491452)

[Rhetoric: WOTUS Rule Is “Destructive” And A “Disaster” For Farmers 56](#_Toc504491453)

[Reality: One in Three Americans Get Drinking Water From Streams Protected by WOTUS 56](#_Toc504491454)

[Rhetoric: EPA Ignored Farmers And Ranchers In Drafting WOTUS Rule 56](#_Toc504491455)

[Reality: More Than 400 Meetings Were Held, More Than 1 Million Comments Collected 57](#_Toc504491456)

[Reality: Rule Did Not Change Any Exemptions for Farming and Ranching 57](#_Toc504491457)

[Rhetoric: Under WOTUS “Every Puddle” Or Ditch Could Be Classified As Navigable Waters 57](#_Toc504491458)

[Reality: WOTUS Rule Does Not Regulate Puddles, Most Ditches, Or Farm Ponds 57](#_Toc504491459)

[Reality: Rule Does Not Protect Waters Not Historically Covered by the Clean Water Act 58](#_Toc504491460)

[Rejecting, Misinterpreting, and Undermining Science 58](#_Toc504491461)

[Rhetoric: Carbon Was Not Primary Contributor to Global Warming 58](#_Toc504491462)

[Manmade Carbon Pollution Is Responsible For Climate Change 58](#_Toc504491463)

[Rhetoric: The Impact of Human Activity on Climate Change is Unknown 59](#_Toc504491464)

[Reality: Overwhelming Consensus That Climate Change Very Likely Due to Human Activities 59](#_Toc504491465)

[Rhetoric: Humans Contribute To Climate Change ‘In Some Way’ 61](#_Toc504491466)

[Reality: Humans Responsible for Warming 61](#_Toc504491467)

[Rhetoric: EPA Plays Important Role In Producing Sound Science 62](#_Toc504491468)

[Reality: Trump Budget Would Cut EPA Workforce By One-Fifth 62](#_Toc504491469)

[Reality: Trump Advisors are Climate Science Deniers 63](#_Toc504491470)

[Rhetoric: Science Should Not Be Politicized 64](#_Toc504491471)

[Reality: Pruitt Wanted ‘Red Team’ to Review Climate Science 64](#_Toc504491472)

[Reality: Pruitt Eyed Climate Deniers to Lead ‘Red Team’ 64](#_Toc504491473)

[Rhetoric: Climate Change Not Responsible for Extreme Weather 66](#_Toc504491474)

[Reality: Man Made Climate Change Likely Causing Increase In Extreme Hurricanes 66](#_Toc504491475)

[Reality: Climate Change Likely to Increase Flooding 67](#_Toc504491476)

[Rhetoric: EPA Scientists Are Not Independent 67](#_Toc504491477)

[Reality: Pruitt Decision Came After Meeting With Congressman Who Opposed Advisory Board 67](#_Toc504491478)

[Reality: Pruitt’s EPA Favored Industry Over Science 68](#_Toc504491479)

[Ethics And Good Government 69](#_Toc504491480)

[Rhetoric: I Don’t Hang With Polluters, I Prosecute Them 69](#_Toc504491481)

[Reality: Environmental Penalties Way Down In Scott Pruitt’s EPA 69](#_Toc504491482)

[Reality: Pruitt Has Met Extensively With Industry And Trade Group Officials 69](#_Toc504491483)

[Rhetoric: The Days of Political Agendas Guiding Policy are Over 69](#_Toc504491484)

[Reality: Trump Appointed Crooked Cabinet 69](#_Toc504491485)

[Reality: Koch Brothers Lobbied For Pruitt, Others in Cabinet 71](#_Toc504491486)

[Reality: Six White House Staffers Held Up To $12 Million In Energy Company Stocks 71](#_Toc504491487)

[Reality: Trump Nominated Industry Insiders to Staff EPA 72](#_Toc504491488)

[Obama Record 72](#_Toc504491489)

[Rhetoric: “What’s So Great” About the Obama Record? 72](#_Toc504491490)

[Reality: Obama EPA Outpaced Action By Pruitt/Trump Administration 73](#_Toc504491491)

[Reality: Obama EPA Took Historic Steps To Limit Greenhouse Gas Emissions 73](#_Toc504491492)

[Reality: Obama EPA Introduced Plans To Curt Harmful Air Emissions By 2030 74](#_Toc504491493)

[Reality: Obama EPA Issued Rules To Protect Clean Water 74](#_Toc504491494)

[Reality: Obama EPA Took Steps To Ensure Safe Mining and Disposal Of Coal 75](#_Toc504491495)

[Reality: Obama Administration Issued Historic Energy And Fuel Efficiency Standards 75](#_Toc504491496)

[Reality: Obama EPA Announced First Ever Standards To Cut Methane Emissions From Oil And Gas Drilling 76](#_Toc504491497)

[Reality: Obama Created More National Monuments Than Any President 77](#_Toc504491498)

[Reality: Inspector General Said Agency Acted Responsibly In Gold King Mine 77](#_Toc504491499)

[Rhetoric: Previous administration left us with 120 million people in areas with poor air quality 77](#_Toc504491500)

[Reality: Pruitt Has Taken Multiple Actions To Slow Improvements On Air Quality 77](#_Toc504491501)

[Rhetoric: Upgrade Water Infrastructure And Promote Clean Water 78](#_Toc504491502)

[Reality: Pruitt Has Taken Action To Slow Improvements On Clean Water 78](#_Toc504491503)

# Regulatory Process

## 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)]

## Rhetoric: Special Interest Groups Use Sue And Settle To Circumvent Regulatory Process

Pruitt: “We will no longer go behind closed doors and use consent decrees and settlement agreements to resolve lawsuits filed against the Agency by special interest groups where doing so would circumvent the regulatory process set forth by Congress. Additionally, gone are the days of routinely paying tens of thousands of dollars in attorney’s fees to these groups with which we swiftly settle.” [EPA, Press Release, [10/16/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/administrator-pruitt-issues-directive-end-epa-sue-settle)]

### Reality: Sue And Settle Is Appropriate, Both As A Legal Question And A Regulatory Tool

**Harvard Environmental Law Review: “Sue And Settle Is Appropriate, Both As A Legal Question And A Regulatory Tool.”** According to the Harvard Environmental Law Review, “The article explains that ‘sue and settle’ is appropriate, both as a legal question and a regulatory tool.” [Harvard Environmental Law Review, [5/6/15](http://harvardelr.com/2015/05/06/the-logic-of-sue-and-settle/)]

**Study Objectively Assessed That “Environmental Settlements Rarely Circumvent Norms Of Administrative Law.”** According to the Harvard Environmental Law Review, “This Article is the first to objectively assess those concerns, and it reveals that environmental settlements rarely circumvent norms of administrative law, and that when they do so, courts can—and do—intervene.” [Harvard Environmental Law Review, April [2015](http://harvardelr.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/McVean-and-Pidot.pdf)]

**HELR: “Judiciary Is Both Willing And Able To Refuse Settlements Or Consent Decrees That Require Agencies To Act Improperly.”** According to the Harvard Environmental Law Review, “Through a series of case studies, McVean and Pidot show that, while settlements may require an agency to allocate resources within their budget, take additional procedural steps, or even take action on a regulation by a certain deadline, these settlements remain within the bounds of agency discretion. Furthermore, the authors argue, the judiciary is both willing and able to refuse settlements or consent decrees that require agencies to act improperly.” [Harvard Environmental Law Review, [5/6/15](http://harvardelr.com/2015/05/06/the-logic-of-sue-and-settle/)]

**HELR: “Although It Might Seem Like A Constraint On Agency Discretion, A Binding Agreement To Take Steps Toward Regulation Could Actually Serve As A Shield Against Political Pressure To Delay Regulatory Action.”** According to the Harvard Environmental Law Review, “A third reason to pursue settlements is likely unique to agency suits: a desire to tie the hands of the agency. In addition to the substantial requirements that stem from the Administrative Procedure Act, agencies face vicious political and public-opinion battles in what has been called the ‘blood sport’ of contemporary regulatory politics. So, although it might seem like a constraint on agency discretion, a binding agreement to take steps toward regulation could actually serve as a shield against political pressure to delay regulatory action.” [Harvard Environmental Law Review, [5/6/15](http://harvardelr.com/2015/05/06/the-logic-of-sue-and-settle/)]

**Harvard Environmental Law Review: “Settlements Are Not Just Acceptable Under Administrative Law, They Might Even Be Preferable In Some Circumstances.”** According to the Harvard Environmental Law Review, “Seen in this light, settlements are not just acceptable under administrative law, they might even be preferable in some circumstances. A recent example is a consent decree between EPA and a group of environmental organizations requiring the agency to “tak[e] final action” on proposed coal-ash regulations. EPA had attempted to formulate new regulations after a high-profile 2008 spill, but, even though the agency had resolved to issue a proposal by the end of 2009, it failed to do so due in part to industry pressure. National politics around the 2012 election led to further delay, and the regulation remained stalled until Earthjustice mounted a legal challenge to EPA’s inaction, resulting in a settlement under which EPA agreed to adopt new rules. As a result, EPA promulgated a promising (though perhaps not perfect) rule to regulate coal ash at the end of 2014.” [Harvard Environmental Law Review, [5/6/15](http://harvardelr.com/2015/05/06/the-logic-of-sue-and-settle/)]

**HELR: Complaints That Sue And Settle Enable Agencies To Violate Administrative Law Are Mistaken**. According to the Harvard Environmental Law Review, “A primary complaint about environmental settlements is that they enable agencies to skirt or violate the constraints of administrative law. As this Article demonstrates, these complaints are mistaken.” [Harvard Environmental Law Review, April [2015](http://harvardelr.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/McVean-and-Pidot.pdf)]

**HELR: Sue And Settle Debate Is “War Of Words Relying On Emotionally Charged Rhetoric To Score Political Points.”** According to the Harvard Environmental Law Review, “Environmental settlements fully conform to administrative law principles, and existing legal safeguards properly preclude collusion. This analysis reveals the current ‘sue-and-settle’ debate for what it is: a war of words relying on emotionally charged rhetoric to score political points.” [Harvard Environmental Law Review, April [2015](http://harvardelr.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/McVean-and-Pidot.pdf)]

**HELR: “Environmental Settlements Provide Federal Agencies With An Important Tool To Strategically Control Litigation Risk.”** According to the Harvard Environmental Law Review, “Environmental settlements provide federal agencies with an important tool to strategically control litigation risk. Settlements also serve as a vehicle for agencies to facilitate and motivate their own decision making processes and overcome regulatory ossification. Environmental settlements will inevitably anger a president’s opponents, but that alone is not a reason to curtail the discretion of federal agencies.” [Harvard Environmental Law Review, April [2015](http://harvardelr.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/McVean-and-Pidot.pdf)]

**HELR Found Settlements Had “Distinct Advantages” To Overcome Litigation Risk And Bureaucratic Inertia.** According to the Harvard Environmental Law Review, “Environmental settlements have distinct advantages because they provide federal agencies with the opportunity to control litigation risk and overcome bureaucratic inertia. In the absence of a compelling justification for limiting the discretion of agencies to enter into settlements, Congress and the public should allow environmental settlement practices to persist.” [Harvard Environmental Law Review, April [2015](http://harvardelr.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/McVean-and-Pidot.pdf)]

# 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: MIT Updated Studies After Trump Administration Used Data

**PRUITT**: “Look, it’s very fishy to me that MIT updated their study or their results after we started citing it. No one is questioning their methodology. Nobody’s questioning their findings.” [Fox News Sunday, [6/4/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/06/04/pruitt-defends-decision-to-withdraw-from-paris-climate-deal-al-gore-weighs-in.html)]

### MIT Study Was Updated in 2016

**Updated MIT Study Found Current Climate Pledges Would Result In Global Temperatures Rising Nearly A Degree**. According to the New York Times, “In an updated 2016 analysis, they found that current climate pledges would result in global average temperatures rising between 2.7 and 3.6 degrees by the end of the century, compared with between 3.3 and 4.7 degrees if no action were taken, a difference of nearly a degree. And the aim of the Paris agreement was to improve those pledges over time.” [New York Times, 6/1/17]

**Initial MIT Study Released Prior To Paris Announcement**. According to MIT News, “This December’s international climate negotiations in Paris are expected to yield reductions in manmade greenhouse gas emissions, but unless deeper cuts follow, the global temperature is likely to rise 3.1-5.2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels by 2100, according to a report released this week by the MIT Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change. The projected temperature increase far exceeds the 2 C threshold identified by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change as necessary to avoid the most serious impacts of climate change, from rising sea levels to more severe precipitation patterns to increased wildfires.” [MIT News, [10/22/15](http://news.mit.edu/2015/paris-commitments-insufficient-to-stabilize-climate-by-2100-1022)]

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

**PRUITT**: “What we do know -- what we do know, objectively, is that the Paris agreement represented a $2.5 trillion reduction in our gross domestic product over two years -- ten years. What we do know is that it impacted up to 400,000 jobs as well. And so this was something that was bad for our country. This makes common sense, that when you take energy sector jobs and say we're no longer going to produce energy in those sectors, that it's going to impact the manufacturing base and the energy jobs in this country.”

### Pruitt Cited Industry Backed Heritage Foundation Study

**Heritage Study Cited By Pruitt 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)]

## Rhetoric: Paris Does Not Achieve “Good Environmental Outcomes”

**REPORTER**: “I would like to go back to the first question that was asked and you didn't answer. Does the president believe today that climate change is a hoax? That's something he said in the campaign. He refused to answer that. So I'm wondering if you can answer that.”

**PRUITT**: “I did answer the question. The discussions the president and I have had have been focused on is Paris good or bad for this country? We focused our attention there. He determined it was bad for this country. It hurt us economically. It didn't achieve good environmental outcomes and he rejected the Paris deal.” [Pruitt Press Briefing, [6/2/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/02/daily-press-briefing-press-secretary-sean-spicer-and-epa-administrator)]

### Goal of Paris Agreement To Slow Warming Temperatures By Two Degrees Celsius

**Paris Agreement Targeted Two Degree Warming**. 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.” [United Nations, Paris Agreement, accessed [6/5/17](http://unfccc.int/paris_agreement/items/9485.php)]

**Results Of 2 Degree Celsius Warming Would Be “Catastrophic.”** According to CBS News, “As the United Nations conference on climate change gets underway Monday in Paris, one temperature that will be on everyone's minds is 2 degrees Celsius (or 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit). Although it might not sound like a big number, climatologists predict that if the planet warms a total of 2 degrees more than its average temperature before the Industrial Revolution -- when humans started burning fossil fuels -- the results could be catastrophic.” [CBS News, [11/30/15](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/paris-un-climate-talks-why-2-degrees-are-so-important/)]

**2 Degree Warming Is Threshold Before Experiencing The Most Destructive And Dangerous Effects Of Climate Change.** According to PBS, “Over many decades, scientists have been asked: How much warming can humanity tolerate, before experiencing the most destructive and dangerous effects of climate change? This is where the threshold of two degrees Celsius, or about 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit, came about.” [PBS, [12/2/15](http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/why-2-degrees-celsius-is-climate-changes-magic-number/)]

### Paris Commitments Would Cover 97 Percent of Greenhouse Gas Emissions

**Paris Commitments Cover 97 Percent Of Global Greenhouse Emissions**. According to the NRDC, “The commitments cover emissions from 190 countries—97 percent of global greenhouse emissions. The agreement secures, for the first time, commitments from all key emitters—including China, India, Mexico, Europe, Japan, and the US—to reduce their emissions. And since our action helps to spur others to act, we can’t protect Americans from the damages of climate change unless we act at home and help secure action from other countries.” [NRDC, [1/31/17](https://www.nrdc.org/experts/han-chen/why-paris-agreement-good-united-states)]

**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: China and India Are Not Required to Take Action Until 2030

**PRUITT**: “Why did China and India not have to take any steps until 2030? Why did India condition their CO2 reductions upon receiving $2.5 trillion of aid in the agreement? We were going to take steps, front loading our costs while the rest of the world waited to reduce their CO2 footprint. That's the reason it put us at a very much an economic disadvantage internationally.” [Meet the Press, [6/4/17](http://www.nbcnews.com/meet-the-press/meet-press-june-4-2017-n768046)]

### Reality: China And India Have Taken Steps To Reduce Emissions

**China Cut Use Of Coal For Past Three Years**. According to PolitiFact, “Between the effects of an economic slowdown and an effort to move toward less-polluting sources, China has cut its use of coal three years in a row.” [PolitiFact, [6/1/17](http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/article/2017/jun/01/fact-checking-donald-trumps-statement-withdrawing-/)]

**PolitiFact: “China Has Promised That By 2030, It Would Reduce The Carbon Intensity Of Its Economy By 60–65 Percent Below 2005.”** According to PolitiFact, “China has promised that by 2030, it would reduce the carbon intensity of its economy by 60–65 percent below 2005 levels, and increase the share of non-fossil energy to around 20 percent.” [PolitiFact, [6/1/17](http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/article/2017/jun/01/fact-checking-donald-trumps-statement-withdrawing-/)]

**PolitiFact: “India Also Committed To Reduce Emissions 33 To 35 Percent of 2005 Levels By 2030.”** According to PolitiFact, “India, in ratifying the agreement on October 2, 2016, said it would follow a path of low carbon commitment in tandem with its national laws and development agenda, including eradication of poverty. India also committed to reduce emissions 33 to 35 percent of 2005 levels by 2030. What it effectively means is that the agreement allows the nations who signed the Paris Agreement to set their own reduction targets to help achieve the overall target of reducing the rise in global warming below 2 degree Celsius.” [PolitiFact, [6/1/17](http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/article/2017/jun/01/fact-checking-donald-trumps-statement-withdrawing-/)]

## Rhetoric: We Don’t Need Paris Because Our CO2 Reductions Are At Pre-1994 Levels

**PRUITT**: “The president indicated very clearly that engagement by this country, internationally, is going to continue. As you know, George, we are part of the UNFCCC. That's a treaty that was ratified in the early 1990s. We have shown leadership, actually substantial leadership, as a country with respect to our CO2 reductions. We're at pre-1994 levels today with respect to our CO2 reductions. In fact, we were there before the Paris Accord was ever executed by this country. And when you look at the years from 2000 and 2014, we reduced CO2 emissions by over 18 percent.” [This Week, [6/4/17](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/week-transcript-17-scott-pruitt-al-gore-susan/story?id=47811251)]

### Reality: US Reducing Dependence On Fossil Fuels Due To Market Conditions

**USA Today: “Businesses Are Moving Away From Fossil Fuels Due To Market Conditions, Further Contributing To Increased Use Of Cleaner Energy Sources.”** According to USA Today, “And Wall Street fund managers and large businesses are moving away from fossil fuels due to market conditions, further contributing to increased use of cleaner energy sources. Since 2010, more than 250 coal-fired power plants have closed in the U.S. On Wednesday, Exxon Mobil shareholders voted – against the board’s recommendation – to require the company publicly report on the risks to its business posed by climate change. [USA Today, [6/1/17](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2017/06/01/us-reducing-dependence-fossil-fuels-even-without-paris-agreement/102392668/)]

### Reality: Drop In CO2 Levels Due To Increase In Natural Gas and Efficiency Gains

**Drop In CO2 Levels Due To Efficiency Gains, An Unusually Warm Winter And A Switch From Coal To Natural Gas.** According to USA Today, “Driven by efficiency gains, an unusually warm winter and a switch from coal to natural gas, energy-related carbon dioxide emissions actually declined 3.8% in 2012 even though the U.S. economy grew 2.8% that year, according to new data by the U.S. Energy Information Administration, the statistical arm of the Department of Energy.” [USA Today, [10/21/13](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/10/21/us-carbon-emissions-energy-lowest-1994/3146123/)]

**Increase Use Of Renewables Helped Drop CO2 Levels**. According to USA Today, “It also attributed the emissions decline to a greater substitution in power generation from coal to natural gas, which emits much less carbon dioxide, and greater use of renewable energy such as solar and wind.” [USA Today, [10/21/13](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/10/21/us-carbon-emissions-energy-lowest-1994/3146123/)]

**Innovation In Natural Gas Contributed To Drop In CO2 Emissions**. According to ThinkProgress, “Yes, U.S. CO2 emissions are at pre-1994 levels. But that fact does not answer the question about Trump’s die-hard climate science denial and opposition to action. And while innovation in the natural gas sector certainly contributed to the drop in U.S. CO2 emissions, innovation and technology in the coal sector did not — unless shutting down coal plants counts as ‘innovation.’” [ThinkProgress, [3/27/15](https://thinkprogress.org/four-and-a-half-false-statements-epa-head-scott-pruitt-made-in-just-one-interview-52be38cad2f2)]

## Rhetoric: We Were Never Going to Make the Target In Paris Agreement

**PRUITT:** “The 26 to 28% reduction in the agreement-- the former administration, all the rules that they enacted, every rule as part of their climate action agenda still fell 40% short of those targets. And you say they could have been reduced.” [Meet the Press, [6/4/17](http://www.nbcnews.com/meet-the-press/meet-press-june-4-2017-n768046)]

### Reality: Targets Set By Paris Were Flexible

**Paris Deal Gave Countries Flexibility And No Penalties To Adjust Emission Targets**. According to the Washington Post, “‘Paris already gives countries tremendous flexibility, and no penalties,’ said Michael Gerrard, a professor of environmental law at Columbia and director of the Sabin Center for Climate Change Law. ‘Trump obviously didn’t read the Paris agreement, and his statement was written by people who willfully misrepresented its contents -- his staff or their lobbyist friends.’” [Washington Post, [6/2/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/the-energy-202/2017/06/02/the-energy-202-trump-s-paris-speech-needs-a-serious-fact-check/59302a21e9b69b2fb981dc14/?utm_term=.ed4b43074b75)]

**US Was A Third Of The Way To 2025 Targets.** According to Inside Climate News, “Under President Barack Obama, the United States pledged to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 26-28 percent from 2005 levels by 2025. That means emissions must be cut about 1.7 billion metric tons, according to figures from the Environmental Protection Agency's latest greenhouse gas inventory. The nation is a third of the way to that target, but the rest was to be achieved via an array of regulations, especially the Clean Power Plan, that are now targeted for elimination by President Donald Trump. Not only was the goal dependent on those rules, it would have also required even more rigorous policies from Obama's successor because reductions from those rules would not have been enough, numerous studies have found.” [Inside Climate News, [3/20/17](https://insideclimatenews.org/news/20032017/paris-climate-agreement-donald-trump-global-warming-clean-power-plan)]

### Reality: Trump Repealed Measures Aimed At Reducing Emissions

**Rules Rolled Back By Trump Administration Would Have Helped US Reduce Emissions.** According to Inside Climate News, “InsideClimate News compiled a chart showing exactly how far the United States still has to go to meet its Paris pledge. We discovered that the U.S. has already achieved an emissions reduction of 572 million metric tons, a third of the Paris target. That was largely the result of coal being driven out of the market under competitive pressure from natural gas and renewables, greater efficiency throughout the economy and a broad range of regulations. Most of the remaining two-thirds counted on the Clean Power Plan and other Obama-era rules. Even if those were implemented, the chart shows, the U.S would still fall 17 percent short of meeting its Paris pledge.” [Inside Climate News, [3/20/17](https://insideclimatenews.org/news/20032017/paris-climate-agreement-donald-trump-global-warming-clean-power-plan)]

## RhetorIc: Small Business “Euphoria” over Trump’S Decision On Paris

**Pruitt:** “Even The New York Times had an article I think within the last couple of days that talked about small business celebrating, euphoria, with respect to the Paris -- the president's decision.” [This Week, [6/4/17](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/week-transcript-17-scott-pruitt-al-gore-susan/story?id=47811251)]

### Reality: Small And Large Business Urged Trump To Keep Paris Agreement In Place

**Hundreds Of Small Businesses Signed Statement In Support Of Paris Agreement.** According to a press release, “We, the undersigned mayors, governors, college and university leaders, and businesses are joining forces for the first time to declare that we will continue to support climate action to meet the Paris Agreement… Signatories number over 1,000 and include some of the most populous states and cities in the U.S., including California and cities like New York, Los Angeles, and Houston as well as smaller cities like Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Dubuque, Iowa. A mixture of private universities, state schools and community colleges, both small and large, have added their institutions to the statement. More than a dozen fortune 500 companies in addition to hundreds of small businesses have also signed the statement.” [We are Still In, press release, [6/5/17](http://www.wearestillin.com/)]

**Corporate America Urged Trump To Keep Paris Agreement**. According to CBS News, “Corporate America overwhelmingly, if fruitlessly, urged President Donald Trump to keep the U.S. in the Paris climate agreement. Why? Support for fighting climate change is in their own self-interest Likely reasons for business’ backing of the accord range from its public relations impact to the 195-nation pact’s value in aiding particular business strategies, such as the energy supermajors’ natural gas operations. ‘If you were a large corporation, the herd instinct told you how to chime in’ on backing the international accord, said Bill McKibben, a Middlebury College professor and environmental advocate.” [CBS News, [6/2/17](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/paris-climate-agreement-us-corporate-support/)]

## Rhetoric: Administration Had Clear Position on Climate Change

**WALLACE:** “Let me get this straight, you and the president spent weeks discussing whether he should pull out of the Paris climate deal and you never discussed climate change?”

**PRUITT:** “It was about the merits and demerits of the deal, Chris.” [Fox News Sunday, [6/4/17](http://www.foxnews.com/transcript/2017/06/04/pruitt-defends-decision-to-withdraw-from-paris-climate-deal-al-gore-weighs-in.html)]

### Reality: Climate Change Wasn’t Discussed When Deciding Paris

**Pruitt Said Climate Change Never Came Up As He Talked With The President About Withdrawing From The Paris Agreement**. According to the Washington Post, “Pruitt said Friday that climate change never came up as he talked with the president about withdrawing from the Paris agreement. ‘All the discussions that we had through the last several weeks have been focused on one singular issue: Is Paris good or not for this country?’ he told reporters, refusing to say whether Trump remains skeptical of global warming.” [Washington Post, [6/2/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/scott-pruitt-outspoken-and-forceful-moves-to-the-center-of-power-within-the-trump-administration/2017/06/02/a1b4d298-46fa-11e7-a196-a1bb629f64cb_story.html?utm_term=.ef36f4a03369)]

**Pruitt Dodged Questions On Climate Role In Paris Decision**. According to Business Insider, “After Pruitt repeatedly dodged host Willie Geist’s question about whether he discussed climate change with the president before pulling out of the Paris Climate Accord last week, host Joe Scarborough jumped in. ‘It’s a simple question Mr. Pruitt, it’s a simple question: Have you ever talked to the president about whether he believes climate change is real?’ Scarborough asked. ‘Does he still believe it was a hoax launched in China? Wouldn’t you like to know?’ Pruitt argued the Paris accord, an agreement dedicated to reducing carbon emissions that fuel climate change, would damage the economy, a claim some economists have disputed.” [Business Insider, [6/6/17](http://www.businessinsider.com/joe-scarborough-epa-administrator-scott-pruitt-trump-climate-change-position-2017-6)]

### Reality: EPA Administrator And White House Spokesman Did Not Know Trump Position

**Pruitt Dodged Questions On Trump Climate Change Beliefs**. According to Politico, “Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt again dodged on Sunday when asked whether President Donald Trump believes that climate change is man-made and accused people asking about his position on the issue of trying to create a distraction from the debate around the Paris climate agreement. Although Pruitt said in an interview with George Stephanopoulos on ABC’s ‘This Week’ that Trump has indicated that ‘the climate changes,’ he repeatedly avoided answering whether the president believes the scientific consensus that global temperatures are warming due to human activity, namely carbon emissions.” [Politico, [6/4/17](http://www.politico.com/story/2017/06/04/pruitt-dodges-another-question-on-trump-climate-change-beliefs-239110?jumpEdition=)]

**EPA Administrator And White House Spokesman Could Not Say If Trump Believed Climate Change Was A Hoax**. According to the Washington Post, “Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt was asked the same question over and over and over again during a Friday briefing with reporters: Does President Trump still believe global warming is a hoax? And each time, Pruitt refused to answer with a ‘yes’ or a ‘no,’ telling reporters that as he and the president discussed exiting the Paris climate deal, the topic of climate change never came up. ‘All the discussions that we had through the last several weeks have been focused on one singular issue: Is Paris good or not for this country?’ Pruitt said when asked the question a first time. ‘That’s the discussions I’ve had with the president. So, that’s been my focus.’” [Washington Post, [6/2/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2017/06/02/trump-aides-creatively-dance-around-this-simple-question-does-the-president-believe-climate-change-exists/?utm_term=.89c237e1108a)]

* **At Paris Press Briefing Scott Pruitt Did Not Answer If President Still Thought Climate Change Was A Hoax**. According to a transcript of the White House Press Briefing, “QUESTION: Sir, I’d like to go back to the first question that was asked, that you didn’t answer. Does the president believe, today, that climate change is a hoax? That’s something, of course, he said in the campaign. When the pool (ph) was up in the Oval Office with him a couple days ago, he refused to answer. So I’m wondering if you can speak for him. PRUITT: You know, I did answer the question, because I said the discussions the president and I have had over the last several weeks have been focused on one key issue: Is Paris good or bad for this country? The president and I focused our attentions there. He determined that it was bad for this country. It hurt us economically. It didn’t achieve good environmental outcomes, and he made the decision to reject the Paris deal.” [White House Press Briefing, 6/2/17]
* **Press Secretary Sean Spicer Did Not Know If Trump Still Believed Climate Change Was A Hoax; He “Had Not Had An Opportunity To Have That Discussion.”** According to a transcript of the White House Press Briefing, “QUESTION: Thank you, Sean. You were asked earlier this week about the president’s personal views on climate change, about whether or not (inaudible). You said you hadn’t had a chance to have that conversation with him. Now it’s been you know 48 to 72 hours. What does the president actually believe about climate change? Does he still believe it’s a hoax? Can you clarify that? Because apparently nobody else at the White House can. SPICER: I have not had an opportunity to have that discussion.” [White House Press Briefing, 6/2/17]

### Reality: Cohn And Conway Would Not Say If Trump Believed In Climate Change

**Economic Advisor Gary Cohn And Kellyanne Conway Dodged Question If Trump Believed In Climate Change**. According to the Washington Post, “Gary Cohn, Trump’s chief economic adviser, repeatedly dodged the question in a CNN interview on Thursday evening. So did Kellyanne Conway, a counselor to the president, on ABC News’s ‘Good Morning America’ on Friday morning. ‘The president believes in a clean environment, clean air, clean water. He has received awards as a businessman, in that regard,’ Conway said. (The Washington Post’s fact-checkers have yet to find any evidence of those awards.)” [Washington Post, [6/2/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2017/06/02/trump-aides-creatively-dance-around-this-simple-question-does-the-president-believe-climate-change-exists/?utm_term=.89c237e1108a)]

* **Conway: “You Need To Ask Him That, And I Hope That You Have Your Chance.”** According to the Washington Post, “When ABC’s George Stephanopoulos pressed Conway to answer the question, she responded, ‘You need to ask him that, and I hope that you have your chance.’ As Trump announced in the White House Rose Garden on Thursday afternoon that the United States would exit the Paris deal, he and members of his administration pitched the decision as an economic one and did not dwell on the environmental implications.” [Washington Post, [6/2/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2017/06/02/trump-aides-creatively-dance-around-this-simple-question-does-the-president-believe-climate-change-exists/?utm_term=.89c237e1108a)]
* **Cohn: “You Are Going To Have To Ask Him. You Are Going To Have To Actually Ask Him.”** According to CNN, “And Gary Cohn, Trump’s top economic adviser, deflected when asked the same question by CNN on Thursday. ‘I am answering what the President is committed to,’ he said, later adding, ‘You are going to have to ask him. You are going to have to actually ask him.’” [CNN, [6/2/17](http://www.cnn.com/2017/06/02/politics/donald-trump-climate-change-belief/index.html)]

### Reality: White House Officials Did Not Know Trump Position On Climate Change

**White House Officials Who Briefed Press On Paris Did Not Know Where The President Stood On Climate Change**. According to the Washington Post, “After the president’s speech, the White House arranged a briefing for reporters with two officials but insisted that neither be named in reports...Another reporter asked the unnamed duo if the president believes that human activity contributes to climate change... Asked a third time, the official said: ‘Whether he — you know, I have not talked to the president about his personal views on whether … I was not with the president on his trip. I have not talked to the president about his personal views on what is contributing to climate change. That’s not the point.” [Washington Post, [6/2/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2017/06/02/trump-aides-creatively-dance-around-this-simple-question-does-the-president-believe-climate-change-exists/?utm_term=.89c237e1108a)]

## Rhetoric: US Will Push for A Better Deal on Paris

**Pruitt**: “Our message there was that the United States is going to be focused on growth and protecting the environment. It was received well [at G-7 Environmental conference].” [CNN, [6/12/17](http://www.cnn.com/2017/06/12/politics/epa-scott-pruitt-leaves-environmental-summit-early/index.html)]

**White House Deputy Press Secretary**: “As the President has made abundantly clear, the United States is withdrawing unless we can re-enter on terms that are more favorable to our country” [The Hill, [9/16/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/351028-trump-softens-stance-on-paris-climate-deal-reports)]

### Reality: Pruitt Missed “First Opportunity to Push for A Better Deal”

**Pruitt Left G-7 Environmental Meeting Early**. According to CNN, “The Trump administration’s top environment official left a meeting with international counterparts early, boarding a plane home to tell President Donald Trump the US position was ‘received well.’ ‘I actually arrived back this morning at 1 o’clock from Italy, the G7 focused on the environment,’ Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt said at Monday’s Cabinet meeting.” [CNN, [6/12/17](http://www.cnn.com/2017/06/12/politics/epa-scott-pruitt-leaves-environmental-summit-early/index.html)]

**Washington Post: “Trump Administration Largely Punted On Its First Opportunity To Push For A Better Deal For The United States.”** According to the Washington Post, “But over the weekend, the Trump administration largely punted on its first opportunity to push for a better deal for the United States, providing fodder for critics who say the offer from a president who once called climate change a ‘hoax’ was never sincere in the first place.” [Washington Post, [6/12/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/the-energy-202/2017/06/12/the-energy-202-pruitt-punts-on-climate-talks/593dcdf1e9b69b2fb981dcd5/?utm_term=.cd8d296a255d)]

**Pruitt Only Attended ‘A Few Hours’ Of The Two Day Summit**. According to the Washington Post, “According to the Associated Press, Pruitt attended only the first few hours of the two-day summit. Pruitt's acting assistant administrator, Jane Nishida, stayed in his place.” [Washington Post, [6/12/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/the-energy-202/2017/06/12/the-energy-202-pruitt-punts-on-climate-talks/593dcdf1e9b69b2fb981dcd5/?utm_term=.cd8d296a255d)]

### Reality: US Cannot Renegotiate Paris Accord

**Italian, French, And German Leaders: “We Firmly Believe That The Paris Agreement Cannot Be Renegotiated.”** According to USA Today, “When Trump announced his pullout, European leaders quickly responded that the accord was ‘irreversible’ and not open to re-negotiation. ‘We firmly believe that the Paris Agreement cannot be renegotiated, since it is a vital instrument for our planet, societies and economies,’ said a joint statement by Italian Prime Minister Paolo Gentiloni, German Chancellor Angela Merkel and French President Emmanuel Macron.” [USA Today, [9/16/17](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2017/09/16/reports-trump-administration-may-not-pull-out-paris-climate-agreement/673988001/)]

# Public Health (Climate Change)

## 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)]

# 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

**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/)]

**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)]

**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: We Must Stop Bleeding Jobs And Start Growing The Economy

**Pruitt**: “George, the President is keeping his promise to the American people this week with respect to the Executive Order coming down on Tuesday--. the Energy Independence Executive Order. We need a pro-growth and pro-environment approach for how we do regulations in this country. For too long, we have accepted a narrative that if you're pro-growth, pro-jobs, you're anti-environment. That's not where we have been as a country. We have made tremendous progress on our environment, we can be both pro-jobs and pro-environment. The Executive Order will address the past administration's effort to kill jobs throughout the country through the Clean Power Plan.” [ABC This Week, [3/26/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-administrator-pruitt-previews-president-trumps-executive-order-energy-independence)]

### Reality: EPA Has Cut Emissions While Growing Economy

**USA Today: EPA Report Showed Economic Growth, Environmental Rules Can Co-Exist**. According to USA Today, “The Trump administration’s argument that ‘job-killing’ environmental regulations are stifling U.S. economic growth is being undercut by … the Trump administration. A new report from the Environmental Protection Agency found that since Congress passed the Clean Air Act in 1970, the economy has more than tripled and the number of vehicle miles traveled every year has nearly doubled — all while the nation’s population and annual energy consumption has surged. At the same time, the levels of six key air pollutants — carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter and sulfur dioxide — have declined dramatically.” [USA Today, [8/8/17](file:///\\beehive-dc-1\shared\Climate%20Action%20Campaign\Sent%20to%20Client\EPA%20report%20shows%20economic%20growth,%20environmental%20rules%20can%20co-exist)]

**Aggregate Emissions Dropped 68 Percent While GDP Grew 88 Percent Since Clean Air Act Was Introduced**. According to the EPA, “Between 1970 and 2011, aggregate emissions of common air pollutants dropped 68 percent, while the U.S. gross domestic product grew 212 percent.6  Total private sector jobs increased by 88 percent during the same period.” [EPA, accessed [3/27/17](https://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview/clean-air-act-and-economy)]

### Reality: EPA Has Cut Emissions While Growing Economy

**Aggregate Emissions Dropped 68 Percent While GDP Grew 88 Percent Since Clean Air Act Was Introduced**. According to the EPA, “Between 1970 and 2011, aggregate emissions of common air pollutants dropped 68 percent, while the U.S. gross domestic product grew 212 percent.6  Total private sector jobs increased by 88 percent during the same period.” [EPA, accessed [3/27/17](https://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview/clean-air-act-and-economy)]

### 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: 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)]

### Reality: Pruitt Misled With Coal Job Numbers

**Washington Post: “Even If He Had Gotten It Right, It Still Would Have Been Deeply Misleading.”** According to the Washington Post, “But according to an EPA spokeswoman, Pruitt bungled the line on one show and did not accurately express it on other shows. (He kept saying “since the fourth quarter,” which sounds like the end of the year, when she said he meant to say since October.) But even if he had gotten it right, it still would have been deeply misleading.” [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 Fact Checker: “Clear That Pruitt Completely Flubbed His Talking Point On One TV Program. But He Still Uttered Misleading Spin On Other News Programs.”** According to the Washington Post, “We don’t try to play gotcha, and it’s clear that Pruitt completely flubbed his talking point on one TV program. But he still uttered misleading spin on other news programs, trying to take advantage of the BLS job labels to suggest that there has been a huge gain in coal/mining jobs, in part by reaching back months before Trump came to the White House. The data is not made up out of whole cloth, but the claim is so tortured that it screams.” [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 Fact Checker: Pruitt And Others Have Little Credibility When They “Try To Manipulate Government Statistics In Service Of A Dubious Talking Point.”** According to the Washington Post, “Administration officials such as Pruitt need to learn they increasingly have little credibility when they try to manipulate government statistics in service of a dubious talking point. Pruitt earns four Pinocchios.” [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)]

**AP Fact Check: Pruitt Blew Smoke Over Coal Jobs And Climate.**According to Associated Press, “PRUITT, pushing back on whether the president is overstating his ability to bring back long lost coal-mining jobs, credited Trump with creating almost 50,000 jobs ‘in the coal sector’ since the fourth quarter of last year. ‘In the month of May alone, almost 7,000 jobs,’ Pruitt told NBC’s ‘Meet the Press.’ THE FACTS: He’s wildly off base. Instead of adding almost 50,000 jobs in the last few months, coal mining accounted for a total of only 51,000 jobs nationally at the end of May. That’s only up about 400 jobs from the prior month, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics. Asked about Pruitt’s claim of 50,000 new coal jobs, his staff on Monday pointed to statistics encompassing seven months of job gains across the far broader ‘mining’ sector. That includes not just coal but also oil and gas extraction, metal ore mining, stone quarrying and other unrelated jobs. Three of the months Pruitt’s staff is counting were while Barack Obama was still president.” [Associated Press, [6/5/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/ap-fact-check-pruitt-blows-smoke-over-coal-jobs-and-climate/2017/06/05/fda42f20-4a3a-11e7-987c-42ab5745db2e_story.html?utm_term=.ba03fa7d39ea)]

### Reality: Pruitt Exaggerated Number of US Coal Jobs

**Claims On Coal Jobs Is “Not True.”** According to CNN, “The most bullish jobs claim comes from Stephen Moore, an economic adviser to Trump during the campaign, who now works as a contributor for CNN. He has said repeatedly that there have been 43,000 mining jobs added since Trump was elected president. But that’s not true. While it is true is that the Labor Department figures show that 43,000 jobs have been added to ‘mining’ jobs category since the final October jobs report just before the election, that category includes employment in oil and gas extraction, as well as traditional mining jobs.” [CNN, [6/1/17](http://money.cnn.com/2017/05/31/news/economy/trump-coal-jobs/index.html)]

**ThinkProgress: “No Data Exists From Government Or Industry Sources To Back Up The Claim That The Industry Has Seen Such A Dramatic Surge In Coal Mining Jobs.”** According to ThinkProgress, “The EPA chief’s biggest fib was probably his statement, made on multiple shows on Sunday, that the coal industry has grown by 50,000 job over the last few months. No data exists from government or industry sources to back up the claim that the industry has seen such a dramatic surge in coal mining jobs over this time period. In fact, the average number of coal mining jobs increased by only 586, or about 1.1 percent during the first three months of 2017, according to a report from S&P Global Market Intelligence, citing data from the U.S. Mine Safety and Health Administration.” [ThinkProgress, [6/5/17](https://thinkprogress.org/epa-chief-exaggerates-coal-job-growth-2ab69ed36b6)]

**Washington Post Fact Checker: “Trump Only Became President On Jan. 20, So It’s More Appropriate To Look At What Has Happened Since January. That’s A Gain Of Nearly 33,000.”** According to the Washington Post, “If you go back to October, you end up with a gain of 47,000 jobs. That’s Pruitt’s ‘nearly 50,000.’ (From April to May, there was a gain of 6,600 jobs — that’s Pruitt’s 7,000.) Of course, Trump only became president on Jan. 20, so it’s more appropriate to look at what has happened since January. That’s a gain of nearly 33,000.” [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)]

### Reality: Pruitt Claimed He Misspoke

**EPA Official Said Pruitt Was Referencing Mining Jobs, Not Coal Jobs**. According to SNL Coal, “An EPA official told S&P Global Market Intelligence that Pruitt’s claim on NBC’s ‘Meet the Press’ was referencing the broader mining sector and was quoting statistics from a June 2 jobs report by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, or BLS. The report noted that the entire mining sector added 7,000 jobs in May — not just the coal sector as Pruitt appeared to claim. The BLS report pointed out that total mining employment had risen 47,000 since reaching a low point in October 2016, with the largest gains in employment coming from support activities in mining.” [SNL Coal, 6/5/17]

# National Security

## Rhetoric: Renewable Energy Undermines Grid Reliability

**PRUITT**: I think what's important is that the EPA and US government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. All jobs matter. When you look at the coal sector and our power grid, energy security is a big deal. When you look at the ability to store solid hydrocarbons on site to generate electricity, draw down coal at 30% today, that creates vulnerability. Attacks on infrastructure. [Morning Joe, [6/6/17](http://www.msnbc.com/morning-joe/watch/scott-pruitt-paris-put-us-at-an-economic-disadvantage-961091139518)]

### 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)]

# Cars And Fuel Economy Standards

## Rhetoric: New Review Meant To Ensure Fuel Standards Were Good For Consumers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Standards “Costly For Automakers And The American People”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Rhetoric: Renegotiating Fuel Rules Would Help Auto Workers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Rhetoric: Standards Were Not “Economically Feasible”

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

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

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

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

## Rhetoric: Midterm Review Analysis was Premature and Rushed

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

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

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

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

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

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

# EPA Budget

## Rhetoric: EPA Can Fulfill Its Mission Under the Trump Budget

PRUITT: With respect to the budget and these principles and priorities that I've outlined, I believe that we can fulfill the mission of our agency with a trimmed budget, with proper leadership and management. [House Appropriations Committee Hearing on the EPA Budget, 6/15/17]

Reality: House Budget Chair Called Budget ‘Untenable’

**House Appropriations Chairman Said EPA Budget Was “Untenable.”** At a Congressional budget hearing Congressman Ken Calvert said, “Earlier this morning, I, along with Chairman Frelinghuysen, Ranking Member Lowey, Ms. McCollum and other members of this subcommittee discussed the defense budget at a hearing with Secretary Mattis. That conversation further underscored the need for additional funding to support our troops and overall U.S. readiness. I certainly wholeheartedly support that goal. However, enacting $54 billion in non-defense program cuts in one fiscal year is an untenable proposition.” [House Appropriations Committee Hearing on the EPA Budget, 6/15/17]

Reality: Republican Congressmen Question Pruitt and Budget

**Ohio Representative Joyce Said Government Should Clean Up Great Lakes**. According to the Washington Post, “Rep. David Joyce, a Republican representing an Ohio district on the coast of Lake Erie. What? The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, an EPA program aimed at cleaning up toxins and combating invasive species in the Great Lakes region after years of industrial pollution from Rust Belt factories. ‘Cleaning up the lakes isn’t about correcting mistakes from the past, but creating new opportunities and a brighter future for our shoreline communities,’ Joyce said, adding the government should ‘clean up the Great Lakes and leverage them as an economic asset for the region.’” [Washington Post, [6/16/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/the-energy-202/2017/06/16/the-energy-202-epa-s-budget-finds-unexpected-defenders-in-congress/5942d527e9b69b2fb981dd2f/?utm_term=.89a006e5ed5a)]

**Idaho Representative Defended Office Of Pesticides Programs**. According to the Washington Post, “Rep. Mike Simpson, a Republican from Idaho, famous for its potato farms. What? The Office of Pesticide Programs, which manages the EPA’s pesticide regulations. ‘With a strong Office of Pesticide Programs,’ Simpson said, ‘job creators in my district and other places in the country, such as the potato industry, would not have access to the essential crop protection tools.’” [Washington Post, [6/16/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/the-energy-202/2017/06/16/the-energy-202-epa-s-budget-finds-unexpected-defenders-in-congress/5942d527e9b69b2fb981dd2f/?utm_term=.89a006e5ed5a)]

**New Jersey Representative Supported Superfund Programs.** According to the Washington Post, “Rep. Rodney Frelinghuysen, a Republican from New Jersey, historically a manufacturing hub. What? The EPA’s Superfund program, which is responsible for cleaning up some of the most contaminated waste sites in the United States. He noted the dense concentration of Superfund sites in his state. Indeed, the four New Jersey counties through which Frelinghuysen’s district stretches -- Essex, Morris, Passaic and Sussex -- contain a total of 27, according to the EPA’s website. ‘Ultimately it will be this committee and our Senate counterparts that determine the final outcome,’ Frelinghuysen said of the EPA’s budget.” [Washington Post, [6/16/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/the-energy-202/2017/06/16/the-energy-202-epa-s-budget-finds-unexpected-defenders-in-congress/5942d527e9b69b2fb981dd2f/?utm_term=.89a006e5ed5a)]

### Reality: OMB Director Defended Budget; Says Scott Pruitt Responsible for Job Cuts

**Decision To Cut 3,000 Jobs Is Up To EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt**. According to EE News, “[OMB Director Mike Mulvaney] declined to comment about the accuracy of news reports saying that up to 3,000 EPA jobs could be at risk. That decision is up to Pruitt, who would implement the cuts, Mulvaney said.” [EE News, [3/16/17](http://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/03/16/stories/1060051557)]

**OMB Director Mike Mulvaney: “You Can’t Drain The Swamp And Leave All The People In It. So, I Guess The First Place That Comes To Mind Will Be The Environmental Protection Agency.”** According to an article in the Washington Post, “‘You can’t drain the swamp and leave all the people in it. So, I guess the first place that comes to mind will be the Environmental Protection Agency,’ Mick Mulvaney, director of the White House Office of Management and Budget, told reporters. ‘The president wants a smaller EPA. He thinks they overreach, and the budget reflects that.’” [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)]

**Mulvaney: “You Can Expect Reductions In The EPA That Don’t Line Up With The President’s View On Things Like Global Warming And Alternative Energies.”** According to EE News, “Now his budget turns those words into numbers, said Mick Mulvaney, the White House budget director. ‘You can expect reductions in the EPA that don’t line up with the president’s view on things like global warming and alternative energies,’ Mulvaney told reporters yesterday. ‘You will see a reduction in subsidies, a reduction in participation in those types of programs.’” [EE News, [3/16/17](http://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/03/16/stories/1060051557)]

**Mulvaney: “The Core Functions Of The EPA Can Be Satisfied — Beyond The Core Functions — Can Be Satisfied With This Budget.”** According to EE News, “‘The core functions of the EPA can be satisfied — beyond the core functions — can be satisfied with this budget,’ Mulvaney said.” [EE News, [3/16/17](http://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/03/16/stories/1060051557)]

## Rhetoric: Trump Has Been Fighting To Protect The Environment

**TRUMP:** “My Administration is committed to keeping our air and water clean, to preserving our forests, lakes, and open spaces, and to protecting endangered species.” [Statement, [4/22/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/04/22/statement-president-donald-j-trump-earth-day)]

### Reality: Trump Planned to Cut Programs That Protect Environment

**Trump Executive Order Undid Previous Climate Change Efforts**. According to an article in the New York Times, “President Trump, flanked by company executives and miners, signed a long-promised executive order on Tuesday to nullify President Barack Obama’s climate change efforts and revive the coal industry, effectively ceding American leadership in the international campaign to curb the dangerous heating of the planet. Mr. Trump made clear that the United States had no intention of meeting the commitments that his predecessor had made to curb planet-warming carbon dioxide pollution, turning denials of climate change into national policy.” [New York Times, [3/28/17](mailto:https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/28/climate/trump-executive-order-climate-change.html?_r=0)]

**Trump Signed Executive Order To Review Designation Of National Monuments**. According to the White House, “President Donald J. Trump joined Secretary Ryan Zinke at the Department of the Interior where he gave remarks and signed the Executive Order on the Review of Designations Under the Antiquities Act. The previous administration used a 100-year-old law known as the Antiquities Act to unilaterally put millions of acres of land and water under strict federal control, eliminating the ability of the people who actually live in those states to decide how best to use that land. The Antiquities Act does not give the federal government unlimited power to lock up millions of acres of land and water, and it is time we ended this abusive practice. This executive order will end this egregious abuse of federal power, and give that power back to the states and to the people, where it belongs.” [White House, [4/27/17](mailto:https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2017/04/27/president-trump-signs-executive-order-antiquities-act)]

**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 Executive Order Rolled Back Waters Of The United States Rule.** According to an article in the Washington Post, “President Trump on [February28, 2017] 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.” [Washington Post, [2/28/16](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/02/27/trump-to-direct-rollback-of-obama-era-water-rule-tuesday/?utm_term=.8530d945bae0)]

Reality: EPA Was Targeted by Trump Budget

**EPA Would Sustain The Biggest Cut Of Any Federal Agency In The White House 2018 Budget**. According to Reuters, “President Donald Trump’s administration on Thursday proposed a 31 percent cut to the Environmental Protection Agency’s budget, as the White House seeks to eliminate climate change programs and trim initiatives to protect air and water quality. The EPA would sustain the biggest cut of any federal agency in the White House 2018 budget, as Trump seeks to clear away regulations he claims are hobbling U.S. oil drillers, coal miners and farmers.” [Reuters, [3/16/17](mailto:http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-budget-epa-idUSKBN16N0E1)]

**EPA Major Target After Trump Solicits Policy Advice From Industry**. According to the Washington Post, “Just days after taking office, President Trump invited American manufacturers to recommend ways the government could cut regulations and make it easier for companies to get their projects approved. Industry leaders responded with scores of suggestions that paint the clearest picture yet of the dramatic steps that Trump officials are likely to take in overhauling federal policies, especially those designed to advance environmental protection and safeguard worker rights.” [Washington Post, [4/16/17](mailto:https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/epa-emerges-as-major-target-after-trump-solicits-policy-advice-from-industry/2017/04/16/87a8a55a-205d-11e7-ad74-3a742a6e93a7_story.html?utm_term=.8dfd27982222)]

* **EPA Primary Target In Industry Comments**. According to the Washington Post, “Those clues are embedded in the 168 comments submitted to the government after Trump signed a presidential memorandum Jan. 24 instructing the Commerce Department to figure out how to ease permitting and trim regulations with the aim of boosting domestic manufacturing. The Environmental Protection Agency has emerged as the primary target in these comments, accounting for nearly half, with the Labor Department in second place as the subject of more than one-fifth, according to a Commerce Department analysis.” [Washington Post, [4/16/17](mailto:https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/epa-emerges-as-major-target-after-trump-solicits-policy-advice-from-industry/2017/04/16/87a8a55a-205d-11e7-ad74-3a742a6e93a7_story.html?utm_term=.8dfd27982222)]

## Rhetoric: EPA Budget Prioritizes Superfund Cleanup

PRUITT: “The Superfund program is a vital function of the EPA. Under my administration, Superfund and the EPA' s land and water cleanup efforts will be restored to their rightful place at the center of the agency's core mission.” [Memo to All Staff, [5/22/17](https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-05/documents/prioritizing_the_superfund_program_memo_5-22-2017.pdf)]

**Pruitt Planned To Prioritize Superfund**. According to the Washington Post, “Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Scott Pruitt says he plans to prioritize the agency’s Superfund cleanups, even as the Trump administration seeks deep cuts to the program responsible for restoring the nation’s most polluted sites. In a memo to EPA staffers this week, Pruitt wrote that Superfund cleanup efforts ‘will be restored to their rightful place at the center of the agency’s core mission.’ He made clear that he would be more involved in signing off on remediation efforts around the country, particularly on the largest cleanups, those estimated to cost $50 million or more.” [Washington Post, [5/11/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/05/11/epa-head-says-he-wants-to-prioritize-superfund-cleanups/?utm_term=.4507f972e136)]

### Reality: Trump Budget Would Put “Massive Dent” In Superfund Program

**Trump Budget Would Cut Superfunds By 28.1%**. According to the Environmental Protection Network, “The administration has stated that EPA should focus on its traditional core programs. However, under this Budget those programs would be cut as follows: Hazardous site cleanup (Superfund) – 28.1%. [Environmental Protection Network, June [2017](https://www.politicopro.com/f/?id=0000015c-9ded-d9ca-adfc-9dedff300001)]

**Trump Budget Would Put “Massive Dent” In Superfund Program**. According to the Washington Post, “The Trump administration’s proposed budget would put a massive dent in that funding for fiscal 2018. It would cut the Superfund program by $330 million a year, nearly a third. The EPA’s budget would be slashed 31 percent.” [Washington Post, [5/11/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/05/11/epa-head-says-he-wants-to-prioritize-superfund-cleanups/?utm_term=.4507f972e136)]

**Pruitt: “Superfund Is An Area That Is Absolutely Essential.”** According to the Washington Post, “Pruitt has defended the program even as he and the White House have aggressively sought to role back a slew of other environmental measures put in place by President Barack Obama, particularly those focused on combating climate change and limiting oil and gas drilling on public lands. ‘Superfund is an area that is absolutely essential,’ Pruitt told a gathering of the U.S. Conference of Mayors in March.” [Washington Post, [5/11/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/05/11/epa-head-says-he-wants-to-prioritize-superfund-cleanups/?utm_term=.4507f972e136)]

**Washington Post: “Superfund Program Has Been Considered Successful Overall And Has Been Popular Around The Country Among Lawmakers And Their Constituents.”** According to the Washington Post, “Like the agency’s brownfields program, which offers grants to communities to help clean up and redevelop abandoned industrial sites, the Superfund program has been considered successful overall and has been popular around the country among lawmakers and their constituents.” [Washington Post, [5/11/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/05/11/epa-head-says-he-wants-to-prioritize-superfund-cleanups/?utm_term=.4507f972e136)]

Reality: Trump Budget Would Undermine Superfund Program

**Executive Order Could Undercut EPA Efforts To Make Superfund Cleanups More ‘Resilient’ To The Adverse Effects Of Climate Change**. According to Inside EPA, “President Donald Trump's sweeping executive order repealing former President Barack Obama's climate policies could undercut EPA efforts to make Superfund cleanups more "resilient" to the adverse effects of climate change, a former official and other sources say… [Mathy Stanislaus, who headed EPA's waste office under Obama]believes waste office staff would be hesitant to push climate adaptation given the direction the Trump administration is taking. Staff will not want to be scrutinized for this, he said, noting that adaption work has cut across various waste programs in addition to Superfund, to include programs under the Resource Conservation & Recovery Act (RCRA) and emergency response. [Inside EPA, 6/23/17]

### Reality: Obama EPA Outpaced Pruitt On Superfund Site Decisions

**Pruitt’s EPA Made Fewer Decisions On Superfund Sites Than Obama Administration.** During the first eight months of the Obama administration the EPA made decisions on 54 superfund sites, compared to 37 by the Pruitt/Trump EPA. [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

## Rhetoric: EPA Is Providing Support For Research Into Cleaner Energy

### Reality: Budget Would Cut EPA Office Of Research And Development Budget

**Trump Budget Would Cut EPA Office Of Research And Development Budget “Roughly In Half.”** According to an article in the Washington Post, “[Trump’s budget proposal] would sharply reduce money for the Superfund program and cut the budget for the EPA’s prominent Office of Research and Development roughly in half, to $250 million.” [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)]

## Rhetoric: President’s Energy Policy Will Lead To Responsible And Sustainable Energy Solutions

**TRUMP:** “Our country is blessed with extraordinary energy abundance, which we didn’t know of, even five years ago and certainly ten years ago.  We have nearly 100 years’ worth of natural gas and more than 250 years’ worth of clean, beautiful coal.  We are a top producer of petroleum and the number-one producer of natural gas.  We have so much more than we ever thought possible…We will export American energy all over the world, all around the globe.  These energy exports will create countless jobs for our people, and provide true energy security to our friends, partners, and allies all across the globe.” [Remarks, [6/29/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/29/remarks-president-trump-unleashing-american-energy-event)]

### Reality: Clean Energy Already Employs 3 Million Americans

**Clean Energy Employs More Than 3.3 Million Americans**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “Employment in the renewable energy and energy efficiency sectors in both the United States and abroad continued to experience growth through 2016. According to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), renewable energy employment alone (excluding efficiency) grew by nearly 18 percent between Q2 2015 and Q1 2016. The agency reports that 3,384,834 Americans were directly employed by the clean energy industry (which includes the energy efficiency, smart grid, and energy storage industries; electric power generation from renewables; renewable fuels production; and the electric, hybrid, and hydrogen-based vehicle industries) in Q1 2016.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

* **Fossil Fuel Industry Employed 2.9 Million**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “By comparison, DOE estimated that 2,989,844 Americans were directly employed by the fossil fuel industry (which includes fuels and electric power generation from coal, natural gas, and petroleum; and the manufacturing of gasoline and diesel-powered vehicles and their component parts) in Q1 2016. More specifically, natural gas and advanced gas technologies provided 398,235 jobs, coal provided 160,119, and petroleum provided 515,518, while gas and diesel vehicles supported 1,915,972 jobs.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

### Reality: Wind Energy Employs More Than 100,000

**U.S. Wind Industry Now Employs More Than 100,000 People**. According to the Washington Post, “n 2016, for the first time, more than 100,000 people in the United States were employed in some manner by the wind industry, according to an annual report released Wednesday by the American Wind Energy Association. The industry grew by double digits once again. The first offshore wind farm became a reality off Rhode Island. And wind was the primary source of new energy installations in much of the Midwest, the Plains states and in Texas, which has nearly 12,000 wind turbines and generates more than a quarter of the nation’s wind energy.” [Washington Post, [4/19/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/04/19/the-u-s-wind-industry-now-employs-more-than-100000-people/?utm_term=.075d76679685)]

### Reality: Energy Efficiency Industry Employed 2.2 Million Americans

**Energy Efficiency Industry Employed 2.2 Million Americans**. According to the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, “USEER found that the energy efficiency industry directly employed nearly 2,200,000 Americans in its green appliance and green building subsectors. USEER further states that the energy efficiency sector predicts a job growth rate of 9 to 11 percent for 2017.” [EESI, [2/15/17](http://www.eesi.org/papers/view/fact-sheet-jobs-in-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-2017)]

### Reality: Clean Power Plan Would Have Reduced Electricity Bills

**Clean Power Plan Would Have Reduced Electricity Bills**. According to the EPA, “States, cities, businesses and homeowners have been working for years to increase energy efficiency and reduce growth in demand for electricity. EPA projects that the Clean Power Plan will continue – and accelerate – this trend. Nationally, this means that, in 2030 when the plan is fully implemented, electricity bills would be expected to be roughly 8 percent lower than they would been without the actions in state plans. That would save Americans about $8 on an average monthly residential electricity bill, savings they wouldn't see without the states' efforts under this rule.” [EPA, accessed [4/24/17](https://www.epa.gov/cleanpowerplan/fact-sheet-clean-power-plan-benefits)]

New Rhetoric

## Rhetoric: Electricity Costs Will Increase Because of Clean Energy

### Reality: Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Are Competitive With Coal

**Energy Efficiency is a Low Cost Way to Meet Electricity Needs.** According to a report from the AEE Institute, “EE is not only cost-effective, it is generally the least-cost option for meeting electricity needs today, as well as for meeting CPP targets … LBNL estimates that the U.S. average “total cost of saved energy” by customer-funded utility- sponsored EE programs is $46/MWh, based on an analysis of programs in 20 states over a five-year period. This is less than half the average retail price of electricity in the United States.” [AEE Institute, [6/22/15](https://www.aee.net/articles/new-report-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-will-grow-provide-options-for-clean-power-plan-compliance-based-on-cost-competitiveness)]

**The Cost of Clean Energy Technology is Coming Down.** According to a report from the AEE Institute, “The most basic indicator of power technology competitiveness is the levelized cost of energy (LCOE), which measures the average cost of electricity over the life of the asset, including the upfront capital cost, operations and maintenance costs, fuel costs, and financing. Since 2007, Lazard, an independent financial advisory and asset management firm, has been tracking the economics of power technologies and publishing LCOE assessments using a consistent methodology, allowing for year-over-year comparison. These annual assessments document declining costs and show that RE technologies can be competitive with conventional technologies … Solar and wind technologies have achieved rapid improvements in cost and performance, and are now challenging traditional sources in U.S. power markets. According to Lazard, in the past five years, the LCOE for wind power and utility-scale solar has declined by 58% and 78%, respectively. During the same time period, LCOE for concentrating solar power has dropped by 59%, geothermal by 11%, and biomass by 5%.” [AEE Institute, [6/22/15](https://www.aee.net/articles/new-report-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-will-grow-provide-options-for-clean-power-plan-compliance-based-on-cost-competitiveness)]

**Utilities Are Choosing Clean Energy Based on Declining Prices.** According to a report from the AEE Institute, “As a result of these price declines, utility RE purchases that were once driven primarily by state policy (e.g., renewable portfolio standards) are now increasingly being made based on economics. In Texas, Austin Energy signed a 20-year contract in 2014 for 150 MW of solar energy19 at a price reported at less than $50/MWh. In 2013, wind power prices were so low that even with no requirement to purchase renewable energy, American Electric Power (AEP) bought three times more wind power in Oklahoma than it originally intended because of its value to ratepayers.20 In the same year, Xcel Energy signed PPAs for 700 MW of wind energy at prices below most of its natural gas-fired generation, and the company expects to save as much as $590 million in fuel costs over the life of the contract. In Michigan, utilities are eliminating surcharges on customer bills associated with that state’s RPS because wind power is so cheap.” [AEE Institute, [6/22/15](https://www.aee.net/articles/new-report-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-will-grow-provide-options-for-clean-power-plan-compliance-based-on-cost-competitiveness)]

### Reality: Clean Energy Helps Provide Price Stability

**Long Term Renewable Energy Contracts Can Lower Electricity Costs.** According to a report from the AEE Institute, **“**In addition, long-term RE contracts provide a hedge against fuel price volatility, which is an important consideration for utilities and private sector buyers. Grid-connected RE also provides system-wide benefits in the form of wholesale price suppression. Because most renewables have no fuel requirement, their marginal cost is near zero, which lowers wholesale market clearing prices, to the benefit of all consumers.” [AEE Institute, [6/22/15](https://www.aee.net/articles/new-report-renewable-energy-and-energy-efficiency-will-grow-provide-options-for-clean-power-plan-compliance-based-on-cost-competitiveness)]

### 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: Action on Climate Change Would Save Billions, Major EPA Study Finds

**EPA: “In 2100 Mitigation Is Projected To Result In Cost Savings Of $4.2-$7.4 Billion.”** According to the EPA, “For many sectors, the projected benefits of mitigation are substantial; for example, in 2100 mitigation is projected to result in cost savings of $4.2-$7.4 billion associated with avoided road maintenance.” [Climate Action Key Benefits, June [2015](http://www2.epa.gov/cira/climate-action-benefits-key-findings#summary)]

**EPA: “When Cost-Effective Adaptation Along The Coast Is Included, The Estimated Damages [To Coastal Property] Are Reduced To $810 Billion.”** According to the EPA, “Adaptation can substantially reduce certain impacts of climate change regardless of whether future GHG levels are low or high. For example, the estimated damages to coastal property from sea level rise and storm surge in the contiguous U.S. are $5.0 trillion through 2100 (discounted at 3%4) in a future without emission reductions. When cost-effective adaptation along the coast is included, the estimated damages are reduced to $810 billion.” [Climate Action Key Benefits, June [2015](http://www2.epa.gov/cira/climate-action-benefits-key-findings#summary)]

## Rhetoric: Trump’s EPA Is Providing Support For Clean Energy Research

### Reality: Budget Would Cut EPA Office Of Research And Development Budget

**Trump Budget Would Cut EPA Office Of Research And Development Budget “Roughly In Half.”** According to an article in the Washington Post, “[Trump’s budget proposal] would sharply reduce money for the Superfund program and cut the budget for the EPA’s prominent Office of Research and Development roughly in half, to $250 million.” [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)]

# 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)]

# Rejecting, Misinterpreting, and Undermining Science

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: Humans Contribute To Climate Change ‘In Some Way’

**Pruitt**: “We know that climate is always changing, we know that humans contribute to it in some way.” [Fox News, [9/19/17](https://twitter.com/FoxNews/status/910091057106493440)]

### 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)]

**Pruitt Is A Climate Science Skeptic**. According to the New York Times, “Mr. Trump vowed on the campaign trail to tear up President Barack Obama’s global warming policies, and on the home front he is moving aggressively to meet those pledges with deep cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency and a new E.P.A. administrator, Scott Pruitt, who is a skeptic of climate science.” [New York times, [3/2/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/02/us/politics/climate-change-trump.html?_r=0)]

**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: Science Should Not Be Politicized

**Pruitt**: “Science should not be politicized. Science is not something that should be just thrown about to try to dictate policy in Washington, D.C.” [EE News, [8/11/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/08/11/stories/1060058705)]

### Reality: Pruitt Wanted ‘Red Team’ to Review Climate Science

**Politico: Pruitt: EPA Will Review “Politicized” Climate Science Report.**According to Politico, “Environmental Protection Agency chief Scott Pruitt said his staff will gauge the ‘accuracy’ of a major federal science report that blames human activity for climate change — just days after researchers voiced their fears to The New York Times that the Trump administration would alter or suppress its findings. ‘Frankly this report ought to be subjected to peer-reviewed, objective-reviewed methodology and evaluation,’ Pruitt told a Texas radio show Thursday. ‘Science should not be politicized. Science is not something that should be just thrown about to try to dictate policy in Washington, D.C.’” [Politico, [8/11/17](http://www.politico.com/story/2017/08/11/pruitt-climate-report-epa-241546)]

* **Scientists Called Report ‘Troubling.’** According to Politico, “Scientists called his remarks troubling, especially because the report — part of a broader, congressionally mandated National Climate Assessment — has already undergone ‘rigorous’ peer-review by a 14-person committee at the National Academies. The reviewing scientists backed the report’s conclusion from researchers at 13 federal agencies that humans are causing climate change by putting more greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, leading to a clear increase in global temperatures.” [Politico, [8/11/17](http://www.politico.com/story/2017/08/11/pruitt-climate-report-epa-241546)]

**Washington Examiner: Trump Administration Lining Up Climate Change 'Red Team'.** According to the Washington Examiner, “The White House and the Environmental Protection Agency are recruiting scientists by enlisting the help of the Heartland Institute, considered to be the lead think tank for challenging the majority of scientists on climate change. The institute has its own red team, which is the antithesis to the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which it calls, unabashedly, the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change.” [Washington Examiner, [7/24/17](http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/trump-administration-lining-up-climate-change-red-team/article/2629124)]

**Pruitt Wanted Televised Climate Debate.**According to E&E News, “U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt confirmed he plans to set up a formal program to challenge climate science. In an interview with Reuters, he said he might like to air the debate on television. E&E News first reported that Pruitt planned to set up a ‘back-and-forth critique’ by government-recruited experts. The program would use ‘red team, blue team’ exercises to conduct an ‘at-length evaluation of U.S. climate science,’ according to a statement from an administration official.” [E&E News, [7/11/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/07/11/stories/1060057221)]

Reality: Pruitt Eyed Climate Deniers to Lead ‘Red Team’

**Pruitt Eyed Steve Koonin To Lead Climate Review.**According to E&E News, “Steve Koonin, a physicist and director of the Center for Urban Science and Progress at New York University, is being eyed to lead EPA’s ‘red team, blue team’ review of climate science, said Myron Ebell, a senior fellow at the Competitive Enterprise Institute and a Trump transition leader. ‘It makes sense because he has positioned himself as an honest broker,’ Ebell said. ‘He doesn’t think that the consensus is what some of the alarmists claim it is, and there’s a lot that needs to be discussed.’ When reached by phone, Koonin declined to comment on whether he was in talks with the administration about the climate job. But he added, ‘I think it would be a good idea if that kind of exercise took place.’ EPA has also consulted with groups like the free-market Heartland Institute for input on which scientists to include in the effort, but the agency didn’t immediately respond to a request for comment about Koonin or its outreach.” [E&E News, [7/24/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/07/24/stories/1060057816)]

**EPA Asked A Climate Denier Think Tank For Help Recruiting Its “Red Team.”**According to Think Progress, “The Environmental Protection Agency has asked the Heartland Institute, a D.C.-based rightwing think tank that denies the human causes of climate change, to help identify scientists to join the agency’s so-called red team-blue team effort to ‘debate’ the science of climate change, according to the Washington Examiner. The move is part of EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt’s efforts to undercut established climate science within the agency. In an interview with Reuters earlier this month, Pruitt suggested the possibility of creating a red team to provide ‘a robust discussion’ on climate science and determine whether humans ‘are contributing to [warming].’” [Think Progress, [7/25/17](https://thinkprogress.org/heartland-is-the-red-team-2d46cb6a17ca)]

**Heartland: Red Team Exercises To Critique Climate Science Are Necessary ‘To Critically Examine What Has Become Alarmist Dogma**. According to Think Progress, “The Heartland Institute offers a model of what the EPA red team might look like. Their contrarian Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change — often referred to as a red team — publishes regular volumes of a report called ‘Climate Change Reconsidered.’ Heartland communications director Jim Lakely told the Washington Examiner the red team exercises to critique climate science are necessary ‘to critically examine what has become alarmist dogma rather than a sober evaluation of climate science for many years.’ But, as many scientists and experts have noted, the peer review process for scientific publications already requires and facilitates rigorous examination.” [Think Progress, [7/25/17](https://thinkprogress.org/heartland-is-the-red-team-2d46cb6a17ca)]

**Pruitt: “What The American People Deserve I Think Is A True, Legitimate, Peer Reviewed, Objective, And Transparent Discussion About CO2.”**According to Breitbart XM Radio, “The American people deserve this debate, they deserve this discussion because it is an orthodoxy, it has been an orthodoxy for the last several years and you have rightly stated the co-benefits … typically like former speaker Pelosi … they come in and say it’s going to cause certain types of health conditions and cite asthma and those types of things, but what they’re referring to is pollutants that we regulate other than NAAQS criteria pollutants like Sox and NOx and particulate matter and ozone and other types of things that they then comingle the CO2 discussion with and that’s where they come up with these types of statements. And I think it’s not very, very transparent to the American people. What the American people deserve I think is a true, legitimate, peer reviewed, objective, and transparent discussion about CO2. … There was a great article … in the Wall Street Journal … called ‘red Team, Blue Team’ by Steve Kuhn and a scientist … from NYU and he talked about the important of having this red team of scientists and this blue team of scientists and those scientists get into a room and ask ‘What do we know, what don’t we know, and what risk does it pose to health and the United States and the world with respect to this issue of CO2. The American people need that kind of honest, open discussion and it’s something that we help to provide as part of our leadership.” [Breitbart XM Radio, 6/5/17]

## 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/)]

Rhetoric: EPA Scientists Are Not Independent

**Pruitt:** “If we have individuals who are on those boards receiving money from the agency ... that to me causes question on the independence and the veracity and the transparency of those recommendations that are coming our way.” [The Hill, [10/17/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/355866-epa-to-restrict-scientific-advisers-who-get-agency-grants)]

Reality: Pruitt Decision Came After Meeting With Congressman Who Opposed Advisory Board

**April 5: Pruitt Met With Congressman Lamar Smith About Science Advisory Board Bill**. According to schedules released by the EPA, Scott Pruitt met with Congressman Lamar Smith on April 5, 2017 to discuss the Science Advisory Board and the Honest Act Bill. [Pruitt Schedule, 4/5/17]

* **Smith Cosponsored H.R.1431 - EPA Science Advisory Board Reform Act Of 2017**. [House of Representatives, HR 1431, [3/8/17](https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/1431/cosponsors)]

* **Smith Sponsored H.R.1430 - HONEST Act**. [House of Representatives, [3/8/17](https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/1430)]

* **EPA Science Reform Act Would Change Membership Requirements Of Science Advisory Board To Include More Industry Voices**. According to The Hill, “The legislation from Rep. Frank Lucas (R-Okla.) would change membership requirements for the EPA’s Science Advisory Board to include more industry voices, expanding financial and conflict of interest disclosure requirements and giving the public the chance to more readily comment on the board’s actions.” [The Hill, [3/30/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/326472-house-approves-epa-science-committee-overhaul)]

Reality: Pruitt’s EPA Favored Industry Over Science

**Vanity Fair: “Scott Pruitt Is Turning The E.P.A. Into A Polluter's Paradise.”** According to Vanity Fair, “In the six years he served as attorney general of Oklahoma, Scott Pruitt could be confused for an energy lobbyist, coordinating with representatives from the gas and oil industries to sue the Obama administration E.P.A. on 14 separate occasions. And his advocacy on behalf of fossil-fuel companies doesn’t appear to have ended since being sworn in as head of the federal agency he once swore to destroy. The New York Times got their hands on Pruitt’s schedule from between February and May of this year—a 320-page document that reveals an itinerary stacked with meetings, dinner dates, and trips to visit corporate executives, conservative interest groups, and lobbyists from the industries he was supposed to regulate. Few meetings, if any, were with other government agencies or public advocacy groups.” [Vanity Fair, [10/3/17](https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2017/10/scott-pruitt-epa-spending)]

**Rolling Stone: Scott Pruitt's Crimes Against Nature Trump's EPA Chief Is Gutting The Agency, Defunding Science And Serving The Fossil-Fuel Industry**. According to Rolling Stone, “Scott Pruitt, the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, wants you to know that he was responsible for persuading President Trump to pull out of the Paris climate agreement. Pruitt has never said that explicitly, of course – he understands that if he wants to keep his job, he needs to pretend that the decision was Trump's alone. But Pruitt did everything he could to telegraph to the world that he thought Paris was a bad deal for America, and urged Big Coal executives to make their views known to the president as well. Trump, who has dismissed climate change as a hoax perpetrated by the Chinese, was lobbied equally hard by major business leaders and some of his own advisers, including his daughter Ivanka and Secretary of State Rex Tillerson, to stay in the agreement. But Pruitt, aligned with White House chief strategist and populist provocateur Steve Bannon, won the fight.” [Rolling Stone, [7/27/17](http://www.rollingstone.com/politics/features/scott-pruitt-is-gutting-the-epa-serving-fossil-fuel-industry-w494156)]

**New York Times: E.P.A. Chief’s Calendar: A Stream Of Industry Meetings And Trips Home**. According to the New York Times, “Since taking office in February, Mr. Trump’s E.P.A. chief has held back-to-back meetings, briefing sessions and speaking engagements almost daily with top corporate executives and lobbyists from all the major economic sectors that he regulates — and almost no meetings with environmental groups or consumer or public health advocates, according to a 320-page accounting of his daily schedule from February through May, the most detailed look yet at what Mr. Pruitt has been up to since he took over the agency.” [New York Times, [10/3/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/03/us/politics/epa-scott-pruitt-calendar-industries-coal-oil-environmentalists.html?smid=tw-nytimes&smtyp=cur&_r=0)]

# Ethics And Good Government

Rhetoric: I Don’t Hang With Polluters, I Prosecute Them

**Pruitt: “I Don’t Hang With Polluters; I Prosecute Them.”** According to the Washington Post, “‘I don’t hang with polluters; I prosecute them,’ he said. ‘I think it’s important in this agency to deal with the bad actors. The difference … is that the agency historically has viewed all industry and all stakeholders as adversaries, as opposed to partners and allies in improving the environment. … When you have that kind of … blanket approach, you don’t achieve good things for the environment.’” [Washington Post, [11/17/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/daily-202/2017/11/17/daily-202-how-epa-chief-scott-pruitt-wants-to-redefine-environmentalism/5a0e124230fb045a2e0030be/?utm_term=.1f15b006127a)]

Reality: Environmental Penalties Way Down In Scott Pruitt’s EPA

**NPR: “Since President Trump Took Office In January, Enforcement Of Environmental Laws Has Dropped Dramatically, Compared With Past Administrations.”** According to NPR, “Since President Trump took office in January, enforcement of environmental laws has dropped dramatically, compared with past administrations. ” [NPR, [8/10/17](https://www.npr.org/2017/08/10/542603483/environmental-penalties-are-down-under-president-trump)]

**There Were “Significantly Less” Environmental Enforcement Cases In The First Six Months Of The Trump Administration**. According to NPR, “A study released by the Environmental Integrity Project finds that $12 million in civil penalties have been collected from violators in 26 cases between January and the end of July. That's significantly less than the number of cases prosecuted and the penalties collected under the same six month period by the Obama, Bush and Clinton administrations. Under Barack Obama, the Justice Department prosecuted 34 cases, collecting $36 million in the time period. Under George W. Bush, 31 cases were lodged, bringing in $30 million in penalties. Under Bill Clinton, there were 45 cases filed, with penalties totaling $25 million.” [NPR, [8/10/17](https://www.npr.org/2017/08/10/542603483/environmental-penalties-are-down-under-president-trump)]

**NPR: “Penalties Collected By Trump's EPA Are 60 Percent Lower Than The Average Of The Three Previous Administrations.”** According to NPR, “So far, penalties collected by Trump's EPA are 60 percent lower than the average of the three previous administrations.” [NPR, [8/10/17](https://www.npr.org/2017/08/10/542603483/environmental-penalties-are-down-under-president-trump)]

Reality: Pruitt Has Met Extensively With Industry And Trade Group Officials

**Washington Post: “Pruitt Has Extensively Traveled The Country To Meet With Industry Trade Group Officials And Top Executives From Chemical, Agricultural And Fossil Fuel Companies.”** According to the Washington Post, “Pruitt has extensively traveled the country to meet with industry trade group officials and top executives from chemical, agricultural and fossil fuel companies. Last week he flew to South Carolina’s Kiawah Island for the American Chemistry Council’s board meeting. He recently went to a National Mining Association meeting at the Ritz-Carlton in Naples, Fla., and to a golf resort in Arizona to speak at a board meeting for the National Association of Manufacturers.” [Washington Post, [11/17/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/daily-202/2017/11/17/daily-202-how-epa-chief-scott-pruitt-wants-to-redefine-environmentalism/5a0e124230fb045a2e0030be/?utm_term=.1f15b006127a)]

## Rhetoric: The Days of Political Agendas Guiding Policy are Over

### Reality: Trump Appointed Crooked Cabinet

**Trump Cabinet A “Mix Of Wealthy Washington Outsiders, Republican Insiders And Former Military Officers Who Have Been Critical Of The Obama Administration.”** According to an article in the New York Times, “President-elect Donald J. Trump’s cabinet and top staff are shaping up to be a mix of wealthy Washington outsiders, Republican insiders and former military officers who have been critical of the Obama administration.” [New York Times, [12/15/16](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/12/05/us/politics/trump-cabinet-insiders-outsiders-millionaires.html)]

**NBC News: “‘Drain The Swamp’? Trump’s Potential Cabinet Fills Out With Washington Insiders**.” [NBC News, [11/11/16](http://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2016-election/drain-swamp-trump-s-potential-cabinet-fills-out-washington-insiders-n682341)]

**Trump Selected Exxon Mobil CEO As Secretary Of State**. According to an article in the New York Times, “President-elect Donald J. Trump on Tuesday officially selected Rex W. Tillerson, the chief executive of Exxon Mobil, to be his secretary of state. In saying he will nominate Mr. Tillerson, the president-elect is dismissing bipartisan concerns that the globe-trotting leader of an energy giant has a too-cozy relationship with Vladimir V. Putin, the president of Russia.” [New York Times, [12/12/16](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/12/us/politics/rex-tillerson-secretary-of-state-trump.html)]

**Department of Energy Nominee Rick 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/)]

* **Perry Has Received More Than $12 Million From Fossil Fuel Interests As A Candidate For State Office**. According to the National Institute on Money In State Politics, Rick Perry has been given $12,435,559 in contributions from fossil fuel interest. Perry received $1,407,129 from oil and gas; $10,993,627 from electric utilities; and $34,803 from mining. [National Institute on Money In State Politics, accessed [12/12/16](http://followthemoney.org/show-me?f-fc=2,3&c-t-eid=11291411&d-cci=36,34,33#[%7B1%7Cgro=d-cci)]

**Department Of Interior Nominee Ryan Zinke: “I Believe Montana Knows Best How To Manage Our Power And Our Resources, Much Better Than Unelected Bureaucrats In Washington, D.C, Do.”** According to KPAX, ‘Congressman Ryan Zinke backed his fellow Republican on Friday. ‘I believe Montana knows best how to manage our power and our resources, much better than unelected bureaucrats in Washington, D.C, do. In Montana, we value our beautiful lands and clean air and water, and we all work together to conserve our resources. Our state has already reduced our emissions rates without the federal government getting involved. The EPA’s supposed ‘Clean Power Plan’ will kill good-paying union jobs and drive up costs for Montana families and small businesses.’ [KPAX, [10/23/15](http://www.kpax.com/story/30336550/montana-joins-suit-to-block-epa-power-plant-emissions-rule)]

* **Zinke Received Approximately $420,000 From Fossil Fuel Industries Throughout His Career In The U.S. House Of Representatives.** According to the Center for Responsive Politics, Representative Ryan Zinke received $345,136 from oil and gas; $43,650 from mining; and $35,200 from electric utilities throughout his career in the House. [Center for Responsive Politics, Industries Contributing to Campaign Committee, accessed 12/15/16]

**Secretary Of State Nominee Is CEO Of Exxon Mobil**. According to Forbes, “The chief executive of the world's largest publicly traded international oil and gas company may also be the next Secretary of State of the United States. In December 2016 Tillerson was tapped by President-elect Donald Trump as his nominee for the position; a potentially contentious Senate confirmation awaits. Tillerson started his career at ExxonMobil in 1975 and became CEO in 2006. The Texas oilman has close ties to the most powerful person on FORBES' list, Vladimir Putin, whom Tillerson knew in the 1990s, when he led Exxon's interests in Russia. Under Tillerson's leadership, Exxon has recovered from a steep drop in its stock price last year.” [Forbes, accessed [1/11/17](http://www.forbes.com/profile/rex-tillerson/)]

* **“Rex Tillerson, CEO Of ExxonMobil, Disparaged The Clean Power Plan In A 2015 Speech Before The National Association Of Manufacturers.”** According to the Union of Concerned Scientists, “Rex Tillerson, CEO of ExxonMobil, disparaged the Clean Power Plan in a 2015 speech before the National Association of Manufacturers. Tillerson claimed to support “comprehensive and science-based cost-benefit analysis” of EPA regulations, but in reality ExxonMobil has funded special interest groups behind misleading reports that artificially inflate the costs and ignore the benefits of the Clean Power Plan. In 2014, ExxonMobil was also named in industry comments calling on the EPA to withdraw its Clean Power Plan proposal.” [Union of Concerned Scientists, accessed [1/11/17](http://www.ucsusa.org/global-warming/fight-misinformation/whos-fighting-clean-power-plan-and-epa-action-climate#.WHah_lz3g9U)]

### Reality: Koch Brothers Lobbied For Pruitt, Others in Cabinet

**Koch Industries Spent $3.1 Million To Lobby Congress For Energy Nominations In First Months Of Trump Administration**. According to an article in EE News, “Koch Industries Inc. put its money behind the confirmation of U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, according to new lobbying disclosure filings. In the first months of the Trump administration, the multinational corporation spent $3.1 million lobbying lawmakers on Capitol Hill. Among the lobbyists’ priorities was securing Pruitt’s nomination as head of EPA. Koch Industries also worked to sway legislators on issues like the Clean Power Plan, carbon pricing, and legislation regarding renewable fuel and corporate average fuel economy standards.” [EE News, [4/26/17](mailto:https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/04/26/stories/1060053580)]

**EE News: “Koch Industries Inc. Put Its Money Behind The Confirmation Of U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt.”** According to an article in EE News, “Koch Industries Inc. put its money behind the confirmation of U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, according to new lobbying disclosure filings.” [EE News, [4/26/17](mailto:https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/04/26/stories/1060053580)]

**Koch Worked To Sway Administration On Clean Power Plan**. According to an article in EE News, “Koch Industries Inc. put its money behind the confirmation of U.S. EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, according to new lobbying disclosure filings. In the first months of the Trump administration, the multinational corporation spent $3.1 million lobbying lawmakers on Capitol Hill. Among the lobbyists’ priorities was securing Pruitt’s nomination as head of EPA. Koch Industries also worked to sway legislators on issues like the Clean Power Plan, carbon pricing, and legislation regarding renewable fuel and corporate average fuel economy standards.” [EE News, [4/26/17](mailto:https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/04/26/stories/1060053580)]

### Reality: Six White House Staffers Held Up To $12 Million In Energy Company Stocks

**Politico: Six White House Staffers Hold Up To $12 Million In Energy Companies**. According to an article in Politico Pro, “Six high-ranking officials in the Trump White House hold a total of $3.7 million to $12.3 million in energy company stocks, according to financial disclosure forms the administration issued last week. The holdings are in energy giants Exxon Mobil, Chevron, Kinder Morgan and a host of other companies and could create major conflicts of interest for a White House that has pledged to grow the nation’s fossil fuel production, according to governance watchdogs.” [Politico Pro, [4/7/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/story/2017/04/white-house-staffers-hold-major-stakes-in-energy-companies-155111)]

**About A Dozen White House Staffers Held Some Stake In Energy Companies**. According to an article in Politico Pro, “Although six staffers hold the vast majority of those shares, about a dozen White House officials have some stake in energy companies overall, according to POLITICO and Center for American Progress analyses of the data.” [Politico Pro, [4/7/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/story/2017/04/white-house-staffers-hold-major-stakes-in-energy-companies-155111)]

**Holdings Included Exxon Mobil, Chevron, Kinder Morgan**. According to an article in Politico Pro, “The holdings are in energy giants Exxon Mobil, Chevron, Kinder Morgan and a host of other companies and could create major conflicts of interest for a White House that has pledged to grow the nation's fossil fuel production, according to governance watchdogs.” [Politico Pro, [4/7/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/story/2017/04/white-house-staffers-hold-major-stakes-in-energy-companies-155111)]

### Reality: Trump Nominated Industry Insiders to Staff EPA

**Trump Nominated Climate Skeptic As Head Of Council On Environmental Quality**. According to the Washington Post, “President Trump on Thursday tapped Kathleen Hartnett-White, a former chairman of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, to head a key White House office that coordinates environmental and energy policies across the government… Like other members of the Trump administration, she has long questioned the overwhelming scientific consensus on human-fueled climate change and has criticized the findings of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), a volunteer group of climate scientists whose findings are considered the gold standard of climate science. And she has described efforts to combat global warming as little more than an attack on the fossil fuel industry.” [Washington Post, [10/13/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/10/13/trump-taps-climate-skeptic-for-top-white-house-environmental-post/?utm_term=.30c1f461a56f)]

* **Hartnett White: “I Am Not At All Persuaded By The IPCC Science That We Are Standing On Some Precipice.”** According to the Washington Post, “ ‘I am not at all persuaded by the IPCC science that we are standing on some precipice,’ ­Hartnett-White told The Washington Post last October, referring to the urgency to combat global warming. ‘We’re not standing on a cliff from which we are about to fall off.’” [Washington Post, [10/13/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/10/13/trump-taps-climate-skeptic-for-top-white-house-environmental-post/?utm_term=.30c1f461a56f)]

**Trump Nominated Energy Industry Lobbyist For EPA Assistant Administrator For Air And Radiation.** [The Hill, [9/10/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/349882-trump-riles-dems-with-pick-for-powerful-epa-job)]

**Trump Nominated Chemical Industry Advocate Michael Dourson As Top Chemical Regulator**. According to NBC News, “Sens. Tom Udall, D-N.M., and Richard Blumenthal, D-Conn., rallied chemical exposure victims and public health advocates on Tuesday to oppose President Donald Trump’s nominee to become the nation’s top chemical regulator. Michael Dourson, Trump’s pick to lead the Environmental Protection Agency’s chemical safety program, has sparked fierce opposition from Democrats and public health advocates for spending decades producing industry-funded research that critics say downplays the health risks of chemical substances. ‘Instead of draining the swamp, [Trump] has filled it up with some of the swampiest creatures ever. And it keeps getting scarier — Michael Dourson might be the worst yet,’ Udall said. ‘Dr. Dourson has made a career of creating junk science for industry.’” [NBS News, [10/3/17](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/democrats-trump-nominee-toxic-chemical-swamp-creature-n807281)]

# 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 Pruitt/Trump Administration

**Pruitt 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/)]

**Pruitt 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/)]

**Pruitt 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: Previous administration left us with 120 million people in areas with poor air quality

**Pruitt:** “One-hundred-twenty million people in this country live in areas that don’t meet air quality standards. That’s what the previous administration left us with,” Pruitt told a Heritage Foundation event in October.” [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

### Reality: Pruitt Has Taken Multiple Actions To Slow Improvements On Air Quality

**Pruitt Missed Ozone Pollution Deadline**. According to Politico, “Missed a key deadline for implementing Obama’s 2015 ozone pollution limits and has not indicated when EPA will require polluted areas to take action. Instead formed an ozone task force.” [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

**Pruitt Moved To Repeal Clean Power Plan**. According to Politico, “Moved to rescind Obama’s Clean Power Plan, which would have reduced planet-warming carbon emissions and harmful air pollutants from coal plants.” [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

**Pruitt Planned To Ease Auto Pollution Standards.** According to Politico Pruitt, “Plans to ease Obama’s auto pollution standards.” [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

**Pruitt Delayed Legal Defense Of Obama’s Standards For Mercury And Air Toxics.** According to Politico, “Delayed the legal defense of Obama’s standards for mercury and air toxics from power plants.” [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

**Pruitt Halted Order To Prevent States From Exempting Power Plants From Pollution Standards**. According to Politico, “Halted an Obama-era order to prevent states from exempting power plants, refineries and chemical manufacturers from pollution standards when they are starting up, shutting down or malfunctioning.” [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

**Pruitt Defended White House Budget That Cut EPA Funding**. According to Politico, “Defended a White House budget proposal that would cut money for state regulators who test air quality and carry out federal laws – despite his public vow to push for funding.” [Politico, [11/19/17](https://www.politico.com/interactives/2017/scott-pruitt-promises/)]

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: Pruitt Has Taken Action To Slow Improvements On Clean Water

**Pruitt 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/)]

**Pruitt 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/)]