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# Energy Dominance

## Rhetoric: U.S. Would Greatly Benefit from “Energy Dominance.”

**ZINKE: Touted Benefits of “Energy Dominance” in Interview.** “Boosting drilling and mining on America’s protected federal lands can help the United States become not just independent, but ‘dominant’ as a global energy force, according to Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke, whose agency manages about one-fifth of U.S. territory…’There is a social cost of not having jobs,’ the former Montana Congressman and Navy Seal said in the interview on Friday. ‘Energy dominance gives us the ability to supply our allies with energy, as well as to leverage our aggressors, or in some cases our enemies, like Iran,’ he said.” [Reuters, [6/19/17](https://www.nytimes.com/reuters/2017/06/19/business/19reuters-usa-interior-zinke.html?_r=0)]

### Reality: “Energy Dominance” Is Not A Serious Policy

**Academic and Energy Experts Believed “Energy Dominance” Was Not Serious Policy, Could Have Negative Impact on U.S. World Standing.** “Academics and energy experts struggled to define what actualizing ‘energy dominance’ would look like and cautioned that such a brusque policy stance could destabilize America’s position on the global stage. Industry groups, on the other hand, expressed excitement about the new direction and stressed the importance of having a liberal democracy like the United States leading on energy policy. With the United States currently producing record levels of oil and gas due to the hydraulic fracturing revolution — a recent U.S. Energy Information Administration report projected the country could be energy independent by 2026 — some experts speculated that the new term is less a policy prescription and more a linguistic manifestation of a president who values ‘winning’ at all costs.” [E&E News, [6/13/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060055924)]

**Environmental Economist And Professor Maximillian Auffhammer: “Frankly, I Have To Chuckle When I Hear [Energy Dominance], Because It Just Doesn't Make Any Sense.”** “‘Frankly, I have to chuckle when I hear it, because it just doesn’t make any sense,’ said Maximilian Auffhammer an environmental economist and professor at the University of California, Berkeley. ‘The word dominance is not generally used in a good context, and it always means there’s a big person on the playground shoving around a smaller person.’ Auffhammer described another way in which the United States could be energy dominant with little political fallout: leading in clean energy technologies.” [E&E News, [6/13/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060055924)]

**Energy Dominance Could Give Renewable-Friendly Countries an Advantage Over U.S.**“What does it miss? So far, Trump’s critics, including the many who attended the science and climate marches in April, have framed the series of executive orders unwinding President Obama’s climate policy as ignorant of a need to take steps toward reducing greenhouse gas emissions and prepare for the effects of climate change. One of those steps was investment from the Department of Energy in solar, wind and other renewable energy technology, which the Trump administration is seeking to cut in its proposed budget. Critics of Trump worry that research and development being made by other nations, like China and Germany, in solar and wind technology will give them a leg up in the energy market in the decades ahead. ‘Notably missing from most of this ‘energy dominance’ talk,’ Dave Anderson, a policy and communications manager for the Energy and Policy Institute, told me, ‘is renewable energy sources.’” [Washington Post, [5/25/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/the-energy-202/2017/05/25/the-energy-202-trump-administration-has-new-energy-buzzword/5925c045e9b69b2fb981db8a/?utm_term=.5da750379023)]

**Industry Executives Warmed to "Energy Dominance" Term.** “Dan Naatz, senior vice president of government relations and political affairs with the Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA), agreed that fracking has changed the calculus for the United States, calling the proliferation of shale energy over the last 10 years ‘phenomenal.’ ‘It’s had huge impacts on American security, the economy, jobs, and now you’re starting to see the impact it could have on the world,’ he said. While ‘dominance’ is not a word Naatz said IPAA would use, he said the trade group has embraced the sentiment behind the language shift. The world benefits when the United States is a major energy producer and can act as a ‘balancing force’ against Russia or the Middle East, he said.” [E&E News,[6/13/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060055924)]

## Rhetoric: United States On The Verge of Being A Net Energy Exporter

**WHITE HOUSE:** “After being a net energy importer since 1953, the United States could be a net energy exporter as soon as 2020.” [White House Press Release, [6/27/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/27/president-donald-j-trump-unleashes-americas-energy-potential)]

### Reality: Only If Energy Policy – Including Clean Power Plan – Remains The Same

**US On Path To Becoming Net Energy Explorer “Without Any Major Overhauling Of Federal Rules.”** According to Washington Post, “But it is notable that the United States is already on its way to becoming a net energy exporter (and has been for some time, according to previous EIA reports) without any major overhauling of federal rules so far.” [Washington Post, [1/6/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/01/06/trump-wants-energy-independence-we-may-already-be-on-the-verge-of-having-it/?utm_term=.ddfea7fa92a2)]

**EIA Prediction Assumed Current Economic Conditions And Energy-Related Policies Remained The Same**. According to Washington Post, “Under the reference scenario, which assumes that current economic conditions and energy-related policies remain the same, the report projects an increase in oil and gas production, which combined with an increase in natural gas exports and a decrease in oil imports indicates that the country could become a net energy exporter in the next 10 years.” [Washington Post, [1/6/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/01/06/trump-wants-energy-independence-we-may-already-be-on-the-verge-of-having-it/?utm_term=.ddfea7fa92a2)]

### Reality:Fewer Natural Gas And Renewables Without Clean Power Plan

**WaPo: “In The Absence Of The Clean Power Plan, Coal Consumption Remains Much More Flat Over The Next Few Decades.”** According to Washington Post, “A scenario assuming the demise of the Clean Power Plan tells a slightly different story, however. In the absence of the Clean Power Plan, coal consumption remains much more flat over the next few decades, while energy-associated carbon dioxide emissions actually increase slightly between 2016 and midcentury.” [Washington Post, [1/6/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/01/06/trump-wants-energy-independence-we-may-already-be-on-the-verge-of-having-it/?utm_term=.ddfea7fa92a2)]

**EIA Administrator: Without The Clean Power Plan, You End Up Getting Less Natural Gas And Less Renewables.** According to Washington Post, “‘Without the Clean Power Plan, you end up getting less natural gas and less renewables [than in the reference scenario],’ Sieminski added.” [Washington Post, [1/6/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/01/06/trump-wants-energy-independence-we-may-already-be-on-the-verge-of-having-it/?utm_term=.ddfea7fa92a2)]

**EIA Predicts Slow Decline In Coal Production Despite Growth In Renewables And Natural Gas.** According to Scientific American, “Despite growth in natural gas and renewables, the EIA expects coal production will continue a slow but gradual decline, falling only 0.7 percent through 2050.” [Scientific American, [1/6/17](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/u-s-on-track-to-become-net-energy-exporter/)]

### Reality: Energy Independence Linked to Markets And Technology, Not Absence of CPP

**Scenarios That Result In Quicker Energy Independence Rely On Technological Progression And Price Of Oil, Not Clean Power Plan**. According to Washington Post, “Additionally, any scenarios included in the report that result in a quicker arrival at net energy exportation generally involve technological progression and changes in the price of oil, not the presence or absence of the Clean Power Plan.” [Washington Post, [1/6/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/01/06/trump-wants-energy-independence-we-may-already-be-on-the-verge-of-having-it/?utm_term=.ddfea7fa92a2)]

**“Even If The Trump Administration Kills The Rule, The Report Notes That Natural Gas And Renewables Will Still Continue To Expand, Albeit More Slowly.”** According to Washington Post, “And even if the Trump administration kills the rule, the report notes that natural gas and renewables will still continue to expand, albeit more slowly, and will remain the primary sources of new electricity generation capacity in the coming decades.” [Washington Post, [1/6/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/01/06/trump-wants-energy-independence-we-may-already-be-on-the-verge-of-having-it/?utm_term=.ddfea7fa92a2)]

**“Report Attributes The Dominance Of These Energy Sources To Low Natural Gas Prices And Falling Costs Of Renewables, As Well As The Incentives Provided By Federal Tax Credits For Wind And Solar.”** According to Washington Post, “This again speaks to the power of the private sector in the U.S. energy landscape — the report attributes the dominance of these energy sources to low natural gas prices and falling costs of renewables, as well as the incentives provided by federal tax credits for wind and solar.” [Washington Post, [1/6/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/01/06/trump-wants-energy-independence-we-may-already-be-on-the-verge-of-having-it/?utm_term=.ddfea7fa92a2)]

## Rhetoric: Trump Policies Will Lead to American Energy Independence

### Reality: Trump Order Would Do Little To Boost U.S. Energy Independence

**Trump Order Would Do Little To Boost U.S. Energy Independence.** According to Politico, “President Donald Trump labeled his new executive order as helping U.S. ‘energy independence,’ but it focuses mostly on an industry that faces virtually zero foreign competition: coal. Trump directed EPA and the Interior Department to begin unwinding his predecessor’s climate change regulations, but the order he signed has relatively little to do with reducing U.S. imports of foreign oil or policies advocates say would make the U.S. more energy independent. That may be because the country has been well on its way to being self-sufficient. … U.S. oil production is near its all-time peak, and imports are at their lowest level in 30 years. Hydraulic fracturing and horizontal drilling have spurred a natural gas boom that has helped reduce what Americans pay for heat and electricity. Gasoline prices have fallen, and energy costs as a whole are taking a smaller bite out of the economy than at any point on record.” [Politico, [3/28/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/story/2017/03/energy-independence-is-not-coming-to-america-154389)]

## Rhetoric: Nuclear Energy is Renewable

**TRUMP:** “…we will begin to revive and expand our nuclear energy sector – which I’m so happy about – which produces clean, renewable and emissions-free energy.” [Remarks by President Trump, [6/29/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/29/remarks-president-trump-unleashing-american-energy-event)]

### Reality: Nuclear Energy is Not Renewable

**Washington Post Energy 202: The Fuel That Powers Nuclear Reactors Is a Mineral of Finite Quantity.”** When it comes to greenhouse gases or traditional smog-forming pollutants, nuclear energy is nearly emissions-free. So it is, in that sense, often considered a "clean" energy. But it has been [up for debate for a long time](http://large.stanford.edu/courses/2012/ph241/chowdhury2/) whether nuclear energy ought to be considered "renewable." The raw fuel that powers nuclear fission reactors is derived from uranium ore, a mineral of finite quantity on Earth.” [Washington Post, [6/30/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/the-energy-202/2017/06/30/the-energy-202-four-misleading-claims-trump-made-in-his-big-energy-week-speech/59553373e9b69b7071abc98d/?utm_term=.ea4a2944cb17)]

## Rhetoric: Trump Decision on Keystone XL was Uncontroversial

**TRUMP:** “As you all know, I approved the Keystone XL Pipeline and the Dakota Access Pipeline in my first week… And, by the way, I thought I’d take a lot of heat.  I didn't take any heat.  I approved them and that was it.  I figured we’d have all sorts of protests.  We didn't have anything.”  [Remarks by President Trump, [6/29/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/29/remarks-president-trump-unleashing-american-energy-event)]

### Reality: 200,000 People Marched Against Trump’s Environmental Agenda in April 2017

**Washington Post Energy 202: “Trump In Fact Took Some Heat.”** “Trump in fact took some heat. He would have seen plenty of that hot anger in April during the [Climate March](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/climate-march-expected-to-draw-massive-crowd-to-dc-in-sweltering-heat/2017/04/28/1bdf5e66-2c3a-11e7-b605-33413c691853_story.html) when 200,000 people demonstrated against his administration's agenda of de-emphasizing federal action on climate change. That agenda, of course, includes reopening the controversial pipelines.” [Washington Post, [6/30/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/the-energy-202/2017/06/30/the-energy-202-four-misleading-claims-trump-made-in-his-big-energy-week-speech/59553373e9b69b7071abc98d/?utm_term=.ea4a2944cb17)]

# 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)]

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

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

## Rhetoric: 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)]

Rhetoric: We Are Focused On Air Quality Attainment

***Pruitt****: Pollutants that-- pollutants that we regulate under the Clean Air Act, the mainstay of what we do-- 40% of the country, as we came into this position, as the president came into office, l-- 40% of the country, 129 (?) people live in areas that don't meet those standards. And that's what we've really decided to, you know, focus upon here, is how do we improve outcomes there?* [CBS News, [1/17/18](https://www.cbsnews.com/video/scott-pruitt-talks-with-major-garrett-full-interview/)]

Reality: EPA has failed to address NAAQS

**June: EPA Delayed State Deadlines For NAAQS**. According to an EPA Press Release, “U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Scott Pruitt sent a letter to governors today to inform them of EPA’s efforts related to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for ozone promulgated in October 2015. EPA is extending the deadline for promulgating initial area designations, by one year, for the 2015 ozone NAAQS. ‘States have made tremendous progress and significant investment cleaning up the air. We will continue to work with states to ensure they are on a path to compliance,’ said Administrator Scott Pruitt.” [EPA Press Release, [6/6/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-extend-deadline-2015-ozone-naaqs-area-designations)]

* **Pursuant To The Language In The Recently-Enacted FY2017 Omnibus Funding Bill, Administrator Pruitt Is Establishing An Ozone Cooperative Compliance Task Force To Develop Additional Flexibilities For States**. According to an EPA Press Release, “The National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ground-level ozone is an outdoor air regulation under the Clean Air Act. As part of the process to determine what areas of the country are able to meet the current air quality standards, states are currently submitting their proposals for area designations under the 70 parts per billion (ppb) standard, which was lowed from 75 ppb in 2015. Areas designated as being in ‘nonattainment’ of the standard face consequences, including: increased regulatory burdens, restrictions on infrastructure investment, and increased costs to businesses. EPA is giving states more time to develop air quality plans and EPA is looking at providing greater flexibility to states as they develop their plans. And, pursuant to the language in the recently-enacted FY2017 Omnibus funding bill, Administrator Pruitt is establishing an Ozone Cooperative Compliance Task Force to develop additional flexibilities for states to comply with the ozone standard.” [EPA Press Release, [6/6/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-extend-deadline-2015-ozone-naaqs-area-designations)]

**August: EPA Fought 'Speculative' Bid To Vacate Ozone NAAQS Designations Delay**. According to Inside EPA, “EPA is fighting several states’ request for a federal appeals court to vacate the agency’s since-withdrawn notice delaying by one year designations for which areas are attaining the 2015 ozone air standard, saying it is ‘speculative’ for the states to say the delay was unlawful and that EPA should be prevented from trying it again. ‘Petitioners’ concern that the withdrawal could be reversed by the Court in some future action is highly speculative, and could be adequately addressed by the Court in its review of any such future action. Accordingly, that speculation provides no basis for the Court to reach out and vacate an action that the Agency has already withdrawn,’ EPA says in an Aug. 29 filing with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.” [InsideEPA, [8/30/17](https://insideepa.com/daily-news/epa-fights-speculative-bid-vacate-ozone-naaqs-designations-delay)]

**October: EPA Said No Update On Ozone Designations**. According to InsideEPA, “EPA says it has ‘no further information’ about when it will issue designations for which areas of the United States are either attaining or in nonattainment with the 2015 ozone standard after appearing to miss a Clean Air Act deadline of Oct. 1 for the findings, and environmentalists are threatening a suit to force issuance of the designations. Under the air law, EPA has two years from the issuance of a new national ambient air quality standard (NAAQS) to issue final designations, which triggers an air law timeline for states to craft state implementation plans outlining the air pollution control measures they will impose in order to either stay in attainment or get out of nonattainment. EPA finalized its revised ozone NAAQS Oct. 1, 2015, making the designations deadline Oct. 1 this year.” [InsideEPA, [10/2/07](https://insideepa.com/daily-news/epa-says-no-update-ozone-designations-nrdc-threatens-lawsuit?destination=node/205720)]

## Rhetoric: I've Prosecuted Bad Actors. And I Will Tell You, If We Have Companies, Industries, Citizens Who Violate The Law, We're Gonna Prosecute Them

***PRUITT****: Now, I'm gonna tell you, as a former attorney general, I've led a grand jury. I've prosecuted bad actors. And I will tell you, if we have companies, industries, citizens who violate the law, we're gonna prosecute them and we're gonna hold them accountable. But we should not start on the premise that all people are that way or all industries are that way. That is just simply wrongheaded, and it doesn't achieve good outcomes.* [CBS News, [1/17/18](https://www.cbsnews.com/video/scott-pruitt-talks-with-major-garrett-full-interview/)]

### Reality: Enforcement is down under Pruitt’s leadership

**Under Trump, E.P.A. Has Slowed Actions Against Polluters, And Put Limits On Enforcement Officers.** According to the New York Times, “The documents, which were reviewed by The Times, indicate that E.P.A. enforcement officers across the country no longer have the authority to order certain air and water pollution tests, known as requests for information, without receiving permission from Washington. The tests are essential to building a case against polluters, the equivalent of the radar gun for state highway troopers.” [New York Times, [12/10/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/12/10/us/politics/pollution-epa-regulations.html?_r=0)]

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

# 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 Found “Insignificant” Decline in Temperature Under Paris

**ZINKE:** “Aside from the climate change argument, and then you look at the MIT report, at the end of the day, it makes insignificant difference.” [U.S. House Appropriations Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

### Administration Misunderstood MIT Study; Did Not Use Updated Version

**MIT Said Trump Misunderstood Research When Citing Study**. According to Reuters, “Massachusetts Institute of Technology officials said U.S. President Donald Trump badly misunderstood their research when he cited it on Thursday to justify withdrawing the United States from the Paris Climate Agreement.” [Reuters, [6/2/17](http://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-climatechange-trump-mit-idUSKBN18S6L0)]

**Author Of MIT Report “Disagrees Completely” With Trump’s Characterization That The 0.2 Degree Cut Is A “Tiny, Tiny” Amount That Is Not Worth Pursuing**. According to the Washington Post, “John Reilly, lead author of the report, said he “disagrees completely” with Trump’s characterization that the 0.2 degree cut is a “tiny, tiny” amount that is not worth pursuing. As a part of the deal, countries reexamine their commitments and can exceed or extend their pledges beyond 2030. The intent of the research was to say the Paris deal was a small step, and that more incremental steps need to be taken in the long run.” [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)]

**Op-Ed: Trump Used Our Research To Justify Pulling Out Of The Paris Agreement. He Got It Wrong.** According to Washington Post, “As scientists concerned with the very real impact of human activity on climate, my colleagues and I certainly hope our research reaches policymakers at the highest levels of government — which, apparently, it did, when White House officials cited our work to justify President Trump’s decision to pull the United States out of the Paris climate accord. Unfortunately, they got it wrong. … One degree, though, wasn’t the figure the administration chose to pluck from our analysis. Instead, the White House said the Paris agreement would reduce the increase in average temperatures by just 0.2 degrees Celsius by 2100. That figure comes from our 2015 study; however, as we made clear in the text, it reflects only the incremental effect of Paris when built upon all the previous commitments made through the UNFCCC, not the cumulative effect — 1 degree — when compared with a business-as-usual policy. In addition, our analysis assumed no further strengthening of national commitments in years after 2030. These are critically important distinctions.” [Washington Post, [6/8/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2017/06/08/trump-used-our-research-to-justify-pulling-out-of-the-paris-agreement-he-got-it-wrong/?utm_term=.23c9134c69b6) ]

## 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%3A//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: Paris Agreement Would Put U.S. At “Permanent Disadvantage Economically.”

**ZINKE:** “We paid $3 billion, $1 billion up front, cash. The $1 billion or the -- the $1 billion cash. It lets China, India, Russia walk. The CO2 in China actually increases until 2030 because it’s structured on people. So China has more people, so the world’s greatest polluter takes a walk ‘til 2030. We have to immediately reduce ours. That puts us at a permanent disadvantage economically.” [U.S. House Appropriations Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

### Reality: Paris Deal Called for Big Investment In Renewable Energy

**Renewable Investment Boom Due To Government Policies That Support Renewables**. “The investment boom comes in large part because the cost of renewable electricity generation has decreased rapidly. However, companies will keep investing in these technologies only in nations with government policies that support the growth of renewables. Because polluting fossil fuels are still mostly cheaper than renewables, clean energy requires subsidies or similar policies.” [Washington Post, [3/14/16](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/03/14/the-paris-climate-agreement-calls-for-massive-investments-in-renewable-energy-heres-why-governments-love-it/?utm_term=.d389ff448e11)]

**United States “Distant Second” In Renewable Investments**. “The most important reason for optimism is that nations around the world have been investing heavily in technologies that offer renewable energy — wind turbines, solar panels, biomass and so on. In 2014, those global investments reached $270 billion. China led the pack, investing $83 billion in wind turbines and solar panels. The United States was the distant second, investing $38 billion, especially in wind energy. Indonesia, Chile, Mexico and Kenya invested more than a billion dollars each.” [Washington Post, [3/14/16](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/03/14/the-paris-climate-agreement-calls-for-massive-investments-in-renewable-energy-heres-why-governments-love-it/?utm_term=.d389ff448e11)]

### Reality: Paris Deal Benefits American Business

**Paris Climate Deal Would Benefit American Business**. “American business leaders understand that remaining in the agreement would spur new investment, strengthen American competitiveness, create jobs, ensure American access to global markets and help reduce future business risks associated with the changing climate. Leaving Paris would yield the opposite.” [New York Times, [5/9/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/09/opinion/the-business-case-for-the-paris-climate-accord.html?_r=0)]

**Unmitigated Climate Change Could Reduce Per Capita GDP In U.S. By 36 Percent By 2100.** “‘The U.S. is really close to the global optimum,’ Burke said, adding that as it warms, the U.S. will fall off that peak. The authors calculate a warmer U.S. in 2100 will have a gross domestic product per person that’s 36 percent lower than it would be if warming stopped about now.” [Associated Press, [10/21/15](https://apnews.com/5949adfa46b84ee9aa28369f9c050e18/study-finds-warmer-it-gets-more-world-economy-hurts)]

## 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

Rhetoric: EPA Has Fast Tracked Chemical Approvals

***Pruitt****: Well, I mean, what's interesting about, you know, the question, Major, is that when-- when we came in-- when I came into this position, we had about 700 chemicals that-- that had not been reviewed at all, that before they could even enter the flow of commerce, it was a requirement under that new law that they be reviewed-- up or down on whether they posed a risk or not. Seven hundred chemicals of backlog when I came in. I made a commitment to our team here that we would address that backlog-- by the summertime*. [CBS News, [1/17/18](https://www.cbsnews.com/video/scott-pruitt-talks-with-major-garrett-full-interview/)]

Reality: Pruitt EPA criticized for rushing approvals

**EPA Criticized For ‘Skipping Vital Steps That Protect The Public From Hazardous Chemicals That Consumers Have Never Used Before.’** According to NBC News, “The Environmental Protection Agency is shifting course under the Trump administration on how it assesses new chemicals for health and environmental hazards, streamlining a safety review process that industry leaders say is too slow and cumbersome. But some former EPA officials, as well as experts and advocates, say the agency is skipping vital steps that protect the public from hazardous chemicals that consumers have never used before, undermining new laws and regulations that Congress passed with overwhelming bipartisan support in 2016.” [NBC News, [1/17/18](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/epa-eases-path-new-chemicals-raising-fears-health-hazards-n838201)]

**Quick Review Could Mean ‘Manufacturers Might Get Approval To Introduce A New Chemical For One Purpose, Without Getting A Thorough, Timely Review Of The Chemical’s Safety If It Is Later Used For A Different Purpose.’** According to NBC News, “According to these critics, that could mean that manufacturers might get approval to introduce a new chemical for one purpose, without getting a thorough, timely review of the chemical’s safety if it is later used for a different purpose. Asbestos, for example, was commonly used in building insulation before the EPA cracked down on its use, but the carcinogenic chemical is still found in brake pads for automobiles — posing hazards for garage mechanics — and is widely used to manufacture chlorine.” [NBC News, [1/17/18](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/epa-eases-path-new-chemicals-raising-fears-health-hazards-n838201)]

## 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]

**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]

**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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Rhetoric: “Energy Dominance” Creates Jobs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Reality: NERA Study is Flawed

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

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

**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:///%5C%5Cbeehive-dc-1%5Cshared%5CClimate%20Action%20Campaign%5CSent%20to%20Client%5CEPA%20report%20shows%20economic%20growth%2C%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: It’s Better To Produce Energy Here Than Be Held Hostage By Foreign Enemies

**ZINKE:** “I’ve spent a lot of time in the Middle East…It’s a lot better to produce it here with reasonable regulations [than overseas with no environmental regulations]…It is better to produce energy here than be held hostage by foreign enemies.”

### Reality: In 2016, US Dependence on Foreign Oil Hovered At Record Low

**2016: U.S. Net Imports Of Petroleum at 25 Percent of US Petroleum Consumption.** “In 2016, U.S. net imports (imports minus exports) of petroleum from foreign countries were equal to about 25% of U.S. [petroleum consumption](http://www.eia.gov/tools/glossary/index.cfm?id=Product%20supplied). This percentage was up slightly from 24% in 2015, which was the lowest level since 1970.” [EIA FAQ, Updated [4/4/17](https://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.php?id=32&t=6)]

## Rhetoric: Energy Exports Will Make the US Stronger Overseas

**HUCKABEE:** “When we can export American energy to markets around the world, the President will also be able to use it as an important tool to increase our global leadership and influence, advancing our global agenda and helping to keep our citizens safe.”

### Reality: US Exports Won’t Be Enough to Undermine Russia’s Energy Advantage

**The US Cannot Use Energy Exports as a Geopolitical Tool Because Private Companies Decide Where and When to Sell.** According to an article in ForeignPolicy.com, “America’s arrival as an energy exporter, while important for reshaping global energy markets, will not automatically translate into the kind of geopolitical tool that countries like Russia use to advance their national interests… just because firms in the United States are producing — and are now ready and able to export — huge amounts of energy doesn’t mean that it will automatically become part of the arsenal for policymakers in Washington…for the United States, the energy boom — and now, the export bonanza — is above all a private-sector phenomenon, not something directed by Washington.” [Foreign Policy.com, [2/29/16](http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/02/29/americas-natural-gas-exports-wont-be-enough-to-blunt-putins-energy-weapon/)]

**“Hard to Envision Big Geopolitical Dividends” From US Energy Exports.** According to an article in ForeignPolicy.com, “For the companies pumping, freezing, and exporting gas, the key consideration is economics, not politics. American firms will sell gas to the buyers willing to pay the most money — not where they will necessarily do the most to advance the U.S. strategic agenda… The fact that U.S. exports are finally hitting the market right when the world is awash in natural gas makes it even harder to envision big geopolitical dividends.” [Foreign Policy.com, [2/29/16](http://foreignpolicy.com/2016/02/29/americas-natural-gas-exports-wont-be-enough-to-blunt-putins-energy-weapon/)]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Fuel Standards Would Reduce Oil Consumption By 1.2 Billion Barrels From MY2022-2025.** “The Standards Will Achieve Significant CO2 and Oil Reductions. Based on various assumptions, including the U.S. Department of Energy's Annual Energy Outlook (AEO) 2016 reference case projections of the car/truck mix out to 2025, the footprint-based GHG standards curves for MY2022-2025 are projected to achieve an industry-wide fleet average carbon dioxide (CO2) target of 173 grams/mile (g/mi) in MY2025 (Table ES-2). […] EPA estimates that over the vehicle lifetimes the MY2022-2025 standards will reduce GHG emissions by 540 million metric tons and reduce oil consumption by 1.2 billion barrels, as shown in Table ES-3.” [U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Final Determination on the Appropriateness of the Model Year 2022-2025 Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards under the Midterm Evaluation*, [January 2017](https://web.archive.org/web/20170113201942/https%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

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

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

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

## Rhetoric: 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%3A/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%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

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

### 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%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

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

### Reality: 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%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

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

## 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%3A/www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/06/Fuel-Economy-Standards-2017-2025-summary.pdf)]

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

## Rhetoric: 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%3A/www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-01/documents/420r17001.pdf)]

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

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

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

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

### Reality: Customer Would Save More Than $1,600 Over the Lifetime Of New Vehicles

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

## Rhetoric: Fuel Economy Rules Need to Be Harmonized

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Reality: Consumers Would Save Money Under Current Standards

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

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

# Public Lands (General)

## Rhetoric: Zinke Philosophically Opposed to Public Lands Transfer

**ZINKE:** “You know, philosophically upfront, I’m -- I’m just not an advocate for sale or transfer of public land. But I am an advocate for -- you know, there’s some good programs on stewardship programs within the Department of Ag. That was a bipartisan effort that transferred to degree (ph) management, as long as all parties agree what that management will look like. I think that’s on the table. In some places, you know, you’re stacked up on -- you have the state and you have a local management, the state management and the federal management on the same piece of property. Is that really in the best interest of the country and how you manage the property? So I -- I think that’s always an open -- open dialogue.” [U.S. House Appropriates Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

### Reality: Zinke’s National Monument Review Was “Undercover” Land Transfer

**High Country News: “Land transfer advocates steer their focus to monuments: a transfer movement moves to rescind monuments and weaken the Antiquities Act.”** “The attempt to abolish Bears Ears and other national monuments is part of a fresh tack in the larger push by conservative lawmakers to purge federal management from public land in the West… While land transfer bills continue to circulate, many of Utah’s land transfer advocates have shifted to a different tactic to undermine federal management in the West: undoing national monuments and hobbling the mechanism presidents can use to create them — the Antiquities Act. Once again, several states have followed Utah’s lead… At least six Western states now have resolutions or bills to rescind or shrink monuments or undermine the Antiquities Act.” [High Country News, [4/12/17](http://www.hcn.org/articles/Public-land-transfer-advocates-target-national-monuments-bears-ears)]

**Center for American Progress: National Monument Review Was Undercover Land Transfer Effort.** “If Zinke truly opposes selling our parks and public lands to the highest bidder, he will leave Bears Ears and the rest of our national monuments as they are. Zinke’s coming decision on Bears Ears will demonstrate how far he is willing to go to help the fossil fuel industries. Any changes made to the protection of the monuments should be seen for what they are: A sell-off of America’s parks and public lands.” [The Hill, [6/8/17](http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/energy-environment/336809-zinkes-monuments-review-is-land-seizure-in-disguise)]

### Reality: National Monuments Review A “Political Favor to Senator Orrin Hatch.”

**National Monuments Review Launched As a Favor To Hatch.**  “As a political favor to Utah Sen. Orrin Hatch, President Donald Trump last month issued an executive order instructing Zinke to [review all monuments designated since 1996](http://www.sltrib.com/opinion/5258028-155/zinke-kicks-off-monuments-review-this?fullpage=1)that exceed 100,000 acres, including Bears Ears and the 1.9 million-acre Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, designated by President Bill Clinton in 1996.” [The Salt Lake Tribune, [5/15/17](http://www.sltrib.com/home/5293060-155/some-urge-more-public-input-as)]

Department of Interior Hired Former ALEC Employee Who Advocated for Land Transfer

**Department of Interior Hired Former ALEC Employee Who Advocated for Land Transfer.** “DeSmogBlog this week published an extensive profile of Todd Wynn, the Interior Department’s new Director of Intergovernmental and External Affairs. DeSmogBlog highlights Wynn’s past statements denying climate science and criticizing wind and solar power. At his previous positions with far-right groups including the Cascade Policy Institute and the American Legislative Exchange Council — better known as ALEC, the infamous far-right ‘bill mill’ — Wynn was a vocal advocate for the Koch brothers’ industry-friendly agenda, attacking everything from the Environmental Protection Agency to the use of renewable energy in Oregon. Wynn’s disdain for the government he now works for goes far deeper than that, however. During his tenure at ALEC it became a leading force behind the effort to dispose of millions of acres of national public lands into state and private hands. Although Wynn’s efforts failed spectacularly in almost all state legislatures last year, in 2013 he sang the praises of Utah’s HB 148, a bill that has taken the state to the brink of a multimillion-dollar lawsuit to try to force the American people to hand over ownership of public lands to the state of Utah.” [Westwise, [10/19/17](https://medium.com/westwise/meet-the-interior-department-official-who-wants-to-give-away-americas-public-lands-1909cc98e62b)]

## Rhetoric: Monuments Review Will Protect Land And Allow “Multiple Use”

**ZINKE**: “There is no doubt that it is drop-dead gorgeous country and that it merits some degree of protection, but designating a monument that - including state land- encompasses almost 1.5 million-acres where multiple-use management is hindered or prohibited is not the best use of the land and is not in accordance with the intention of the Antiquities Act.” [DOI, [6/12/17](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/secretary-zinke-submits-45-day-interim-report-bears-ears-national-monument-and-extends)]

### Reality: National Monuments Were Managed for Multiple Use

**Former Interior Department Deputy Solicitor: “One Of The Strengths Of National Monuments Is We Know How They Work: They're Managed For Multiple Uses…”** “In designating such sites, Congress may set the boundaries, then exclude or include any activities, such as grazing or oil and gas development, as it deems necessary. ‘When Congress enacts wilderness areas or national conservation areas, often it includes specific management provisions in its designations,’ explained former Interior Department Deputy Solicitor for Land Resources Justin Pidot, who is now an associate professor at the University of Denver Sturm College of Law. ‘It could be a wilderness area with uranium mining. If Congress did that, the designation is not worth a lot.’ But given that congressional leeway, it can be difficult to compare how the lands included in the Bears Ears monument could fare under a different status. ‘Without seeing the specifics of what a legislative vehicle looks like, it’s really hard to know how to compare a national monument designation to other designations,’ Pidot said. ‘One of the strengths of national monuments is we know how they work: They’re managed for multiple uses so long as those uses are consistent with the care and protection of the cultural historic resources that are present. It’s a well-trod path.’” [E&E News, [6/6/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060055610)]

### Reality: Oil and Gas Industry Had Little Interest in Drilling Bears Ears

**Oil and Gas Industry Showed Little Interest in Bears Ears.** “A recent study commissioned by the left-leaning Center for American Progress found that Bears Ears ranks in the 52nd percentile for oil and gas resource potential as compared with areas of comparable size throughout the West. Bears Ears ranks in the 68th percentile for mineral resources. ‘The places they are looking at scaling back don’t have extraordinarily high resource potential,’ said Matt Lee-Ashley, a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, in an interview with the Washington Examiner. ‘You don’t see the big oil and gas companies clamoring to get in there [Bears Ears], and that’s indicative of the resource potential not being outstanding,’ added Lee-Ashley, who is also a former deputy chief of staff at the Department of the Interior.” [Washington Examiner, [7/27/17](http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/shrinking-monuments-could-open-land-for-mining-and-drilling-but-energy-industry-isnt-interested/article/2632628)]

## Rhetoric: First National Monument Was Small and “Controversial”

**Zinke Believed First National Monument Designated Was “Controversial.”** “But in his current review of dozens of national monuments, Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke has both repeatedly turned to Devils Tower as an example of how monuments should be designated — referring to its relatively small footprint — and pointed to the site as ‘controversial’ at its 1906 creation. ‘His first monument, the Devils Tower in Wyoming, was about 1,200 acres. Yet in recent years we’ve seen single monuments span tens of millions of acres,’ Zinke said in April. His comments came as President Trump signed an executive order mandating a review of all monuments created since 1996 that encompass more than 100,000 acres. A final report on that review is due Aug. 24.” [E&E News, [8/11/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/stories/1060058704/search?keyword=ryan+zinke)]

### Reality: Protection of Devils Tower Had Advocates at Local, State, and Federal Level

**University of Wyoming History Professor: Protection of Devils Tower Was a “Grass-Roots Attempt.”** “University of Wyoming history professor Phil Roberts questioned Zinke’s characterization of the monument’s early days as controversial, noting that state and federal lawmakers had pushed for the area to become a national park for more than a decade, while also working to ensure the land did not fall into private ownership. ‘This is a community’s attempt, or a grass-roots attempt, to create a national monument. By the time the Antiquities Act came around, it appeared ... that this would be the solution to protecting it,’ Roberts said. ‘Any suggestion that suddenly Theodore Roosevelt got up on his high horse and set aside something just because he was president can’t be further from the truth.’” [E&E News, [8/11/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/stories/1060058704/search?keyword=ryan+zinke)]

### Reality: Industry Groups Have Expressed Interest In Drilling In Utah National Monuments

**WEA: “There Is Certainly Is Industry Appetite For Development There, Or Else Companies Wouldn’t Have Leases In The Area.”** Kathleen Sgamma, head of the Western Energy Alliance, told E&E News that “There certainly is industry appetite for development there, or else companies wouldn’t have leases in the area.” [Bloomberg, [5/10/17](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-05-10/trump-takes-aim-at-western-monuments-that-may-hold-oil-riches)]

**American Petroleum Institute: National Monuments “Hold An Abundance Of Oil And Natural Gas Resources….We Strongly Urge Congress to Re-Examine the Role and Purpose of the Antiquities Act.”** [API Letter to Murkowski and Bishop, [1/13/17](http://www.energytomorrow.org/blog/2017/01/13/~/media/EnergyTomorrow/blog/2017/January-images/Milito%20letter%20antiquities.pdf)]

**If Bears Ears Monument Gets Smaller, Oil And Gas Operators Are Poised To Push For Drilling Rights.** According to Salt Lake Tribune, “In making their case for rescinding Bears Ears National Monument, Utah officials have downplayed the potential for oil and gas development on the lands that five tribes persuaded President Barack Obama's administration to set aside under the Antiquities Act. But a review of Bureau of Land Management records indicates that industry does hope to tap hydrocarbon deposits under parts of the Bears Ears region that Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke may soon recommend removing from the monument.” [Salt Lake Tribune, [6/17/17](http://www.sltrib.com/home/5351997-155/if-bears-ears-monument-gets-smaller)]

# General National Monuments and Public Lands

## Rhetoric: Zinke Philosophically Opposed to Public Lands Transfer

**ZINKE:** “You know, philosophically upfront, I’m -- I’m just not an advocate for sale or transfer of public land. But I am an advocate for -- you know, there’s some good programs on stewardship programs within the Department of Ag. That was a bipartisan effort that transferred to degree (ph) management, as long as all parties agree what that management will look like. I think that’s on the table. In some places, you know, you’re stacked up on -- you have the state and you have a local management, the state management and the federal management on the same piece of property. Is that really in the best interest of the country and how you manage the property? So I -- I think that’s always an open -- open dialogue.” [U.S. House Appropriates Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

### Reality: Zinke’s National Monument Review Was “Undercover” Land Transfer

**High Country News: “Land Transfer Advocates Steer Their Focus To Monuments: A Transfer Movement Moves To Rescind Monuments And Weaken The Antiquities Act.”** “The attempt to abolish Bears Ears and other national monuments is part of a fresh tack in the larger push by conservative lawmakers to purge federal management from public land in the West… While land transfer bills continue to circulate, many of Utah’s land transfer advocates have shifted to a different tactic to undermine federal management in the West: undoing national monuments and hobbling the mechanism presidents can use to create them — the Antiquities Act. Once again, several states have followed Utah’s lead… At least six Western states now have resolutions or bills to rescind or shrink monuments or undermine the Antiquities Act.” [High Country News, [4/12/17](http://www.hcn.org/articles/Public-land-transfer-advocates-target-national-monuments-bears-ears)]

**Center for American Progress: National Monument Review Was Undercover Land Transfer Effort.** “If Zinke truly opposes selling our parks and public lands to the highest bidder, he will leave Bears Ears and the rest of our national monuments as they are. Zinke’s coming decision on Bears Ears will demonstrate how far he is willing to go to help the fossil fuel industries. Any changes made to the protection of the monuments should be seen for what they are: A sell-off of America’s parks and public lands.” [The Hill, [6/8/17](http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/energy-environment/336809-zinkes-monuments-review-is-land-seizure-in-disguise)]

### Reality: National Monuments Review A “Political Favor to Senator Orrin Hatch.”

**National Monuments Review Launched As a Favor To Hatch.**  “As a political favor to Utah Sen. Orrin Hatch, President Donald Trump last month issued an executive order instructing Zinke to [review all monuments designated since 1996](http://www.sltrib.com/opinion/5258028-155/zinke-kicks-off-monuments-review-this?fullpage=1)that exceed 100,000 acres, including Bears Ears and the 1.9 million-acre Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, designated by President Bill Clinton in 1996.” [The Salt Lake Tribune, [5/15/17](http://www.sltrib.com/home/5293060-155/some-urge-more-public-input-as)]

## Rhetoric: Presidents Can Reduce the Size of Existing Monuments

**Zinke: “I Don’t Think There’s Too Much Question That A Monument Can Be Adjusted.”** According to E&E News, “But Zinke pointed to past changes to monuments, asserting that previous presidents have altered sites at least 18 times. ‘I don’t think there’s too much question that a monument can be adjusted. Whether a monument can be rescinded or not, that is a question for the courts. I’m going to do the right thing,’ Zinke said.” [E&E News, [7/31/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/07/31/stories/1060058133)]

Reality: The President Does Not Have Power to Reduce or Rescind National Monuments

**Legal Scholars: President Does Not Have Authority To Rescind Monuments**. According to the High Country News, “A May 2017 legal analysis by Mark Squillace, a law professor at the University of Colorado, and three other scholars, argues that the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 ‘makes it clear that the President does not have any implied authority to (abolish or modify monuments), but rather that Congress reserved for itself the power to modify or revoke monument designations.’” [High Country News, [6/13/17](http://www.hcn.org/articles/zinke-wants-to-significantly-shrink-bears-ears-national-monument)]

**“Antiquities Act Does Not Say The President May Rescind Such Designations.”** According to Robert Rosenbaum in *The Washington Post*, “The Antiquities Act does not say the president may rescind such designations, but proponents of revocation argue that the president has the implied power to do so. They argue that the Constitution’s grant of executive authority to the president is broad and that this is merely one of the unstated powers encompassed within that broad grant.” [Washington Post, [3/29/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/no-president-trump-cant-revoke-national-monuments/2017/03/29/35e53336-10cd-11e7-ab07-07d9f521f6b5_story.html?utm_term=.8b0527991967)]

### Reality: Only Congress Can Change The Boundaries of a National Monument

**Former Interior Secretary Sally Jewell: “Only Congress Has That Ability.”** “Yeah, exactly. The Antiquities Act was created back in 1906 because there were many Native American sacred sites that were being destroyed and looted. And so the president was given the authority to act very quickly to protect those objects of cultural interest, but also objects of scientific interest and beyond. And no president has revoked a monument. That's not been done. And the only time they've modified it has been for relatively minor boundary adjustments. And even that was cleared up by further action in - taken by Congress in 1976 and 1970 that clarified that only Congress has that ability.” [NPR, [8/25/17](http://www.npr.org/2017/08/25/546021535/trump-administrations-plan-to-reduce-protected-land-size-criticized)]

Rhetoric: Monument Designations Negatively Impacted Local Economies and Multiple Use

**ZINKE**: “There is no doubt that it is drop-dead gorgeous country and that it merits some degree of protection, but designating a monument that - including state land- encompasses almost 1.5 million-acres where multiple-use management is hindered or prohibited is not the best use of the land and is not in accordance with the intention of the Antiquities Act.” [DOI, [6/12/17](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/secretary-zinke-submits-45-day-interim-report-bears-ears-national-monument-and-extends)]

**Ryan Zinke: “In Some Cases, The Designation Of The Monuments May Have Resulted In Loss Of Jobs, Reduced Wages And Reduced Public Access.”** “In this case, the administration, as you all know, has heard from members of Congress and states and, in some cases, the designation of the monuments may have resulted in loss of jobs, reduced wages and reduced public access. And in the case of sign public land use, we feel that the public, the people that the monuments affect, should be considered. And that’s why the President is asking for a review of the monuments designated in the last 20 years to see what changes, if any, improvements can be made, and give states and local communities a meaningful voice in the process.” [White House Press Briefing, [4/25/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/04/25/press-briefing-secretary-interior-ryan-zinke-executive-order-review)]

**Ryan Zinke: “And When They Designate A Monument, What It Does Is It Restricts It And Sometimes It Restricts It From Traditional Uses Like Grazing. Public Access, In Some Cases, Can Be Restricted Because Gates Go Up.”** “And remember, the monuments before this happened were public land. And when they designate a monument, what it does is it restricts it and sometimes it restricts it from traditional uses like grazing. Public access, in some cases, can be restricted because gates go up. So I think you have to proceed carefully on it. But multiple use on much of our land was designed under Pinchot to use for the public good for all of us, and not necessarily single use. And that’s where we are.” [White House Press Briefing, [4/25/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/04/25/press-briefing-secretary-interior-ryan-zinke-executive-order-review)]

**National Monument Review Memorandum: Restrictions on “Vegetative Management” Indirectly Hinder Grazing in National Monuments.** “In regard to grazing, while it is uncommon for proclamations to prohibit grazing outright, restrictions resulting from monument designations on activities on vegetative management can have the indirect results of hindering livestock-grazing uses.” [Memorandum for the President, accessed [9/18/17](https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/4052225-Interior-Secretary-Ryan-Zinke-s-Report-to-the.html)]

Reality: National Monuments Improved Local Economies

**Headwaters Economics Found Local Community Improved Around 17 National Monuments After Designation.** “Chris Mehl is the Policy Director of Bozeman-based Headwaters Economics. The non-partisan research organization published three studies, the most recent in June, on the economic performance of local communities adjacent to 17 national monuments in the West. ‘In all 17 cases, the performance of the community surrounding the national monument improved,’ Mehl says. ‘Jobs went up, per capita income — which is a great way to measure prosperity in a community, how much money is coming in per-person — went up in every case single case that we studied for example.’” [MTPR, [8/10/17](http://mtpr.org/post/national-monuments-are-money-makers-businesses-across-west%27)]

### Reality: National Monuments Were Managed for Multiple Use

**Former Interior Department Deputy Solicitor: “One Of The Strengths Of National Monuments Is We Know How They Work: They’re Managed For Multiple Uses…”** “In designating such sites, Congress may set the boundaries, then exclude or include any activities, such as grazing or oil and gas development, as it deems necessary. ‘When Congress enacts wilderness areas or national conservation areas, often it includes specific management provisions in its designations,’ explained former Interior Department Deputy Solicitor for Land Resources Justin Pidot, who is now an associate professor at the University of Denver Sturm College of Law. ‘It could be a wilderness area with uranium mining. If Congress did that, the designation is not worth a lot.’ But given that congressional leeway, it can be difficult to compare how the lands included in the Bears Ears monument could fare under a different status. ‘Without seeing the specifics of what a legislative vehicle looks like, it’s really hard to know how to compare a national monument designation to other designations,’ Pidot said. ‘One of the strengths of national monuments is we know how they work: They’re managed for multiple uses so long as those uses are consistent with the care and protection of the cultural historic resources that are present. It’s a well-trod path.’” [E&E News, [6/6/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060055610)]

### Reality: Oil and Gas Industry Had Little Interest in Drilling Bears Ears

**Oil and Gas Industry Showed Little Interest in Bears Ears.** “A recent study commissioned by the left-leaning Center for American Progress found that Bears Ears ranks in the 52nd percentile for oil and gas resource potential as compared with areas of comparable size throughout the West. Bears Ears ranks in the 68th percentile for mineral resources. ‘The places they are looking at scaling back don’t have extraordinarily high resource potential,’ said Matt Lee-Ashley, a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, in an interview with the Washington Examiner. ‘You don’t see the big oil and gas companies clamoring to get in there [Bears Ears], and that’s indicative of the resource potential not being outstanding,’ added Lee-Ashley, who is also a former deputy chief of staff at the Department of the Interior.” [Washington Examiner, [7/27/17](http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/shrinking-monuments-could-open-land-for-mining-and-drilling-but-energy-industry-isnt-interested/article/2632628)]

Reality: Grazing Continues on National Monuments

**2017: Congressional Research Service Found “No Changes To Livestock Grazing On The Ground As A Result Of The Establishment Of The [Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks] Monument.”** “To date, there have been no changes to livestock grazing on the ground as a result of the establishment of the monument, according to BLM. For instance, there have been no changes to terms and conditions of grazing leases and permits, or the number of acre s grazed, as a result of the monument proclamation, according to the agency. However, BLM has asked livestock permittees to ‘enhance their communication’ with the agency on maintenance activities that occur on linear features (e.g., pipelines) and roads.” [Congressional Research Service, [7/14/17](https://www.organmountains.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/OMDPNM-Grazing-Final-Memo_CRS_2017.pdf)]

**2017: Grand Staircase-Escalante Designation Did Not Lead to Reductions in Grazing.** “The Presidential proclamation designating the Monument in 1996 included language specifically providing for the continuation of grazing on the Monument. Although grazing use levels have varied considerably from year to year due to factors like drought, no reductions in permitted livestock grazing use have been made as a result of the Monument’s designation nearly 20 years ago.” [BLM Utah, accessed [9/18/17](https://eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/projects/lup/69026/89840/107421/GSENM_GRAZING_EIS_FACT_SHEET_7-28-2015_%282%29.pdf)]

**2017: Grazing Plan Finalized for Craters of the Moon National Monument.** “Federal officials on Friday released a cattle grazing plan for central Idaho's Craters of the Moon National Monument and Preserve that immediately came under fire from an environmental group. The U.S. Bureau of Land Management's Final Environmental Impact Statement allows cattle grazing on nearly all of the roughly 275,000 acres (111,290 hectares) it administers in the monument. The document stems from a federal lawsuit filed by the Western Watersheds Project citing concerns about sage grouse and a subsequent court ruling requiring the federal agency to come up with a new plan. Lisa Cresswell, the planning and environmental coordinator for the Twin Falls District of the BLM, said the document combined with the BLM's 2015 Greater Sage Grouse Approved Resource Management Plan Amendment protects sage grouse habitat while allowing grazing in Craters of the Moon.” [Associated Press, [5/26/17](https://www.usnews.com/news/best-states/idaho/articles/2017-05-26/us-cattle-grazing-plan-for-idaho-monument-draws-criticism)]

**2010: Carrizo Plain Management Plan Allowed Grazing on More Than 170,000 Acres.** “The Interior Department’s final plan for managing the Carrizo Plain National Monument -- an area that has been referred to as ‘California’s Serengeti’ -- will continue to allow livestock grazing in spite of calls from some environmentalists that grazing violates the monument’s charter.” [Land Letter, 4/15/10]

**Grazing Allowed in Parts of Vermilion Cliffs, Upper Missouri River Breaks, Sonoran Desert, Ironwood Forest, Grand Canyon-Parashant, Great Sequoia, Canyons of the Ancients, and Craters of the Moon National Monuments.** [Headwaters Economics, accessed [9/18/17](https://headwaterseconomics.org/wp-content/uploads/NatlMon_Permitted_Uses.pdf)]

## Rhetoric: First National Monument Was Small and “Controversial”

**Zinke Believed First National Monument Designated Was “Controversial.”** “But in his current review of dozens of national monuments, Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke has both repeatedly turned to Devils Tower as an example of how monuments should be designated — referring to its relatively small footprint — and pointed to the site as ‘controversial’ at its 1906 creation. ‘His first monument, the Devils Tower in Wyoming, was about 1,200 acres. Yet in recent years we’ve seen single monuments span tens of millions of acres,’ Zinke said in April. His comments came as President Trump signed an executive order mandating a review of all monuments created since 1996 that encompass more than 100,000 acres. A final report on that review is due Aug. 24.” [E&E News, [8/11/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/stories/1060058704/search?keyword=ryan+zinke)]

### Reality: Protection of Devils Tower Had Advocates at Local, State, and Federal Level

**University of Wyoming History Professor: Protection of Devils Tower Was a “Grass-Roots Attempt.”** “University of Wyoming history professor Phil Roberts questioned Zinke’s characterization of the monument’s early days as controversial, noting that state and federal lawmakers had pushed for the area to become a national park for more than a decade, while also working to ensure the land did not fall into private ownership. ‘This is a community’s attempt, or a grass-roots attempt, to create a national monument. By the time the Antiquities Act came around, it appeared ... that this would be the solution to protecting it,’ Roberts said. ‘Any suggestion that suddenly Theodore Roosevelt got up on his high horse and set aside something just because he was president can’t be further from the truth.’” [E&E News, [8/11/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/stories/1060058704/search?keyword=ryan+zinke)]

### Reality: Teddy Roosevelt Also Designated 800,000 Acre Grand Canyon National Monument

**1908: Teddy Roosevelt Designated 800,000 Acre Grand Canyon National Monument.** “When Teddy Roosevelt set aside 800,000 acres of the Grand Canyon in 1908, it was not a popular decision. Mining interests had long declared that Arizona’s future ‘depends exclusively upon the development of her mineral resources.’ But thanks to Roosevelt’s vision, Congress eventually came to recognize the value in protecting the Grand Canyon as a national park, and Presidents Hoover and Johnson both invoked the Antiquities Act to expand it further.” [Westwise, [8/30/17](https://medium.com/westwise/fact-check-misleading-math-on-national-monuments-908f9679c47b)]

**Grand Canyon National Monument Was Larger Than All But Four Land National Monuments Under Review by Zinke.** [DOI Press Release, [5/5/17](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/interior-department-releases-list-monuments-under-review-announces-first-ever-formal)]

## Rhetoric: Previous Administrations Have Reduced The Size Of Monuments At Least 18 Times, So There’s No Reason We Can’t Do It Today

**National Monument Review Memorandum: “Existing Monuments Have Been Modified By Successive Presidents In The Past, Including 18 Reductions In The Size Of Monuments, And There Is No Doubt That President Trump Has The Authority To Review And Consider Recommendations To Modify Or Add A Monument.”** [Memorandum for the President, accessed [9/18/17](https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/4052225-Interior-Secretary-Ryan-Zinke-s-Report-to-the.html)]

### Reality: This Hasn’t Happened in 50 Years – Before New Conservation Laws Were Passed

**President Has Not Altered National Monument Boundary Since 1964.** “Presidents have adjusted the size of national monuments about a dozen times before. ‘Those were primarily very small adjustments. Sometimes lands were omitted, sometimes lands were added,’ McIntosh said. ‘And no president has made even minor boundary adjustments since Kennedy in 1964.’ Since that time, too, Congress passed the Federal Land Management and Policy Act in 1976, which remade public land law and reserved more power over national monuments for Congress.” [Atlantic, [6/14/17](https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/06/obama-conserved-13-million-acres-in-utahcan-trump-un-conserve-them/530265/)]

### Reality: Prior Reductions Weren’t Contested Because They Were Based on New Information

**Monument Reductions Were Not Challenged in Court, Occurred Prior to Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.** “But, legal scholars note, none of those reductions were ever challenged in court, so there is no legal opinion on whether presidents actually had the power to make them. And all of them occurred prior to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, which some experts believe more explicitly limits presidential powers to revoke or change monuments. Moreover, many of those earlier readjustments were based on new information. Taft, for instance, reduced the Navajo monument once better mapping showed exactly where the threats to cliff dwellings and other Native American antiquities existed, says Professor Keiter.” [Christian Science Monitor, [4/26/17](https://www.csmonitor.com/Environment/2017/0426/Can-the-president-shrink-or-even-eliminate-national-monuments)]

### Reality: Better Technology Reduced the Need to Change Monument Boundaries

**Increased Mapping and Scientific Knowledge Reduced Need for Monument Changes.** “Some argue that the monument reductions made in the early part of last century were necessary because the government lacked the technological expertise to determine exactly what areas should be protected — challenges that no longer exist. ‘A majority of the past adjustments were to correct for mistakes of what was or wasn’t preserved in the original monument boundaries. When presidents designated monuments in the early part of the century, they often did so with limited knowledge of where objects of scientific or historic interest were,’ said Virginia Cramer, a spokeswoman for the Sierra Club’s ‘Our Wild America’ campaign. ‘Given the robust public process and improved mapping and scientific information, no monument designated in the past 80 years has been reduced by a later president,’ she said.” [Washington Times, [7/4/17](http://m.washingtontimes.com/news/2017/jul/4/bears-ears-monument-changes-have-precedent/)]

### Reality: Most National Monument Reductions Have Been Small

**Prior Monument Reductions Have Been Small.**

* **Eisenhower Reduced Great Sand Dunes National Monument in Colorado by 8,920 Acres.** [Deseret News, [6/12/17](https://www.deseretnews.com/article/900000045/times-in-history-when-u-s-presidents-have-acted-to-shrink-monuments.html)]
* **Eisenhower Reduced Arches National Monument by 240 Acres.** [PEER, [1/15/17](https://www.peer.org/assets/docs/nps/National_Monuments_FAQ.pdf)]
* **Eisenhower Reduced Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument by 470 Acres.** [PEER, [1/15/17](https://www.peer.org/assets/docs/nps/National_Monuments_FAQ.pdf)]
* **Eisenhower Reduced Colorado National Monument by 91 Acres.** [PEER, [1/15/17](https://www.peer.org/assets/docs/nps/National_Monuments_FAQ.pdf)]
* **Eisenhower Reduced Glacier Bay National Monument by 24,295 Acres.** [PEER, [1/15/17](https://www.peer.org/assets/docs/nps/National_Monuments_FAQ.pdf)]
* **Truman Reduced Santa Rose Island National Monument by 4,700 Acres.** [Deseret News, [6/12/17](https://www.deseretnews.com/article/900000045/times-in-history-when-u-s-presidents-have-acted-to-shrink-monuments.html)]
* **Taft Reduced Navajo National Monument by 320 Acres.** [Deseret News, [6/12/17](https://www.deseretnews.com/article/900000045/times-in-history-when-u-s-presidents-have-acted-to-shrink-monuments.html)]
* **Presidents Taft, Howard, and Coolidge Reduced the 639,200 Acre Mount Olympus National Monument by 313,280 Acres.** Coolidge was responsible for virtually the entire reduction. [Deseret News, [6/12/17](https://www.deseretnews.com/article/900000045/times-in-history-when-u-s-presidents-have-acted-to-shrink-monuments.html)]
* Mount Olympus National Monument Was Reduced to Increase Timber Production for World War I Effort. “During World War I, the monument was reduced by one‑half to permit lumber production, especially spruce harvesting, for the war effort (Evans and Williams 1985; Lien 1992; Richardson 1968; Twight 1983; Williams 1999).” [National Park Service, [11/18/03](https://www.nps.gov/parkhistory/online_books/fs/monuments.htm)]
* **Kennedy Added 2,882 Acres and Removed 3,925 Acres from Bandelier National Monument.** [Congressional Research Service, [11/14/16](http://www.law.indiana.edu/publicland/files/national_monuments_modifications_CRS.pdf)]

**Utah Delegation Requested That Zinke Shrink Bears Ears by 90 Percent.** In contrast, the Utah delegation reportedly asked Secretary Zinke to shrink the size of Bears Ears by 1.2 million acres, down to “about 120,000 acres.” [The Salt Lake Tribune, [9/18/17](http://www.sltrib.com/news/environment/2017/09/17/utah-quietly-tells-feds-trim-bears-ears-monument-by-90-percent/)]

Rhetoric: Monuments Review Public Comments Did Not Reflect True Local Voice

**Monument Review Memorandum: Public Comments Did Not Reflect True Local Voice**. “The DOI received approximately 2.6 million form comments, associated with NGO-organized campaigns, which far outnumbered individual comments. Too often, it is the local stakeholders who lack the organization, funding, and institutional support to compete with well-funded NGOs. As a result, the public consultation processes that have occurred prior to monument designations have often not adequately accounted for the local voice.” [Memorandum for the President, accessed [9/18/17](https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/4052225-Interior-Secretary-Ryan-Zinke-s-Report-to-the.html)]

Reality: Over 99 Percent of Public Comments Supported Maintaining National Monuments

**Over 99 Percent of Public Comments Supported Maintaining National Monuments.** “More than 99 percent of the people who commented on President Donald Trump’s national-monuments review were in complete agreement: Leave the monuments alone. That’s the stunning result of a detailed new survey on the comments that the federal government solicited after Trump issued an executive order earlier this year to revisit the status of 27 national monuments.” [Outside Online, [8/23/17](https://www.outsideonline.com/2235841/new-study-leave-our-national-monuments-alone)]

* **88 Percent of Self-Identified Utahns Supported Bears Ears.** “Of the roughly 1,200 self-identified Utahns who commented, 88 percent recommended preserving the Bears Ears National Monument in its current form, while 11 percent argued the monument should be rescinded or significantly reduced in size, says Aaron Weiss, media director at CWP.” [Outside Online, [6/15/17](https://www.outsideonline.com/2193091/6-best-comments-people-gave-trump-about-bears-ears)]

Reality: Local Communities Advocated to Establish Monuments Years Prior to Designation

**Stakeholders Advocated for Gold Butte for At Least 13 Years.**

* **2003: The Committee Friends Of Gold Butte Was Formed To Educate The Public About Gold Butte And Engage The Public**. According to Friends of Gold Butte, “After the Clark County Act passed in 2002, the lack of protection for Gold Butte was a major concern for preservationists in southern Nevada. Increased visitation to the area resulted in accelerated destruction of important biological and cultural resources that the ACECs were established to protect. In early 2003, the committee Friends of Gold Butte was formed to educate the public about Gold Butte and engage the public in conservation solutions for the area.” [Friends of Gold Butte, accessed [8/18/17](http://www.friendsofgoldbutte.org/about/designations/)]
* **2016: Gold Butte National Monument Established by the Obama Administration.** [Washington Post, [12/28/16](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/with-new-monuments-in-nevada-utah-obama-adds-to-his-environmental-legacy/2016/12/28/e9833f62-c471-11e6-8422-eac61c0ef74d_story.html?utm_term=.6c803592ecaf)]

**Stakeholders Advocated for Bears Ears for At Least Six Years.**

* **2010: Utah Dine Bikeyah Forms to Advocate for Native America Cultural Needs and Land Stewardship Around Bears Ears.** [Men’s Journal, [Undated](http://www.mensjournal.com/adventure/articles/the-long-history-and-uncertain-future-of-bears-ears-national-monument-a-timeline-w467841)]
* **2016: Bears Ears National Monument Established by the Obama Administration.** [Washington Post, [12/28/16](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/with-new-monuments-in-nevada-utah-obama-adds-to-his-environmental-legacy/2016/12/28/e9833f62-c471-11e6-8422-eac61c0ef74d_story.html?utm_term=.6c803592ecaf)]

**Stakeholders Advocated for Cascade-Siskiyou for At Least 30 Years.**

* **1987: David Willis Took Over Soda Wilderness Council, Convinced State BLM Director to Keep Soda Mountain in Cascade-Siskiyou Region as a Wilderness Study Area.** “Active in the council since 1983, Willis took over as chairman in 1993. Unable to walk far enough to explore the wild canyons, Willis bushwhacked on horseback, reins “gripped between his wrists. He invited anyone who might help his quest - federal land managers, congressional aides and environmental leaders - to join him on the rugged ride to let the land speak for itself. Soda Mountain nearly fell off the tightrope several times. One key moment came in 1987, when BLM nearly dropped it from consideration as wilderness. Willis called Bill Luscher, the new state director of BLM, and invited him to ride the canyons. Afterwards, Luscher agreed to keep Soda Mountain a wilderness study area. ‘I felt very strongly that the area deserved protection,’ Luscher said. ‘I also really admired Dave Willis and his tenacity to keep going after something.’” [Associated Press, 8/7/00]
* **2017: Cascade Siskiyou Expanded by the Obama Administration.**

**Stakeholders Advocated for Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks for At Least Five Years.**

* **2009: Dona Ana County Commissioners Voted 5-0 in Favor of Resolution Supporting Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks Wilderness Act.** “Dona Ana County commissioners on Tuesday decided to back a federal measure that would create 259,000 acres of wilderness in the county. Commissioners heard from several opponent and supporters of the wilderness area before voting 5-0 in favor of a resolution in support of the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks Wilderness Act, introduced into Congress last week by New Mexico’s senators.” [Las Cruces Sun-News, 9/23/09]
* **2014: Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument Established By President Barack Obama with Proclamation 9131.** [Federal Register, [5/21/14](https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2014/05/28/2014-12508/establishment-of-the-organ-mountains-desert-peaks-national-monument)]

**Stakeholders Advocated for Rio Grande Del Norte for At Least Eight Years.**

* **2005: Local Environmental Advocate First Approached Congressional Delegation About Protecting Rio Grande Del Norte Area; Spent Years Generating Support.** “An environmental advocate who played an early role in rounding up support for protecting what’s now the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument has roots in Pueblo. Jim O’Donnell spent three years gathering support from ranchers and land-grant activists to protect the area and saw that work culminate with last Monday’s designation of the monument.” [The Pueblo Chieftain, 4/1/13]
* **2013: President Obama Established Rio Grande Del Norte National Monument**. [White House, [3/25/13](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2013/03/25/presidential-proclamation-r-o-grande-del-norte-national-monument)]

Rhetoric: Engaged Local Stakeholders During National Monument Review Process

**ZINKE:** “Finally, rural America has a voice again… For years, the people of Utah and other rural communities have voiced concern and opposition to some monument designations. But too often in recent history, exiting presidents make designations despite those concerns…  I’m interested in listening to those folks. That’s what my team and I will be doing in the next few months.” [DOI Press Release, [4/26/17](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/secretary-zinke-weighs-president-trumps-executive-order-directing-interior-review)]

**ZINKE:** “We have a open process where it’s regulations.gov because I -- I -- when I’ve evaluated the Bears Ears, I think I’ve talked to Nature Conservancy and -- and spent, you know, an enormous amount of time and then reviewing the thousands of -- of -- of comments on it.” [U.S. House Appropriations Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

**Zinke: “I Look Forward To Hearing From And Engaging With Local Communities And Stakeholders As This Process Continues.”** According to a press release Zinke Said, “Today’s action, initiating a formal public comment process finally gives a voice to local communities and states when it comes to Antiquities Act monument designations. There is no pre-determined outcome on any monument. I look forward to hearing from and engaging with local communities and stakeholders as this process continues.” [DOI, Press Release, [5/5/17](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/interior-department-releases-list-monuments-under-review-announces-first-ever-formal)]

**Zinke: “President Trump And I Opened The Formal Public Comment Period – The First-Ever For Monuments Designated Under The Antiquities Act – In Order To Give Local Stakeholders A Voice In The Decision-Making Process.”** According to a press release Zinke said, “President Trump and I opened the formal public comment period – the first-ever for monuments designated under the Antiquities Act – in order to give local stakeholders a voice in the decision-making process. After hearing some feedback, I'd like to remind and reassure folks that even if a monument is modified, the land will remain under federal ownership. I am strictly opposed to the sale or transfer of our public lands, and nothing in this review changes that policy.” DOI, Press Release, [7/11/17](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/interior-secretary-ryan-zinkes-statement-end-monuments-review-public-comment-period)]

Reality: Zinke Only Visited Eight of the Twenty-Seven Monuments Under Review

**Zinke Only Visited Eight of the Twenty-Seven Monuments Under Review.** [Department of Interior Press Release, [8/24/17](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/secretary-zinke-sends-monument-report-white-house)]

Reality: Many Local Stakeholders Felt Left Out of Monument Process

**Zinke Met With Residents and Elected Officials in Closed-Door Discussions.** “U.S. Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke took a 90-minute helicopter tour of the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument on Thursday and met with residents and elected officials in closed-door discussions that are expected to shape the monument’s future. By the end of the day, Zinke didn’t overtly state support or opposition for reducing the three-year-old monument’s current size.” [Las Cruces Sun-News, [7/27/17](http://www.lcsun-news.com/story/news/local/2017/07/28/u-s-secretary-interior-ryan-zinke-reviews-organ-mountains-desert-peaks/517917001/)]

* **Zinke Did Not Respond to Request for Meeting With Pro-Monument Chamber of Commerce and Sportsmen Groups.** “At least two organizations in favor of keeping the monument intact — the Las Cruces Green Chamber of Commerce and the Southwest Consolidated Sportsmen — said they extended invitations to host Zinke during his visit to Las Cruces. But the invites went unanswered. Carrie Hamblen, executive director of the Green Chamber of Commerce, said the organization will host a roundtable discussion Friday morning at a local outfitting business. But she’s not expecting Zinke to attend, even though he was invited. The pro-monument viewpoint isn’t widely enough represented in Zinke’s meetings, she said.” [Las Cruces Sun-News, [7/27/17](http://www.lcsun-news.com/story/news/local/2017/07/28/u-s-secretary-interior-ryan-zinke-reviews-organ-mountains-desert-peaks/517917001/)]
* **Monument Supporters Were Angry Zinke Did Not Participate in Public Forum.** “A number of monument supporters and some monument critics took issue with Zinke not appearing in a public forum Thursday evening that was open to anyone. And proponents of the monument said they were concerned that stakeholders sharing their views weren’t adequately represented in the closed-door discussions. The forum drew a full house to a large room inside the Las Cruces Convention Center. Speakers included Las Cruces Mayor Pro Tem Greg Smith, other government officials, and local boxing star Austin Trout.” [Las Cruces Sun-News, [7/27/17](http://www.lcsun-news.com/story/news/local/2017/07/28/u-s-secretary-interior-ryan-zinke-reviews-organ-mountains-desert-peaks/517917001/)]

**Veterans Groups Were Disappointed That Zinke Signaled Interest in Shrinking Organ Mountains While Visiting Monument and Stakeholders.** “We told Sec. Zinke that the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument is an integral part of Doña Ana County’s identity, and we urged him to leave the national monument intact. Our community worked for over a decade to protect the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks area, and it should not be undone in a mere 120-days. We were discouraged to learn about his interest in shrinking the national monument, especially before meeting with diverse stakeholders today, and after not attending the community town hall last night.’” [Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks, [7/28/17](https://www.organmountains.org/news/statement-from-veterans-following-hike-with-doi-secretary-ryan-zinke/)]

**Zinke Cancelled Visit With U.S. Representative Dina Titus (D-NV) and Other Stakeholders During Nevada Monument Tour, But Talked With Tribe Over Phone.** “Zinke had planned to stay in Mesquite through Monday to meet with U.S. Rep. Dina Titus, D-Nev., and stakeholders there and in Overton on the last leg of a swing through the West. But he canceled those plans to return to Washington, D.C., for the first Cabinet meeting with new White House Chief of Staff John Kelly. While the Monday meeting was scuttled, Zinke did meet with some stakeholders Sunday and has scheduled phone meetings with others, including the Moapa Band of Paiute Indians, according to his staff.” [Las Vegas Review-Journal, [7/30/17](https://www.reviewjournal.com/news/politics-and-government/zinke-caps-review-of-nevada-monuments-with-bunkerville-visit/)]

**As Zinke Listens In On The Monumental Divide At Utah’s Bears Ears, Natives Feel Unheard.** According to Washington Post, “Long after the Black Hawk helicopter carrying Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke flew off into the bright Utah sky, James Adakai stood in the airport parking lot with an angry frown frozen on his face. As chairman of a tribal commission established to oversee the Bears Ears National Monument, Adakai, who is Navajo, felt he deserved a place in a meeting Zinke arranged at the airport to discuss the monument’s fate.” [Washington Post, [5/14/17](http://thebaltimorepost.com/as-zinke-listens-in-on-the-monumental-divide-at-utahs-bears-ears-natives-feel-unheard)]

**Bears Ears Initial Comment Period Was Just 15 Days.** “On May 5, Zinke said he would give the public just 15 days — an unusually short window — to comment on Bears Ears National Monument. Most actions by government agencies allow for 60 or 90 day public comment periods. The comment period ran from May 12 through May 26.” [Westwise, [6/20/17](https://medium.com/westwise/secretary-zinkes-magic-8-ball-approach-to-policy-making-f4014506f86f)]

**DOI’s Online Comment Process Fails to Account for Lack of Internet Access Among Many American Indian Tribes. “**Interior officials are soliciting input on the matter online through the federal website [www.regulations.gov,](http://www.regulations.gov/) despite the lack of internet access among some American Indians affiliated with the tribes that either proposed or support the 1.3-million-acre monument, recently designated in San Juan County's Cedar Mesa and surrounding canyon country west of Blanding… New Mexico's Sen. Martin Heinrich contends language and digital barriers will prevent many American Indians from participating. ‘Internet access is far from universal in Indian Country,’ the Democratic lawmaker wrote in a letter last week to Zinke, asking for public hearings and a 45-day comment extension. ‘Across vast reaches of the Navajo Nation, even cell service is hard to come by.’” [High Country News, [5/15/17](http://www.sltrib.com/home/5293060-155/some-urge-more-public-input-as)]

Rhetoric: National Monument Review Process Had “No Pre-Determined Outcome.”

**Ryan Zinke: “But Given My Personality, I’m Going To Be Transparent About It.”** “Certainly the governor is going to have an influence. Jobs are going to have an influence. The congressional folks are going to have an influence on it. But given my personality, I’m going to be transparent about it.” [White House Press Briefing, [4/25/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/04/25/press-briefing-secretary-interior-ryan-zinke-executive-order-review)]

**Zinke: “Often Under Previous Administrations, Decisions Were Made In The Washington, D.C., Bubble…This Monument Review Is The Exact Opposite.”** According to a press release, “‘Too often under previous administrations, decisions were made in the Washington, D.C., bubble, far removed from the local residents who actually work the land and have to live with the consequences of D.C.’s actions. This monument review is the exact opposite,’ said Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke.’” [DOI, Press Release, [7/11/17](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/interior-secretary-ryan-zinkes-statement-end-monuments-review-public-comment-period)]

**Zinke Frequently Called for Local Input Into National Monuments Review; Stated There Was “No Pre-Determined Outcome On Any Monument.”** “Throughout the national monument review, Secretary Zinke has fallen all over himself saying he wants to hear from all Americans, including monument supporters. He has urged monument advocates to submit electronic comments, saying their voice would be heard. From the beginning of the review, Zinke has repeatedly said ‘there is no pre-determined outcome on any monument.’” [Westwise, [8/16/17](https://medium.com/westwise/zinke-vs-zinke-on-national-monuments-1aeddfc112f5)]

Reality: Zinke’s Monuments Review Was a “Guessing Game” and “Reality Show Charade” Lacking Clear Process

**National Monument Review Process Was “Guessing Game.”** “Zinke said Thursday that he was recommending no changes for the two Washington and Idaho monuments, though the final decision is the president’s to make. Interior provided no explanation of the process that led to the secretary’s announcement or any analysis to support it. Zinke said he called on his training as a geologist — ‘I realize Craters of the Moon is a living timeline of geologic history,’ he said — and his experience as a sportsman. Like-minded people ‘from all over the country go to Hanford Reach for some of the best fishing and bird hunting around,’ he noted. His comments drew a swift rebuke from the Center for American Progress. ‘The only thing that’s been consistent throughout Zinke’s review is its arbitrariness,’ said Kate Kelly, the organization’s public lands director. ‘From the get-go, it’s been a guessing game on … how the review is being conducted and what is driving Zinke’s decisions.’ Kelly praised the decision to leave Hanford Reach and Craters of the Moon alone but said ‘the fate of 25 more monuments rests in the hands of a process without logic or transparency.’” [Washington Post, [7/13/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/07/13/two-national-monuments-are-no-longer-up-for-review-interior-says-that-leaves-25/?utm_term=.1e62d42bbd24)]

**CWP: Zinke’s Monument’s Review Was a “Week-by-Week Reality Show Charade.”** “In response to Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke’s announcement removing Grand Canyon–Parashant National Monument from his efforts to shrink or eliminate national monument designations, the Center for Western Priorities released the following statement from Executive Director Jennifer Rokala: ‘It’s time for Secretary Zinke to end this week-by-week reality show charade. Does he really expect us to say ‘thank you’ for taking the only legal option available to him? By pardoning a landscape-scale monument of more than one million acres, he’s acknowledging both the value and legal status of all of America’s national monuments. ‘The people of Arizona and the West deserve better from the Interior Department. The small business owners and rural economies that thrive because of our national monuments need Secretary Zinke to provide certainty right now, not one week at a time.’” [Center for Western Priorities, [8/4/17](http://westernpriorities.org/2017/08/04/statement-on-interior-secretary-zinkes-pardon-of-grand-canyon-parashant-national-monument/)]

**U.S. Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-AZ): “The Secretary Has Not Been Forthcoming With The Criteria … We Haven’t Had Transparency With Who He’s Meeting.”** “While Rep. Raúl Grijalva, D-Ariz., was glad Zinke decided to remove Grand Canyon-Parashant from the list of monuments under review, he said, ‘It didn’t belong on the list anyway.’ In a phone interview on Friday. Grijalva questioned a lack of transparency in Zinke’s review process. ‘The secretary has not been forthcoming with the criteria … we haven’t had transparency with who he’s meeting,’ he said. ‘Pulling rabbits out of a hat is not the proper way.’ Environmental advocates, too, criticized Zinke for providing few details surrounding the review process. ‘Zinke is holding America’s national monuments hostage and we have no idea what the terms are,’ Randi Spivak, public lands director for the Tucson-based Center for Biological Diversity, said in an emailed statement.” [Arizona Central, [8/4/17](http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-environment/2017/08/04/grand-canyon-parashant-national-monument-emerges-unscathed-trump-review/541167001/)]

**Department of Interior Press Release Made No Mention of Process or Justification for Decision.** “Zinke said Thursday that he was recommending no changes for the two Washington and Idaho monuments, though the final decision is the president’s to make. Interior provided no explanation of the process that led to the secretary’s announcement or any analysis to support it.” [Washington Post, [7/13/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/07/13/two-national-monuments-are-no-longer-up-for-review-interior-says-that-leaves-25/?utm_term=.899a45436ed6)]

Reality: Zinke Refused to Release Final Monuments Review Report to the Public; Disregarded Millions of Comments in Favor of Maintaining Existing Boundaries

**Unclear When Final Monuments Review Report Would be Released to the Public.** “A White House official confirmed that Trump had received the report but would not say when it would be released or when the president would act on Zinke’s recommendations. The secretary had earlier taken six monuments off the review list without any detailed explanation of why.” [Washington Post, [8/24/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/08/24/interior-secretary-recommends-trump-alter-a-handful-of-national-monuments-but-declines-to-reveal-which-ones/?utm_term=.1f635ea1d760)]

[Rep. Ruben J. Kihuen @RepKihuen](https://twitter.com/RepKihuen)

Disappointed in the lack of specificity & transparency from [@SecretaryZinke](https://twitter.com/SecretaryZinke/) regarding our monuments! [#MonumentsForAll](https://twitter.com/search?q=%23MonumentsForAll)

[Twitter, [8/24/17](https://twitter.com/RepKihuen/status/900779167129763840)]

[Rep. Jacky Rosen @RepJackyRosen](https://twitter.com/RepJackyRosen)

Is this the kind of transparent process you had in mind, [@SecretaryZinke](https://twitter.com/SecretaryZinke/)? [#KeepItPublic](https://twitter.com/search?q=%23KeepItPublic) [nbcnews.com/politics/white…](https://t.co/jtAxf1yKm3)

[Twitter, [8/24/17](https://twitter.com/RepJackyRosen/status/900880160655896576)]

**CWP: Monuments Review Designed to End as a “Publicity Stunt.”** “By executive order, Zinke’s report is due on Thursday. The secretary has given roses to a half dozen monuments already, but left the fate of more than 20 others uncertain. Now it appears he’s trying to talk about anything other than his attack on national monuments, as he heads to Montana on Thursday, then celebrates the National Park Service’s 101st anniversary on Friday. All this comes on the heels of his romantic getaway to the Mediterranean, which he took instead of visiting any of the 19 monuments he had not yet been to as part of his review. Unless Interior and the White House come clean quickly, it appears the national monuments review will end as it began — as a publicity stunt, ignoring the pleas of 2.7 million Americans who told Secretary Zinke and President Trump in no uncertain terms to leave their national monuments alone.” [Westwise, [8/23/17](https://medium.com/westwise/the-white-house-cant-keep-its-own-story-straight-about-trump-s-national-monuments-review-5e815516479)]

**Ryan Zinke Believed Majority Of Comments In Favor Of Monuments “Demonstrated A Well-Orchestrated National Campaign Organized By Multiple Organizations.”** “‘Comments received were overwhelmingly in favor of maintaining existing monuments and demonstrated a well-orchestrated national campaign organized by multiple organizations,’ Zinke said in the statement on Thursday. He acknowledged supporters’ point that monuments can bring economic benefits to local communities. But he also noted opponents’ concerns that designations had translated into reduced public access, confusing management plans ‘and pressure applied private land owners … to sell.’” [Washington Post, [8/24/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/08/24/interior-secretary-recommends-trump-alter-a-handful-of-national-monuments-but-declines-to-reveal-which-ones/?utm_term=.1f635ea1d760)]

[Western Priorities‏ @WstrnPriorities](https://twitter.com/WstrnPriorities)

.[@SecretaryZinke](https://twitter.com/SecretaryZinke) demonstrates how to disregard 2.7 million opinions in a single paragraph. [#KeepItPublic](https://twitter.com/hashtag/KeepItPublic?src=hash)

[Twitter, [8/24/17](https://twitter.com/WstrnPriorities/status/900779127749222400)]

**Former Interior Secretary Bruce Babbit: “I Don’t Understand Why This Is Being Done With Such Secrecy. It’s Hard To Respond When They’re Hiding The Ball**.” “I don’t understand why this is being done with such secrecy. It’s hard to respond when they’re hiding the ball,’ said Babbitt, who served two terms as Arizona’s governor before joining the Clinton administration. ‘We need some transparency. The public is entitled to know what’s going on.’”[E&E News, [8/29/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/stories/1060059353/search?keyword=cascade-Siskiyou)]

**U.S. Senator Dianne Feinstein (D-CA): “Unfortunately, He’s Keeping The Details Of That Decision Secret, Providing Nothing More Than A Brief Report Summary That Fails To Name The Monuments He Suggested Cutting.”** “Sen. Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.) demanded Thursday that Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke make public a formal report asking President Trump to reduce protections on a number of national monuments. ‘Today, we learned that Secretary Zinke in his report to the president proposed changing a ‘handful’ of the monuments under review,’ Feinstein said in a statement. ‘Unfortunately, he’s keeping the details of that decision secret, providing nothing more than a brief report summary that fails to name the monuments he suggested cutting.’” [The Hill, [8/24/17](http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/347896-feinstein-urges-zinke-to-make-national-monuments-review-public)]

Reality: Voters Did Not Trust Interior Secretary Zinke to Make Decisions About National Monuments

**Poll Found Only Six Percent of Registered Voters Trusted Zinke With Public Lands Decisions.** “A new Morning Consult/Politico poll shows voters do not trust U.S. Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke with decisions on the future of America’s national monuments. When choosing from a number of options, poll participants ranked Secretary Zinke in last place, with only 6 percent of registered voters placing their trust in him. Voters instead trust the views of local residents, whose message to Secretary Zinke is clear: hands off our national monuments. Indeed, a Center for Western Priorities analysis of public comments submitted to the Department of Interior revealed 98 percent expressed support for keeping or expanding national monument designations.” [Westwise, [8/11/17](https://medium.com/westwise/voters-dont-trust-ryan-zinke-on-national-monuments-and-for-good-reason-ebc0d88c37b2)]

**Zinke’s Poll Numbers Dropped During Monument Review.** “The Western Values Project released the results of a new poll showing Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke’s popularity falling in his home state of Montana. The survey, conducted just after his recommendation to shrink national monuments was released, shows Zinke with a -10 job approval rating, down 7 percent since July. The poll surveyed 502 Montana registered voters from August 25-29.” [Western Values Project, [8/31/17](http://westernvaluesproject.org/new-poll-zinkes-popularity-tanks-as-montanans-learn-about-monuments-review/)]

### Reality: Zinke’s Final Monuments Report Was “Riddled With Inaccuracies”

**Salt Lake Tribune Columnist Robert Gehrke: “Zinke’s Leaked Memo Reads Like A Term Paper A D-Plus High Schooler Would Have Slapped Together The Night Before It Was Due...”** “Zinke’s leaked memo reads like a term paper a D-plus high schooler would have slapped together the night before it was due. It dutifully rehashes all the anti-monument talking points, dismisses the public sentiment in favor of national monuments generally and sprinkles in some pretty glaring misstatements — like how a New Mexico monument abuts the U.S.-Mexico border and creates border control issues, even though it was drawn to be five miles away from the border, or that it limits traditional sacred uses in Bears Ears, even though it specifically does not. It doesn’t include specific suggestions for boundaries or scale of any revisions to existing monuments. That work apparently still needs to be done.” [Salt Lake Tribune, [9/22/17](http://www.sltrib.com/news/politics/2017/09/22/gehrke-the-four-things-you-should-know-about-the-once-secret-bears-ears-recommendations/)]

**Salt Lake Tribune Editorial Board: “Zinke’s Report Was too “Maddingly Vague” to Give White House Guidance or Legal Rationale for Action.** “Now that the report from Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke has been leaked to the press, it is apparent that the future of those monuments, especially Utah’s Bears Ears and Grand Staircase-Escalante, is even more muddled than it was before. That might offer a glimmer of hope to people who oppose the whole idea of national monuments, to those who hold out a mostly irrational hope of an economic bonanza sparked by a land-rush of access to a lot of coal, oil, natural gas and grazing land that either isn’t there or isn’t profitably exploitable. But Zinke’s report is so maddeningly vague that it provides the White House with little guidance on just what it should do, and what legal rationale it should offer for doing it.” [Salt Lake Tribune, [9/19/17](http://www.sltrib.com/opinion/editorial/2017/09/19/tribune-editorial-zinkes-report-leaves-a-monumental-mess/)]

**Seattle Times Editorial Board: Zinke Monuments Report Was “Riddled With Inaccuracies.”** “Zinke’s report goes beyond the scissoring of monument boundaries and recommends altering management plans designed to harmonize wildlife, recreation and public use. It’s also riddled with inaccuracies, including basic details on hunting and fishing rights at two monuments in New Mexico. The report is as unsettling as it is legally untenable. It contravenes the conservation and recreation values of the vast majority of Americans. All the more reason for members of Congress give it the heave-ho.” [Seattle Times, [9/21/17](http://www.seattletimes.com/opinion/editorials/congress-must-challenge-ryan-zinkes-attack-on-national-monuments/)]

**U.S. Senator Martin Heinrich (D-NM) Highlighted Several Errors in Zinke’s Monuments Report.** “Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke’s proposed recommendations to alter two of New Mexico’s national monuments are based on factual errors, Sen. Martin Heinrich said today. The New Mexico Democrat said the department’s draft monument review contains inaccuracies about road closures, hunting and fishing access, and the U.S.-Mexico border as it pertains to the two monuments in his state. ‘I certainly hope that before the president acts on any of these recommendations, that the secretary makes sure that he gets his facts straight,’ said Heinrich during an unrelated hearing. The senator added that he was creating a fact sheet on the New Mexico monuments that more consistently reflect ‘conditions on the ground.’” [E&E News, [9/19/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/09/19/stories/1060061117)]

**Center for Western Priorities: Zinke Monuments Report Was “Embarrassingly Thin on Substance…”** “It’s now clear why the White House has been keeping this memo under lock and key—Secretary Zinke tried to toss the White House a political hot potato. This so-called ‘final report’ is embarrassingly thin on substance, but is filled with politically-motivated suggestions sure to please anti-park members of Congress and their friends in the oil, gas, and coal industries. The report takes a cudgel to America’s public lands legacy, encouraging President Trump to make an unprecedented attack that would close off national monuments for future generations.” [Center for Western Priorities, [9/17/17](http://westernpriorities.org/2017/09/17/response-to-leak-of-white-house-national-monuments-review/)]

**New Mexicans: Toss Out Inaccurate Monument Report.**According to Politico, “Sens. Tom Udall and Martin Heinrich, as well as Reps. Ben Ray Lujan and Michelle Lujan Grisham, sent a letter to White House Chief of Staff John Kelly on Tuesday calling on the White House to reject Zinke’s report urging changes to a host of national monuments after they claimed to find a number of factual errors surrounding recommended changes to two in their state. ‘The public deserves better than predetermined political conclusions based on hearsay and claims that are easily disproven if the Department had taken the time to listen to and work with local communities,’ they wrote.” [Politico, 9/27/17]

**Center for Western Priorities: All Of The Falsehoods In Ryan Zinke’s Leaked National Monuments Report.** “In the week since the Washington Post published Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke’s secret final report on national monuments, a staggering number of falsehoods and misleading claims have come to light. The errors, taken in whole, suggest the entire report is nothing more than a pretext to open protected public lands to coal, oil, and timber extraction, with little attention paid to accuracy.” [Medium, [9/26/17](https://medium.com/westwise/all-of-the-falsehoods-in-donald-trumps-secret-national-monuments-report-4f62904b9275)]

# Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument

## Rhetoric: Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument Has Areas That Don’t Need Protection

**ZINKE:** After touring Grand Staircase Escalante by helicopter, Zinke stated “There are some absolutely beautiful areas inside the monument and areas I can see need protection but there are other areas I’m not so sure.” [St. George News, [5/11/17](https://www.stgeorgeutah.com/news/archive/2017/05/11/tds-on-the-ground-with-zinke-grand-staircase-trip-brings-optimism/#.WUQnhBMrLUo)]

### Reality: Utahns Believe Grand Staircase – Escalante Designation Was Good for Utah

**“By A Margin Of Better Than 2 To 1, Utahns Believe That The Monument’s Designation Was Good For Their State.”** A 2016 survey by The Pew Charitable Trusts found that by a margin of better than 2 to 1, Utahns believed that Grand Staircase-Escalante’s designation as a national monument was good for their state. [The Pew Charitable Trusts, [7/2016](http://www.pewtrusts.org/~/media/assets/2016/08/3935-pew-utah-grand-staircaseescalante-topline-final.pdf)]

**Utah Office Of Tourism Highlights Grand Escalante As One Of Its “Most Visited Parks” And Notes Its Vast Size And “Phenomenal” Allure.”** The allure of Grand Staircase–Escalante National Monument (GSENM) is phenomenal… It is spectacular and contains the most extensive network of slot canyons in Utah. At Grand Staircase–Escalante, Utah visitors will find a vast and pristine backcountry that affords excellent opportunities for solitude and unconfined wilderness recreation, along with great scenic driving opportunities and endless camping options, both developed and primitive.  [Utah Office of Tourism, Accessed [6/16/17](https://www.visitutah.com/places-to-go/most-visited-parks/grand-staircase-escalante)]

### Reality: Grand Staircase Escalante Is Good For The Local Economy

**Since Grand Staircase-Escalante’s Designation In 1996, Per Capita Incomes Have Risen 28 Percent And Employment Has Risen 40 Percent**. According to the Center for American Progress, “In fact, since Grand Staircase-Escalante’s designation in 1996, per capita incomes have risen 28 percent and employment has risen 40 percent in the communities adjacent to the national monument. While such statistics do not prove causation, they do disprove the idea that the national monument prevented economic growth.” [CAP, [5/9/17](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2017/05/09/432111/case-grand-staircase-escalante-national-monument/)]

**Grazing Within Grand Staircase-Escalante Has Remained Virtually Unchanged Since The Monument’s Designation**. “When the Monument was designated, there were 106,645 total AUMs [“Animal Unit Month” or ‘AUM,’ is the amount of forage needed to sustain one cow and her calf, one horse, or five sheep or goats for a month.] Of these, 77,400 were active AUMs. Today, there are 106,202 total AUMs and 76,957 are active…. Actual use levels on the Monument have averaged just over 41,000 AUMs annually. There is no clear trend in actual use levels and no evidence of “sharp” or ‘precipitous’ declines in grazing on the Monument since designation.” [BLM Utah, Accessed [6/16/18](https://eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/projects/lup/69026/89840/107421/GSENM_GRAZING_EIS_FACT_SHEET_7-28-2015_%282%29.pdf)]

### Reality: Courts Have Already Ruled That Grand Staircase Escalante Was Established Legally

**2004 Federal Ruling Upheld Legal Authority Of Designating Grand Staircase**. “A federal judge on Monday affirmed President Clinton’s establishment of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, rejecting claims that the president had overstepped his bounds… ‘The record is undisputed that the President of the United States used his authority under the Antiquities Act to designate the Grand Staircase Monument,’ wrote [Judge Dee] Benson in his 47-page ruling issued Monday.” [AP, 4/19/04]

# Bears Ears National Monument

## Rhetoric: Bears Ears Needs to Be “Right Sized”

**ZINKE**: “I’ve submitted my 45-day interim report to President Trump expressing my belief that the monument needs to be right-sized and that it is absolutely critical that an appropriate part be co-managed by the Tribal nations. I also recommend that Congress take action to protect some areas.” [DOI, [6/2/17](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/secretary-zinke-submits-45-day-interim-report-bears-ears-national-monument-and-extends)]

### Reality: Proposed Cuts Would Eliminate 90 Percent of Bears Ears and Leave Important Antiquities Unprotected

**Zinke Planned to Recommend a 90 Percent Cut to Bears Ears National Monument.** “As the Trump administration continues to stoke a debate around commemorating our nation’s history, it’s increasingly clear whose culture they don’t care about. Yesterday, Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke reportedly recommended that President Trump eliminate nearly 90 percent of Bears Ears National Monument in Utah, an area sacred to Native American tribes across the Southwest. This unprecedented and illegal action would endanger tens of thousands of archaeological sites over an area the size of Glacier National Park.” [Westwise, [8/25/17](https://medium.com/westwise/trump-administration-aims-to-eliminate-90-percent-of-utah-park-protecting-archaeological-sites-5635224a5a74)]

**90 Percent Cut to Bears Ears Would Lead to Loss of Protection for Important Antiquities.** “A new report from Archaeology Southwest shows just how damaging it would be for President Trump to unprotect Bears Ears National Monument. Dozens of leading archaeologists noted that, while the park encompasses an estimated 100,000 archaeological sites, only around 10 percent of the area has been surveyed. These ruins and rock art have long been threatened by heavy looting and vandalism. In 2009, the Bureau of Land Management uncovered thousands of looted objects, such as pots and woven baskets, taken from ruins and grave sites. A map prepared by the state of Utah shows just how widespread antiquities and historic sites are across Bears Ears. There is no way President Trump and Secretary Zinke could shrink Bears Ears by nearly 90 percent without leaving the vast majority of these antiquities unprotected.” [Westwise, [8/25/17](https://medium.com/westwise/trump-administration-aims-to-eliminate-90-percent-of-utah-park-protecting-archaeological-sites-5635224a5a74)]

## Rhetoric: Tribes “Very Happy” About Reducing the Size of Bears Ears

**Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke: “This Is A First. We Have Not Had This Before... [The Native American Tribes Are] Pretty Happy And Willing To Work With Us.”** [Deseret News, [6/12/17](http://www.deseretnews.com/article/865681811/Zinke-Bears-Ears-monument-boundaries-need-to-change.html)]

### Reality: Tribes Were Not Happy with Zinke’s Plans for Bears Ears

**Tribal Coalition: “We Don’t Want It To Be Rescinded.”** According to the Washington Post, “Filfred said he told Zinke, and later his assistant, whom the secretary did not name, that the coalition of Ute, Navajo, Hopi and Zuni tribe leaders who fought 10 years for a monument designation wanted no change. He said Zinke is apparently speaking with the leader of a small Navajo faction that opposed the monument but isn’t part of the nation’s leadership. ‘We don’t want it to be rescinded,’ Filfred said. ‘We wanted it left alone. Right now, what I’m hearing is this is only a recommendation. But when they do make that move, we’re ready as a Navajo nation for a lawsuit, and all the other tribal leaders are ready. We have others who are ready for litigation. This is uncalled for.’” [Washington Post, [6/12/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/06/12/interior-secretary-recommends-delaying-a-final-decision-on-changing-bears-ears-national-monument/?utm_term=.ce410184b25a)]

**Utah Dine Bikeyah “Deeply Upset” By Zinke’s Interim Bears Ears Plans.** “The coalition did not release a statement, but Utah Dine Bikeyah — a Native American advocacy organization at the heart of the monument push — slammed the preliminary recommendations. ‘We are deeply upset at Secretary Zinke’s announcement today,’ said a statement released by the Salt Lake City organization. ‘The secretary failed to take the time to listen to the very people who know best what is at stake at Bears Ears and ignored overwhelming support in Utah for the monument. If the administration proceeds in attempting to shrink the monument, we could lose funding potential, proactive management and law enforcement resources for the land that would no longer be included in the monument.’” [Deseret News, [6/12/17](http://www.deseretnews.com/article/865681811/Zinke-Bears-Ears-monument-boundaries-need-to-change.html)]

**Navajo Nation Council Delegate Davis Filfred: “We Wanted It Left Alone…We’re Ready As A Navajo Nation For A Lawsuit, And All The Other Tribal Leaders Are Ready.”** “Davis Filfred, a Navajo Nation Council Delegate, reacted to the notion that tribes are ‘happy’ with the proposal: ‘I haven’t been happy with [Secretary Zinke] since day one. I don’t know what that word happy is…We don’t want it to be rescinded. We wanted it left alone. Right now, what I’m hearing is this is only a recommendation. But when they do make that move, we’re ready as a Navajo nation for a lawsuit, and all the other tribal leaders are ready. We have others who are ready for litigation. This is uncalled for.’” [Westwise, [6/13/17](https://medium.com/westwise/interior-secretary-zinke-caught-lying-about-tribal-support-for-his-bears-ears-plan-1e157143c6fe)]

**Navajo Nation’s Davis Filfred: “I Haven’t Been Happy With Him Since Day One,’ Said Davis Filfred. ‘I Don’t Know What That Word Happy Is.”** According to the Washington Post, “The statement brought a quick rebuke from representatives of the Navajo Nation. ‘I haven’t been happy with him since day one,’ said Davis Filfred. ‘I don’t know what that word happy is.’ Filfred said he told Zinke, and later his assistant, whom the secretary did not name, that the coalition of Ute, Navajo, Hopi and Zuni tribe leaders who fought 10 years for a monument designation wanted no change. He said Zinke is apparently speaking with the leader of a small Navajo faction that opposed the monument but isn’t part of the nation’s leadership.” [Washington Post, [6/12/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/06/12/interior-secretary-recommends-delaying-a-final-decision-on-changing-bears-ears-national-monument/?utm_term=.c16f5e1c3c6c)]

**Tribal Coalition: “This Is Uncalled For.”** According to the Washington Post, “‘We don’t want it to be rescinded,’ Filfred said. ‘We wanted it left alone. Right now, what I’m hearing is this is only a recommendation. But when they do make that move, we’re ready as a Navajo nation for a lawsuit, and all the other tribal leaders are ready. We have others who are ready for litigation. This is uncalled for.’” [Washington Post, [6/12/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/06/12/interior-secretary-recommends-delaying-a-final-decision-on-changing-bears-ears-national-monument/?utm_term=.c16f5e1c3c6c)]

**Native American Rights Fund Lawyer Natalie Landreth: “[T]his Was Really Just A Cynical Effort To Distract Indian Country From The Devastating Blow Of Reducing The Size Of The Monument.”** Natalie Landreth, a lawyer for the Native American Rights Fund representing three of the tribal nations (The Ute Mountain Ute, Hopi, and Zuni Tribes) supporting the monument, stated “Our initial reaction on behalf of the three tribes we represent was that this was really just a cynical effort to distract Indian Country from the devastating blow of reducing the size of the monument.” [Indian Country Today, [6/13/17](https://indiancountrymedianetwork.com/news/native-news/zinke-says-tribes-happy-bears-ears-modifications-tribes-disagree/)]

**Op-Ed by Matthew Chappell of the USFS: Zinke Discounts Native Voices.** According to Missoulian, “As Secretary Ryan Zinke concludes touring the Bear’s Ears, he seems set on committing an adamant political massacre of an ignorance similar to Custer’s vainglorious annihilation at the Little Bighorn — by discounting Native American voices. Zinke only met with tribal leaders for an hour, repeatedly neglecting requests for ‘equal time.’ The majority of Zinke’s visit was spent with monument opponents, including Gov. Gary Herbert, Sen. Orrin Hatch and Congressman Rob Bishop. They convened behind closed doors and held private meetings in helicopters and straddled on horseback.” [Missoulian, [6/15/17](http://missoulian.com/opinion/columnists/zinke-discounts-native-voices/article_00b8eb8f-61f0-52d0-bb1f-6ec5ade918f0.html)]

**Navajo Nation Attorney General Says That Bears Ears Lands are Holy Lands.** According to the Normangee Star, “Ethel Branch, Navajo Nation attorney general, said the lands within Bears Ears are essentially holy lands that hold critical plants, minerals and powers that members of many tribes rely on to heal and strengthen themselves.” [Normangee Star, [6/19/17](http://normangeestar.net/2017/06/19/utah-monument-recommendation-spurs-action/)]

**Tribal Leaders Outraged Over Zinke’s Reported Bears Ears Recommendation.** ”Leaders of the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition expressed outrage over reports that Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke has recommended to President Trump that he make dramatic reductions to Bears Ears National Monument. “Secretary Zinke’s recommendation is an insult to Tribes. He has shown complete disregard for Sovereign Tribes with ancestral connections to the region, as well as to the hundreds of thousands of people who have expressed support for Bears Ears National Monument,” stated Carleton Bowekaty, Zuni councilman and Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition Co-Chair.” [KUTV, [8/25/17](http://kutv.com/news/local/tribal-leaders-outraged-over-zinkes-reported-bears-ears-recommendation)]

**Tribes Call Interior Secretary’s Monument Recommendations ‘An Insult,’ Vow Lawsuits.** ”Tribal leaders on Friday blasted Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke, saying his plan to shrink Utah’s Bears Ears National Monument is “an insult” and shows blatant disregard for their concerns. In a statement, the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition — a governing body established by the Obama administration to oversee the massive 1.5 million-acre Bears Ears site — said they plan to sue.” [Washington Times, [8/25/17](http://m.washingtontimes.com/news/2017/aug/25/tribes-call-interior-secretarys-monument-recommend/)]

**Tribes Are ‘Willing To Go Into Battle’ If Trump Makes Utah’s Bears Ears Monument Smaller.** ”Utah tribal leaders are steeling themselves for legal battle should President Donald Trump act on a proposal to shrink Bears Ears National Monument, saying such a move would be an insult to the five tribes that sought the monument. While details of Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke’s report on the 27 big monuments Trump instructed him to “review” remain under wraps, the secretary had previously announced Bears Ears should be significantly reduced.” [Salt Lake Tribune, [8/25/17](http://www.sltrib.com/news/environment/2017/08/25/bears-ears-backers-bracing-for-legal-battle/)]

### Reality: Many Americans Excluded From Comment Process

**DOI’s Online Comment Process Fails to Account for Lack of Internet Access Among Many American Indian Tribes. “**Interior officials are soliciting [input on the matter online](https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=DOI-2017-0002-0001) through the federal website [www.regulations.gov,](http://www.regulations.gov/) despite the lack of internet access among some American Indians affiliated with the tribes that either proposed or support the 1.3-million-acre monument, recently designated in San Juan County’s Cedar Mesa and surrounding canyon country west of Blanding… New Mexico’s Sen. Martin Heinrich contends language and digital barriers will prevent many American Indians from participating. ‘Internet access is far from universal in Indian Country,’ the Democratic lawmaker wrote in a letter last week to Zinke, asking for public hearings and a 45-day comment extension. ‘Across vast reaches of the Navajo Nation, even cell service is hard to come by.’” [High Country News, [5/15/17](http://www.sltrib.com/home/5293060-155/some-urge-more-public-input-as)]

# Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument

Rhetoric: Science and Biodiversity Should Guide Recommendations for Changes to Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument

**Zinke: “I Think You Have To Go To Science On What Objects, And In This Case Biodiversity, So Let’s Look At What That Means And How Do We Protect It.”** “While Zinke already has recommended National Recreation Area status for some new monument lands in Utah, he said if he recommends any border alterations in the Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument, doing so would have to protect the land’s unique biodiversity that led to the monument designation. ‘Generally I think you have to go to science on what objects, and in this case biodiversity, so let’s look at what that means and how do we protect it,’ Zinke said during a brief Saturday news conference along the shore of Hyatt Lake that included comments by U.S. Rep. Greg Walden. ‘This site is unique among the 27 sites I’m reviewing, not just because it’s in Oregon.” [Ashland Daily Tidings, [7/16/17](http://www.dailytidings.com/news/20170716/zinke-some-lands-may-be-better-suited-as-rec-areas)]

Reality: Cascade Siskiyou Was an “Ecological Wonder” Set Aside Specifically for Biodiversity; Boundary Reduction Not “Scientifically Defensible.”

**1997: World Conservation Union Identified Cascade-Siskiyou As One of 50 Areas of “Global Significance” for Plant Diversity in North America.** “In 1995, the BLM drew a jagged boundary around some 53,000 acres of Oregon public land bridging the Cascade and Siskiyou mountains. The agency designated the knot of mountains, steep canyons and grasslands an Ecological Emphasis Area, a label the government had never used before and hasn’t used since. In 1997, the World Conservation Union identified the region as one of 50 areas of ‘global significance’ for plant diversity in North America. Two years ago, the World Wildlife Fund decided to locate one of its five North American regional offices in nearby Ashland.” [Newhouse News Service, 3/9/00]

**Cascade-Siskiyou Was First National Monument Designated to Protect Biodiversity.** “When Clinton set aside the then-53,000-acre site in 2000, it marked the first time a monument had been created with the sole intention of protecting biodiversity. In his final weeks in office, Obama expanded the monument to its current 100,000 acres, asserting that the additional land would ‘increase habitat connectively, watershed protection and landscape-scale resilience for the area’s unique biological values.’” [E&E News, [8/18/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/stories/1060058952/search?keyword=cascade-Siskiyou)]

**85 Scientists: Cascade-Siskiyou Was An “Ecological Wonder…Home to A Spectacular Species of Plants and Animals.”** “Established by presidential proclamation in June 2000, the Monument is unique among the BLM’s National Conservation La nds in that it was established specifically to preserve an area of ‘remarkable biological diversity.’ Sitting a t the crossroads of four distinct ecoregions and encompassing a wide range of topography, climate and geology, the greater Cascade Siskiyou landscape is widely recognized as one of the most biologically diverse places in North America. The Monument proclamation describes it as an ‘ecological wonder’ that is ‘home to a spectacular variety of rare and beautiful species of plants and animals, whose survival in this region depends upon its continued ecological integrity.’” [Scientist Letter, [5/28/15](http://media.wix.com/ugd/93b739_8b109b376d0748fe96fbc8faa2e7aa9a.pdf)]

**Geos Institute President Dominick DellaSala: “This Is The Last Place Any Kind Of Monument Reduction Should Be Attempted…Reducing The Boundaries Is Not Scientifically Defensible.”** “In Oregon, climate change was a main reason to expand the Cascade-Siskiyou, as researchers pressed the Obama administration to protect whole watersheds and reduce habitat fragmentation between the Cascade and Siskiyou mountains. ‘It’s the only functional land bridge making that connection,’ says Dominick DellaSala, president and chief scientist at the Geos Institute, who was involved with research on the monument’s role in climate resilience. He describes Cascade-Siskiyou, which encompasses a wide variety of habitats including oak woodlands, mixed conifer stands and chaparral, as the first monument to biodiversity. ‘Traditional uses like logging are land-use stressors that are incompatible with the monument’s biodiversity.’ In fact, researchers pushed for a far larger expansion than the one Obama enacted. ‘This is the last place any kind of monument reduction should be attempted,’ DellaSala says. ‘Reducing the boundaries is not scientifically defensible.’” [High Country News, [8/24/17](http://www.hcn.org/articles/monuments-details-emerge-on-proposed-monument-cutbacks)]

**Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument Had Several Endemic Species and One of the Highest Diversities of Butterflies in the Country.** “The monument supports an exception al range of fauna, including one of the highest diversities of butterfly species in the United States. The Jenny Creek portion of the monument is a significant center of fresh water snail diversity, and is home to three endemic fish species, including a long isolated stock of redband trout. The monument contains important populations of small mammals, reptile and amphibian species, and ungulates, including important winter habitat for deer. It also contains old growth habitat crucial to the threatened Northern spotted owl and numerous other bird species such as the western blue bird, the western meadowlark, the pileated woodpecker, the flammulated owl, and the pygmy nuthatch.” [Presidential Proclamation, [6/9/00](https://www.blm.gov/or/resources/recreation/csnm/files/Proclamation_7318.pdf)]

Rhetoric: Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument Had Negative Impact on Timber Industry

Reality: Monument Designation Had Little Impact on Timber Jobs

**Headwaters Economics: Jackson County Economy Continued to Grow After Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument Designation.** “The communities in Jackson County, Oregon neighboring the Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument experienced strong growth after the designation of the monument, continuing previous growth trends.” [Headwaters Economics, [Spring 2017](https://headwaterseconomics.org/wp-content/uploads/CascadeSiskiyou.pdf)]

* **Headwaters Economics: Service Industry Jobs Increased Since Monument Designation.** “Services jobs—such as doctors, engineers, and teachers—account for the majority of employment growth in Jackson County in recent decades. These jobs are increasingly mobile, and many entrepreneurs locate their businesses in areas with a high quality of life.” [Headwaters Economics, [Spring 2017](https://headwaterseconomics.org/wp-content/uploads/CascadeSiskiyou.pdf)]

**Monument Designation Had Little Impact on Reduction in Timber Jobs Near Cascade-Siskiyou Compared to Price Fluctuations and Automation.** “In Jackson County, Oregon, which borders Cascade-Siskiyou, timber jobs have declined as a portion of the economy. However, the 2000 monument designation appears to have had little effect on that trend. Manufacturing, which includes log milling, now provides 8,542 jobs, compared with 6,384 jobs in 1970. That’s a smaller slice of the overall economy than it once was, Mehl says, but that’s because ‘the pie has grown so much.’ Mehl acknowledges the shifts experienced by counties like Jackson can be painful, even if the overall economy continues to improve. Still, monuments are not to blame. In fact, price fluctuations and increasing automation have destabilized timber, agriculture and mining industries, and such volatility is likely to continue.” [High Country News, [8/24/17](http://www.hcn.org/articles/monuments-details-emerge-on-proposed-monument-cutbacks)]

## Rhetoric: “Motorized transportation was prohibited in the original CSNM designation.”

**Monuments Review: “Motorized Transportation Was Prohibited In The Original CSNM Designation.”** [National Monuments Review Report, [9/18/17](https://www.eenews.net/assets/2017/09/18/document_gw_09.pdf)]

**Monuments Review: “Due To Poor Maintenance, Remaining Usable Roads In CSNM Are Unpassable And Unsuitable For Use.”** [National Monuments Review Report, [9/18/17](https://www.eenews.net/assets/2017/09/18/document_gw_09.pdf)]

### Reality: There Are Hundreds of Roads in Cascade-Siskiyou

**There Are Hundreds of Roads in Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument.** “A memo from Zinke to the president justifying his recommendation that the boundaries of the monument, which lies mostly in Oregon and crosses over into California, be ‘revised’ says motor vehicles aren’t allowed in it. ‘There are hundreds of roads inside this monument. I live on private land inside the monument. Do we walk or ride horses?’ asked Dave Willis, the chairman of the Soda Mountain Wilderness Council.” [Associated Press, [9/19/17](http://www.argusobserver.com/news/several-question-ryan-zinke-s-recommendation-to-cut-cascade-siskiyou/article_b1fc115c-9d5d-11e7-84de-43b306feee4e.html)]

## Rhetoric: Cascade-Siskiyou Should Be Amended to Protect Hunting and Fishing Rights

**Monuments Review: “The Proclamation Should Be Amended…To Protect Objects And Prioritize…Hunting And Fishing Rights.”** [National Monuments Review Report, [9/18/17](https://www.eenews.net/assets/2017/09/18/document_gw_09.pdf)]

### Reality: Hunting and Fishing Already Allowed in Cascade-Siskiyou

**Northwest Guides And Anglers Association Founder Bob Rees: “Rolling Back Protections On Cascade-Siskiyou Would Be The Worst Attack On Oregon Hunters And Anglers I’ve Seen In My Twenty Years As A Fishing Guide. American Outdoor Enthusiasts Should Have More Access To Public Lands, Not Less.”** “He also wondered why Zinke’s memo referred to protecting hunting and fishing rights, saying those activities are already allowed in national monuments. ‘These factual errors make it look disinformed,’ Willis said in a phone interview. ‘It’s sloppy work or an attempt to make something that’s unacceptable acceptable to people who don’t know better.’ Bob Rees, founder of the Northwest Guides and Anglers Association, said: ‘Rolling back protections on Cascade-Siskiyou would be the worst attack on Oregon hunters and anglers I’ve seen in my twenty years as a fishing guide. American outdoor enthusiasts should have more access to public lands, not less.’” [Associated Press, [9/19/17](http://www.argusobserver.com/news/several-question-ryan-zinke-s-recommendation-to-cut-cascade-siskiyou/article_b1fc115c-9d5d-11e7-84de-43b306feee4e.html)]

**Clinton Proclamation: “Nothing In This Proclamation Shall Be Deemed To Enlarge Or Diminish The Jurisdiction Of The State Of Oregon With Respect To Fish And Wildlife Management.”** [Presidential Proclamation, [6/9/00](https://www.blm.gov/or/resources/recreation/csnm/files/Proclamation_7318.pdf)]

**Obama Proclamation: “Nothing In This Proclamation Shall Be Deemed To Enlarge Or Diminish The Jurisdiction Of The State Of Oregon Or The State Of California With Respect To Fish And Wildlife Management.”** [Presidential Proclamation, [1/12/07](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2017/01/12/presidential-proclamation-boundary-enlargement-cascade-siskiyou-national)]

# Gold Butte National Monument

## Rhetoric: Gold Butte Monument Should be Revised to Protect Water Rights

**Zinke: Gold Butte Monument Should be Revised to Protect Water Rights.** “Zinke recommended revising the boundary ‘through the use of appropriate authority, including lawful exercise of the president’s discretion ... to protect historic water rights,’ according to the AP. The northern half of Gold Butte also is home to five of the Virgin Valley Water District’s springs in the Virgin Mountains, a study area under the Bureau of Land Management determined to have resources worthy of protection until Congress decides otherwise.” [Las Vegas Sun, [9/24/17](https://lasvegassun.com/news/2017/sep/24/this-land-is-your-land-for-now/)]

### Reality: Water District Had Enough Water Rights to Meet Projections Past 2080

**Water District Had Enough Water Rights to Meet Projections Past 2080.** “Virgin Valley Water District General Manager Kevin Brown said if the monument boundary couldn’t be changed to exclude the springs, he wanted specific protections added to the monument proclamation. He said the current language left opportunity for interpretation, which could cause problems down the road as people retire and staff rosters change at the water district and BLM. ‘We do have access to the springs; however, the language that President Obama put in the proclamation last year was not the language we had requested to Sen. (Harry) Reid,’ Brown said. ‘Ours was more inclusive to allow us to do things.’ According to the water district, the agency has sufficient existing surface water rights to meet annual projections to the year 2080 and beyond. Brown said that included the springs. He added that the district’s long-term plans included developing the surface and spring water to potable standards at an estimated cost of $40 million.” [Las Vegas Sun, [9/24/17](https://lasvegassun.com/news/2017/sep/24/this-land-is-your-land-for-now/)]

# Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument

## Rhetoric: Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks Monument Border “Abuts” the International Border; Was Security COncern

**Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks Monument Border “Abuts” the International Border Between the U.S. and Mexico.** “The report stated that the OMDP monument ‘abuts’ the border and that ‘border security is a concern resulting from the designation, as the proclamation restricts motorized transportation close to the border.’” [E&E News, [9/19/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/09/19/stories/1060061117)]

### Reality: Monument Boundary Five Miles from International Border

**Organ Mountains Monument Boundary Five Miles from International Border.** “He also said Zinke mischaracterized the proximity of the Organ Mountain-Desert Peaks National Monument to the international border. The report stated that the OMDP monument ‘abuts’ the border and that ‘border security is a concern resulting from the designation, as the proclamation restricts motorized transportation close to the border.’ Heinrich said that, based on Department of Homeland Security advice, the monument boundary was set 5 miles north of the international border.” [E&E News, [9/19/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/09/19/stories/1060061117)]

### Reality: Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument Did Not Interfere With Border Patrol

**U.S. Customs and Border Protection Commissioner Supported New Proposal.** “In addition to the nearly five mile buffer, the new proposal also provides an east-west route for Border Patrol to travel between the Potrillo Mountains Wilderness. And it underscores current law by expressly stating that the wilderness designation does not affect Border Patrol’s ability to conduct overflights above the wilderness areas or other border security activities in the wilderness areas, including the use of motorized vehicles while in pursuit of a suspect. The commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, who oversees Border Patrol, wrote a letter in strong support of the strengthened proposal. In the letter Commissioner Alan Bersin states that the bill, as modified, ‘would significantly enhance the flexibility of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to operate in this border area.’” [U.S. Senator Jeff Bingaman Press Release, 6/9/10]

**Former U.S. Border Patrol National Deputy Chief Ron Colburn: “After My Recent Site Visit To Las Cruces And The Potrillos, I Remain Convinced That This Is A Constructive Piece Of Legislation That Would Work To Protect Our International Border With Mexico And Protect Our Nationally Valuable Wilderness Resources.”** “I want to commend all parties who worked so hard to forge the ‘Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks Wilderness Act.’ After my recent site visit to Las Cruces and the Potrillos, I remain convinced that this is a constructive piece of legislation that would work to protect our international border with Mexico and protect our nationally valuable wilderness resources. This bill is clearly the end product of many hours of consultative work, numerous meetings and collaborative efforts of those who legislate, those who protect our precious, publicly stewarded lands and those who ultimately protect the homeland. It is apparent to me that the people, our American public that is, have been the sounding board for the intended positive outcomes of S.B. 1689, and all walks, straddling ‘both sides of the fence’ - no pun intended - have been consulted, including the ranching and agricultural community; environmental and wildlife conservationist non-governmental organizations and staunch supporters of protection of our borders and enforcement of our land’s laws.” [Las Cruces Sun-News, 9/19/10]

**2014: U.S. Customs And Border Protection: “This Designation Will In No Way Limit Our Ability To Perform Our Important Border Security Mission.”** “President Obama’s plan to designate a 500,000-acre national monument in southern New Mexico today will not impede the government’s ability to secure the Mexican border, according to U.S. Customs and Border Protection. The CBP statement refutes claims by Rep. Rob Bishop (R-Utah) and a local New Mexican sheriff that the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument would restrict land access and impede the U.S. Border Patrol from cracking down on illegal drug and human trafficking. ‘This designation will in no way limit our ability to perform our important border security mission, and in fact provides important flexibility as we work to meet this ongoing priority,’ CBP spokeswoman Jenny Burke said in an email.” [Environment And Energy Daily, 5/21/14]

## Rhetoric: Monument Proclamation Should be Amended to Prioritize Fishing and Hunting Rights

**Monument Review: “The Management Plan Should be Revised to Continue to Protect Objects and Prioritized Public Access…And Hunting and Fishing Rights.”** [National Monuments Review Report, [9/18/17](https://www.eenews.net/assets/2017/09/18/document_gw_09.pdf)]

### Reality: Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks Listed as One of Top Ten Public Lands Hunting Spots for Quail

**U.S. Senator Martin Heinrich (D-NM): Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks Listed as One of Top Ten Public Lands Hunting Spots for Quail.** “I’ve had the opportunity, in fact, to hunt everything from Mearns Quail to Javelina in the Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks National Monument. In addition, Petersen’s Hunting Magazine just last month listed that monument as one of the top ten public land destination hunts in the nation for quail.” [Westwise, [9/19/17](https://medium.com/westwise/senator-calls-out-multiple-factual-errors-in-national-monuments-report-to-donald-trump-9c462ac1251b)]

# Rio Grande Del Norte National Monument

## Rhetoric: Road Closures Led to Loss of Multiple Use

**Monument Review: “Road Closures Due To Monument Restrictions Have Left Many Grazing Permittees Choosing Not To Renew Permits.”** “Specifically, Heinrich said the report incorrectly stated that the footprint of the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument in Taos County had led to road closures, adversely affecting ranching. The report stated that ‘road closures due to monument restrictions have left many grazing permittees choosing not to renew permits.’ Heinrich said, ‘I confirmed with BLM [Bureau of Land Management] staff that that is not accurate.’” [E&E News, [9/19/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/09/19/stories/1060061117)]

### U.S. Senator Martin Heinrich (D-NM): “I Confirmed With BLM [Bureau Of Land Management] Staff That That Is Not Accurate”

**U.S. Senator Martin Heinrich (D-NM): “I Confirmed With BLM [Bureau Of Land Management] Staff That That Is Not Accurate.”** Specifically, Heinrich said the report incorrectly stated that the footprint of the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument in Taos County had led to road closures, adversely affecting ranching. The report stated that ‘road closures due to monument restrictions have left many grazing permittees choosing not to renew permits.’ Heinrich said, ‘I confirmed with BLM [Bureau of Land Management] staff that that is not accurate.’” [E&E News, [9/19/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/09/19/stories/1060061117)]

## Rhetoric: Monument Proclamation Should Be Amended to Prioritize Fishing and Hunting Rights

**Monument Review: “The Proclamation Should be Amended… to Protect Objects and Prioritized Public Access…And Hunting and Fishing Rights.”** [National Monuments Review Report, [9/18/17](https://www.eenews.net/assets/2017/09/18/document_gw_09.pdf)]

### Reality: Hunting and Fishing Improved in Rio Grande Del Norte Following Monument Designation

**U.S. Senator Martin Heinrich (D-NM):** **Hunting and Fishing Improved in Rio Grande Del Norte Following Monument Designation.** “As for the Rio Grande del Norte, I confirmed this morning with the largest membership sportsmens organization in New Mexico that hunting and fishing access have actually improved post-monument designation. And that the monument even hosts a bighorn sheep hunt that did not exist before the monument designation.” [Westwise, [9/19/17](https://medium.com/westwise/senator-calls-out-multiple-factual-errors-in-national-monuments-report-to-donald-trump-9c462ac1251b)]

# Methane

## Rhetoric: Zinke Wanted Taxpayers To Get “Fair Value” From Oil And Gas Drilling On Public Lands

**Zinke Wanted Taxpayers to Get “Fair Value” From Oil and Gas Extraction on Public Lands.** “During his confirmation hearing for the job of running the Department of the Interior, Ryan Zinke told the Senate he wanted taxpayers to get ‘fair value’ on resources extracted from public lands by private companies. But a recent move by him means taxpayers will get millions of dollars less from companies that extract oil and gas from public lands. Five months into the job, Zinke has arrived at a final decision, to the consternation of environmental and fiscal critics, on exactly how Interior will define what is an appropriate value for oil, gas and coal taken from lands collectively owned by U.S. citizens.” [Washington Post, [8/9/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/the-energy-202/2017/08/09/the-energy-202-the-interior-department-could-cost-taxpayers-at-least-60-million-by-rolling-back-obama-rule/598a23ef30fb045fdaef11ce/?utm_term=.dc0005d9e455)]

**ZINKE**: “That’s not what I said, ma’am…what I said was my position in methane, I think it’s a waste. And we both agree that flaring is a waste. So we’re looking at the rule in order to make sure that we can provide incentives to capture it. Because as a steward of your public lands and the arguer of public lands, I think just flaring it is a waste. So we had to make sure that we incentivize capture systems, we got to make sure that our isolated assets, you can connect. And we make sure that the tax payers getting a fair valuation on our public holdings.” [Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Hearing on Interior Budget, 6/20/17]

### Reality: Repeal of Coal Valuation Rule Would Cost Taxpayers Up To $75 Million in Royalties

**Interior Department: Repeal of Coal Valuation Rule Could Cost Taxpayers Up to $75 Million.** “Breaking his promise to ensure taxpayers receive a fair return from oil, gas, and coal development on U.S. public lands, Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke and the Interior Department plan to rescind 2016 royalty reforms at a cost of $75 million annually to U.S. taxpayers. At issue is a rule implemented by the Office of Natural Resources Revenue (ONRR) — Consolidated Federal Oil & Gas and Federal & Indian Coal Valuation Reform — which updated decades old rules on taxpayer-owned oil, gas, and coal. The rule, often referred to as ‘the ONRR rule,’ closed a major royalty loophole, first reported by Reuters, that allowed energy companies to sell coal, oil, and gas to their own companies at significantly depressed prices, thereby dodging royalty payments owed to taxpayers.” [Westwise, [8/4/17](https://medium.com/westwise/trumps-interior-secretary-is-sending-a-75-million-gift-to-oil-gas-and-coal-companies-876e40f46aa2)]

Reality: Methane Rule Could Save Taxpayers Hundreds of Millions of Dollars by Limiting Wasted Natural Gas

**Environmental Defense Fund: Oil and Gas Companies Wasted $330 Million of Natural Gas on Public Lands Annually.** “An in-depth analysis by ICF International estimates that fugitive and vented losses from oil and natural gas operations on federal and tribal lands amounted to over 65 billion cubic feet (Bcf) in 2013. This gas would be worth nearly $330 million at current prices. Mark Brownstein of EDF says ‘These losses, which are largely composed of the powerful pollutant methane, are an irresponsible use of taxpayer and tribal resources, and harmful to the climate.’ This report, commissioned by the Environmental Defense Fund, also identifies and measures methane abatement opportunities from federal and tribal lands, building on a 2014 analysis that focused on emission reduction opportunities from the onshore U.S. oil and gas industry.” [Environmental Defense Fund, [September 2015](https://www.edf.org/energy/substantial-loss-natural-gas-public-lands)]

**Federal Government and States Lost Hundreds of Millions of Dollars in Royalty Revenue from Wasted Natural Gas.** “The United States is the largest natural gas producer in the world, yet the American public has not benefited from the full potential of this energy resource due to venting, flaring, and leaks of significant quantities of gas during the production process. In fact, enough natural gas was lost between 2009 and 2015 to serve more than 6 million households for a year. According to a 2010 Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, that amount of wasted gas means states, tribes and federal taxpayers lose millions of dollars annually in royalty revenue for the Federal Government and the states that share it.” [Department of Interior Press Release, [11/15/16](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/interior-department-announces-final-rule-reduce-methane-emissions-wasted-gas-public)]

**Methane Rule Allowed Government to Set Adjust Flared Gas Royalty Rates to Save Money for Taxpayers.** “To ensure a fair return to the American taxpayer, the rule also clarifies when operators owe royalties on flared gas, and restores the government’s congressionally authorized flexibility to set royalty rates at or above 12.5 percent of the value of production.” [Department of Interior Press Release, [11/15/16](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/interior-department-announces-final-rule-reduce-methane-emissions-wasted-gas-public)]

**Department Of Interior Secretary Sally Jewell: “Not Only Will We Save More Natural Gas To Power Our Nation, But We Will Modernize Decades-Old Standards To Keep Pace With Industry And To Ensure A Fair Return To The American Taxpayers For Use Of A Valuable Resource That Belongs To All Of Us.”** [Department of Interior Press Release, [11/15/16](https://www.doi.gov/pressreleases/interior-department-announces-final-rule-reduce-methane-emissions-wasted-gas-public)]

### Reality: Zinke Packed Royalty Policy Committee With Representatives from Industry and Trade Associations That Have Cost Taxpayers Millions

**Zinke Packed Royalty Policy Committee With Representatives from Industry and Trade Associations.** “The establishment of a committee of external advisers is a fine concept at first glance; in reality, however, Zinke’s committee simply serves to empower an industry-led board with a self-dealing mission. Indeed, through this committee, the Trump administration is granting the oil, gas, and coal industries the power to determine what ‘fair’ looks like when it comes to the royalties, rents, and fees that they pay for the right to drill and mine taxpayer-owned resources. Zinke has stacked his committee with trade associations and individual companies that stand to benefit from weakened royalty collection policies. These groups have also actively avoided paying what they owe the American taxpayer. Furthermore, the committee is strikingly unbalanced in its partisanship: States that are led by Democratic governors were entirely shut out of the primary membership of the committee. Tribal nations that have expressed substantial concerns about the environmental and social impacts of federal oil, gas, and coal policies were likewise excluded from the committee, as were all national fiscal watchdog organizations that represent the interests of American taxpayers.” [Center for American Progress, [10/3/17](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2017/10/03/440191/fox-guards-henhouse/)]

**Oil and Gas Companies Represented Half of All Fines Collected by Office of Natural Resources Revenue; Lobbied Trump to Restore “Lucrative Royalty Loophole.”** “A review of federal data from the past 10 years found that oil and gas companies represented on the committee as members or alternates, or that serve on the trade association boards were responsible for more than half of all fines collected by the Office of Natural Resources Revenue.\* These fines include the following examples: Anadarko paid $17 million in 2011 to resolve claims of violating the False Claims Act by knowingly underpaying royalties owed on natural gas. Shell paid $2.2 million in 2011 to resolve claims of violating the False Claims Act by knowingly underpaying royalties owed on natural gas production. Chevron paid$1.1 million in 2011 for knowingly resuming improper claiming of deductions. In 2012, the company paid another $646,200 in fines for knowingly maintaining inaccurate data on a dozen royalty reports. Furthermore, committee member Cloud Peak Energy is a coal company that has successfully lobbied the Trump administration to restore a lucrative royalty loophole. The loophole, which the federal government estimates costs taxpayers $75 million per year in lost revenue, allows mining and drilling companies to sell coal, oil, and gas to their own subsidiaries at artificially low rates for the purpose of dodging royalty payments.” [Center for American Progress, [10/3/17](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2017/10/03/440191/fox-guards-henhouse/)]

**Taxpayers For Common Sense President Ryan Alexander: “Everyone In Wyoming Should Be Concerned That On A Committee Of 38 People, Tasked With Ensuring That Taxpayers Are Getting Their Fair Return From Oil And Gas Drilling On Our Public Lands, There Is Not One Person From A Public Interest Group, Representing The Federal Taxpayer.”** “Last week, I was offered the opportunity to present public comments to the Department of the Interior regarding the newly re-established Royalty Policy Committee. What I witnessed at that meeting was troubling. Everyone in Wyoming should be concerned that on a committee of 38 people, tasked with ensuring that taxpayers are getting their fair return from oil and gas drilling on our public lands, there is not one person from a public interest group, representing the federal taxpayer. In fact, most of the Royalty Policy Committee consists of officials from energy industries that are at the table to protect their own special interest. The truth is that for too long, taxpayers in Wyoming have lost billions of dollars in revenue because of an outdated system that benefits industry instead of everyday Americans.” [Caspar Star-Tribune, [10/12/17](http://trib.com/opinion/columns/alexander-oil-and-gas-royalty-policies-favor-industry-not-taxpayers/article_2211c4fd-8c86-5312-92f3-80fa8e43a725.html#comments)]

# Endangered Species

## Rhetoric: No “Off-Ramp” for Endangered Species Designations

**Zinke Believed Endangered Species Designations Lacked “Off-Ramp.”** “On other topics, Zinke said the Endangered Species Act has been ‘abused’ by bureaucrats and environmental groups and needs to be reformed to be less ‘arbitrary.’ ‘There is no off-ramp’ for species to be removed from protected status, he said.” [Associated Press, [9/25/17](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/zinke-interior-employees-loyal-trump-50088342)]

### Reality: Endangered Species Can be Delisted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

**“Delisting a Species: Section 4 of the Endangered Species Act.”** “The goal of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) is to conserve endangered and threatened species. Species are added to the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants in order to regulate activities that may impact them. When a species is able to survive on its own in the wild, the species is considered to be “recovered,” and protection of the ESA is no longer necessary…When the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) removes species from the Federal Lists of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants, we ‘delist’ them.” [USFWS Fact Sheet, Accessed [9/26/17](https://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/delisting.pdf)]

# Sage Grouse

## Rhetoric: Governors’ Reactions to Sage Grouse Secretarial Order Were “Positive”

**ZINKE:** “[The Governors’ reactions to the Sage Grouse secretarial order were] positive. One is that I -- the consultation, many of the governors had read it yet, but I -- but that’s why we had the -- the conference call, is to assure them that -- that most of it was on our side to form the task group from us to make sure that we’re on the same page and then give them more latitude. The governors are not all the same on the approach… Utah is quite a bit different than -- than even Wyoming and I -- I think that’s a good thing to have some flexibility on approach. The -- the evaluation is really not on habitat per se. It’s on whether the -- the numbers of -- of the sage-grouse are healthy.” [U.S. House Appropriates Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

### Reality: Wyoming and Colorado Governors Opposed Changes to Sage Grouse Plan

**Wyoming and Colorado Governors Opposed Changes to Current Sage Grouse Plan.** “The Department of the Interior may want to switch to a numbers game to protect the greater sage-grouse, but Gov. Matt Mead does not. In a letter to Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke, a professed outdoorsman and Teddy Roosevelt enthusiast, Mead and Colorado governor John Hickenlooper reiterated their belief that a population-based conservation strategy would ‘not be the right decision.’ Right now, the bird is managed by policy that protects its home range. The governors also said large changes to the plans are not likely necessary.” [Casper Star-Tribune, [6/2/17](http://trib.com/business/energy/mead-advises-zinke-sage-grouse-plans-don-t-need-big/article_93438b02-6660-5692-ab09-e26ff38bb6b7.html)]

* **Praise From Hickenlooper and Mead Staff Involved in the Review Process.** “John Swartout, a Republican who is a senior adviser to Colorado Gov. John Hickenlooper (D)[was] a member of a federal-state sage grouse task force that worked closely with Interior on the IMs and reviewed and provided input on them. ‘I think from a process standpoint the fact that Secretary Jewell and staff brought these [IMs] to the task force and gave us a chance to take a look at them was great,’ Swartout said. ‘t doesn’t always happen where the federal agencies do the kind of outreach they say they’ll do. We found it extremely helpful, and I think they found it extremely helpful.’ Jerimiah Rieman, chairman of the sage grouse task force and the natural resource policy director for Wyoming Gov. Matt Mead (R), echoed Swartout. ‘Throughout this greater sage grouse process, BLM has been open to allowing constructive dialogue,’ Rieman said. ‘We may not agree on every point, and I’m sure there will be things in the IMs we do not agree with. But we have to be open to continual dialogue moving forward as we find things that are working and things that are not working. And we need to have the flexibility to adapt.’” [E&E News, [9/1/16](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060042281)]

**Republican Nevada Governor Brian Sandoval Questioned Interior Department’s Changes to the Sage Grouse Conservation Plan.** “Nevada Gov. Brian Sandoval (R) has joined a growing chorus of government officials concerned about proposed changes to Obama-era greater sage grouse conservation plans that move away from habitat conservation and instead focus on state-by-state population goals. Sandoval’s office said in a statement to E&E News that the governor does not agree with focusing on population targets, as suggested by a review team of federal officials that was directed by Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke in June to evaluate the federal plans and suggest areas where changes are needed. The review team report, sent to Zinke on Aug. 4, suggests moving away from focusing on habitat protection and instead allowing states to develop ‘appropriate population objectives’ for complying with the plans.” [E&E News, [8/23/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/stories/1060059125/search?keyword=ryan+zinke)]

* **Wyoming Governor Matt Mead (R) Was Also Concerned About Sage Grouse Plan Changes.** “Mead, like Sandoval, thanked Zinke and the Interior Department for making ‘an earnest effort to collaborate with the states during the sage-grouse management review.’ But Mead said in his statement that Wyoming will continue to rely on its core sage grouse area strategy, developed in 2008, which focuses on habitat protection. ‘While DOI identifies numerous ways to improve federal plans, I am concerned that the recommendations place more focus on population targets and captive breeding,’ Mead said. Identifying and protecting prime sage grouse habitat provides ‘certainty’ to the oil and gas and coal mining industries in the Cowboy State, he said.” [E&E News, [8/23/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/stories/1060059125/search?keyword=ryan+zinke)]

## Rhetoric: Sage Grouse Plan is One Size Fits All

**ZINKE:** “That’s exactly what this secretarial order does – it provides more flexibility than the one-size-fits all solution [ordered by former Secretary Sally Jewell].” [ABC News, [6/7/17](http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/wireStory/interior-head-orders-review-sage-grouse-conservation-plan-47900868)]

### Reality: There are Seven Instructional Memorandums and 15 Individual Environmental Impact Statements Used To Direct Grouse Protection Measures Under the Current Plan

**Seven Instruction Memorandums Amending 98 Land Use Plans.**  The seven instruction memorandums (IMs) issued today by the Bureau of Land Management come nearly a year after Interior Secretary Sally Jewell in September 2015 finalized the federal plans, which amended 98 BLM and Forest Service land-use plans to include grouse protection measures. [E&E News, [9/1/16](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060042281)]

**15 Environmental Impact Statements.** There are “…15 coordinated environmental documents developed to provide a consistent approach to sustaining the [sage grouse] species and its habitat across the West.  By proactively addressing greater sage grouse conservation concerns on Forest Service- and BLM-administered lands, we hope to maintain the widest possible range of options for managing the public lands and for our neighboring landowners.” [USDA/USFS Sage Grouse Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Accessed [6/19/17](https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/r4/home/?cid=stelprdb5439561)]

# 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]

**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]

**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]

**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]

* **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]

## 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)]

# DOI Budget

## Rhetoric: Budget Does Not Prioritize Oil and Gas Over Clean Energy

**ZINKE:** “The president’s overall budget proposes about $11.7 billion and saves the taxpayers about 1.6 on it, but it does also prioritize America’s energy independence. And with an all-of-the-above strategy, we do not value oil and gas over alternative energies, but all-of-the- above is -- is a -- a prudent focus.” [U.S. House Appropriations Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

**ZINKE:** “So on-shore we don’t touch. But we also don’t touch, you know, it’s not just oil and gas. And I’m not -- I’m all of the above. I don’t favor oil and gas over coal, over wind, over nuclear. I’m just all of the above, because I think, being energy independent and, in some cases, energy dominant is in our best interests of the country. We all want clean, affordable, reliable, abundant energy. But that’s part of our royalty look of -- at it, too, is are we getting a -- a value out of royalty and make a recommendation to you on -- on how to fund our infrastructure.” [U.S. House Appropriations Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

### Reality: Trump’s Budget Slashes Renewable Energy Research, Incentivizes Drilling

**Trump Budget Would Cut Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy By 70 Percent.** “The Trump administration is expected to propose massive cuts to federal government research on wind and solar energy next week, according to current and former Energy Department officials familiar with budget discussions. The department’s Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE), which funds research on advanced vehicles as well as other aspects of clean energy, would face a roughly 70 percent cut in 2018, carving about $ 1.45 billion from its $2.09 billion 2017 budget.” [Washington Post, [5/18/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/05/18/trumps-budget-expected-to-massively-slash-research-on-renewable-energy-and-clean-coal/?utm_term=.de690a17fd25)]

**Trump Budget Would Open Up Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and End Revenue Sharing Program with Offshore Drilling States.** “The Trump administration’s fiscal 2018 budget proposal pitches a variety of legislative changes to boost federal revenue from the oil and gas industry, including the sale of oil and gas drilling leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and ending a revenue sharing program with states that allow offshore drilling. The administration also proposed to reduce — presumably by selling — crude oil held in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve by half. The policy proposals are likely to face significant opposition from lawmakers from Gulf Coast states over the revenue sharing plan, and Democrats in particular over opening up ANWR to potential development. But for the Trump administration, they speak to two key priorities: A combined $22 billion contribution to eliminating the deficit over the next 10 years while expanding economic opportunities for the oil and gas industry.” [Roll Call, [5/23/17](http://www.rollcall.com/news/policy/trump-budget-allow-anwr-drilling-end-oil-revenue-sharing)]

**Trump Budget Would Raise Billions from Opening Public Lands for Drilling, Cut Billions from Energy Research Programs.** “Mr. Trump’s budget, released Tuesday, says it will raise about $36 billion over the next 10 years by selling off major American energy resources and infrastructure, opening up vast new areas of public land for oil and gas drilling, and redirecting state revenues from oil and gas royalties back to Washington. At the same time, the budget would cut $3.1 billion from energy research programs at the Energy Department, an 18 percent reduction from last year’s spending. These programs are aimed at developing innovative technologies like better batteries for electric vehicles or carbon capture for coal and gas plants — all of which could one day help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and combat global warming.” [New York Times, [5/23/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/23/climate/trump-budget-energy.html?_r=0)]

Reality: DOI 5-Year Strategic Plan Prioritized Oil and Gas Development

**DOI 5-Year Strategic Plan Prioritized Oil and Gas Development.** “While disregarding climate change, the 2018–2022 strategic plan places a premium on facilitating oil and gas development. It calls for speeding up the processing of parcels nominated for oil and gas leasing on public lands. It establishes an Executive Committee for Expedited Permitting to facilitate on- and -offshore leasing, and aims to reduce the time it takes to green-light energy projects on Native land by 50 percent. The department is also seeking to speed up the application process for drilling permits, even though industry is currently sitting on thousands of approved permits. ‘It is bewildering that the agency would prioritize approving more permits—at the inevitable expense of your environmental responsibilities—when companies have plenty and appear to be simply stockpiling them,’ wrote Representative Raúl Grijalva, ranking member of the House Natural Resources Committee, in an April letter to the acting director of the Bureau of Land Management.” [The Nation, [10/25/17](https://www.thenation.com/article/interior-department-scrubs-climate-change-from-its-strategic-plan/)]

**Center For Western Priorities Deputy Director Greg Zimmerman: “This Document Is A Succinct Description Of The Zinke Doctrine—Private Drilling And Mining Companies Get Top Billing At The Expense Of Americans Accessing Our Parks And Public Lands. On The Week That The Interior Department Proposed Severe Fee Hikes For National Parks Visitors And Secretary Zinke Crowed About Selling Oil Leases At Bargain Rates, We’re Seeing First-Hand How Everyday Americans Lose Under The Zinke Doctrine.”** [Center for Western Priorities, [10/25/17](http://westernpriorities.org/2017/10/25/response-to-leak-of-interior-department-five-year-strategic-plan/)]

## Rhetoric: Defending Budget Cuts

**ZINKE**: “The Department’s 2018 budget reflects the Administration’s commitment to strengthen America’s economic and energy security, focus on the Nation’s infrastructure, be responsible stewards of magnificent land s, encourage public access for outdoor recreation, and strengthen tribal sovereignty and support self -determination.” [U.S. House Appropriations Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

### Reality: Budget Would Cause Massive Cuts To NPS

**NPS: Most Parks Would Seek To Close Campgrounds And Access To Comply With FY2018 Budget**. According to the National Park Service Budget Justification, “To operate at the proposed FY 2018 budget level, most parks will seek reductions in non personnel costs, including contracted support, supplies, materials, and training. To further reduce costs, the NPS would utilize various strategies on a park -by -park basis, which may include limiting the use of or closing certain areas, such as campgrounds and facilities, and reducing, adjusting, or eliminating hours of operations and visitor services in times of low visitation.” [NPS, Budget Justification, FY [2018](https://www.nps.gov/aboutus/upload/FY-2018-NPS-Greenbook.pdf)]

**Trump Budget Would Cut 1,242 Positions From NPS**. According to the National Park Service Budget Justification, “The 2018 President’s budget request funds 6.4 percent fewer FTE ( -1,242) . At these levels, visitors and partners will experience service reductions, and remaining employees will face heavier workloads. At this funding level, nearly 90 percent of parks would reduce their current staffing levels, leading to a reduction in services to the public. Likewise, support programs would also experience staffing and service level reductions, which further impacts parks.” [NPS, Budget Justification, FY [2018](https://www.nps.gov/aboutus/upload/FY-2018-NPS-Greenbook.pdf)]

**NPS Has Already Cut Workforce By More Than 2,300 Since 2011.** According to the National Park Service Budget Justification, “Reductions to both the seasonal and permanent workforce would have an immediate impact on day to day park operations. Since FY 2011, the NPS workforce has decreased by more than 2,300 FTE (11 percent).” [NPS, Budget Justification, FY [2018](https://www.nps.gov/aboutus/upload/FY-2018-NPS-Greenbook.pdf)]

Rhetoric: Increasing National Park Fees Would Protect Public Land and Enhance Visitor Experience

**Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke: “Targeted Fee Increases At Some Of Our Most-Visited Parks Will Help Ensure That They Are Protected And Preserved In Perpetuity And That Visitors Enjoy A World-Class Experience That Mirrors The Amazing Destinations They Are Visiting.”** “In a statement, the National Park Service said the fee increases would raise $70 million more toward addressing an $11 billion backlog in park maintenance to repair deteriorating buildings, restrooms and roads. ‘The infrastructure of our national parks is aging and in need of renovation and restoration,’ Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke said in a statement announcing the decision this week. ‘Targeted fee increases at some of our most-visited parks will help ensure that they are protected and preserved in perpetuity and that visitors enjoy a world-class experience that mirrors the amazing destinations they are visiting.’” [Washington Post, [10/26/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/10/26/trump-could-make-visiting-a-national-park-more-expensive-than-a-six-flags-ticket/?utm_term=.614684eecc15)]

**Zinke: “The Greatest Bargain In America Is $80 For A Year-Long Pass Of Our Public Lands.”** “Zinke told Fox News’s Shannon Bream late Thursday night that the criticisms from environmentalists and Democrats are ‘baloney.’ ‘The greatest bargain in America is $80 for a year-long pass of our public lands,’ Zinke said, referring to the Interior Department’s annual pass for visits to all of its fee-charging areas. ‘Now, I face an $11.5 billion backlog of our public lands and our parks. And our parks are being loved to death. Everyone loves our parks,’ he continued. ‘As a former military, there’s two things we need to fund absolutely: our military and our parks. So come on, America,’ Zinke said. ‘If you think that $80, all year, every park, all the time, by a carload, is too much to ask — I mean, come on.’” [The Hill, [11/10/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/359791-zinke-calls-criticisms-of-park-fee-hikes-baloney)]

Reality: Proposed Increases in Park Fees Would Take More Than 161 Years to Offset Deferred Maintenance Backlog

**Proposed Fee Increases Would Not Offset Backlog for More Than 161 Years.** “The new changes would affect 17 national parks and potentially bring in an additional $70 million a year, according to the Park Service, which says the increases are necessary to address the $11.3 billion maintenance backlog in the federal parks. At a rate of $70 million a year it would take more than 161 years for that extra annual revenue to wipe out the entire $11.3 billion backlog — to say nothing of the maintenance needs that would arise between now and then. On top of that, the fees would offset less than one-quarter of the $297 million Park Service budget cut proposed by the Trump administration.” [Washington Post, [10/26/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2017/10/26/the-park-services-proposal-to-double-entry-fees-could-fix-their-maintenance-problem-161-years-from-now/?utm_term=.bfdd0ac7ace4)]

Reality: Significant Increases in Fees Would Decrease Park Accessibility

**Entrance Fees Connected to “Significant but Small” Decrease in Park Visitation.** “Doubling entrance fees during peak seasons could lead some potential park visitors to stay home instead. “High entry fees will shut the public out of our parks,” the Sierra Club said in a statement. Research has shown that entrance fees are associated with “significant but small” drops in park attendance. The effect of more than doubling park entrance fees is not known.” [Washington Post, [10/26/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2017/10/26/the-park-services-proposal-to-double-entry-fees-could-fix-their-maintenance-problem-161-years-from-now/?utm_term=.bfdd0ac7ace4)]

**Democratic Senators: “This Proposal Seems Directly Contrary To Your Often-Stated Goal Of Improving Public Access To Our Public Lands.”** “They also contrast the fee increases with the Trump administration’s proposal to cut the Park Service’s budget by 12.9 percent, or nearly $400 million, on an annual basis. ‘This proposal seems directly contrary to your often-stated goal of improving public access to our public lands,’ 11 Democratic senators wrote to Zinke after the agency proposed the new fees. ‘We believe that it is especially problematic for your Department to propose fee increases at the same time that the Trump administration is recommending slashing National Park Service funding levels and holding virtual fire-sales on our public resources at below market value.’” [The Hill, [11/10/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/359791-zinke-calls-criticisms-of-park-fee-hikes-baloney)]

**Denver Post Editorial Board: “So Call Us Amazed That The Make-America-Great-Again Administration Is Stiffing Poor Families Who Wish To Enjoy Our Most Popular National Parks.”** “Seventy-five dollars might not sound like a lot of money to a Washington elite, but it’s real money for low-income families. So call us amazed that the Make-America-Great-Again administration is stiffing poor families who wish to enjoy our most popular national parks. Call us doubly amazed that a Westerner from the great state of Montana, Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke, is the Trump official to hatch the idea. Zinke has proposed, and, unlike past administrations, given the public scant time to comment on, pricey entrance fees at 17 of the nation’s most visited wilderness showcases, including Rocky Mountain National Park here in Colorado.” [Denver Post, [10/27/17](http://www.denverpost.com/2017/10/27/ryan-zinkes-national-parks-fee-increase-a-slap-to-low-income-families/)]

**New York Times Columnist Timothy Egan: National Parks Were a “Birthright of Citizenship.”** “The man who loves nothing so much as his gold-plated bathroom fixtures wants to gouge people who want to experience something that all of Donald Trump’s minions could never create. It’s a teardrop in the federal budget, but is emblematic of the ocean of wrong coming from this president. First, we already own these parks — Glacier, Olympic, Mount Rainier, Zion, Yellowstone, the names themselves music to lovers of magic in the natural world. They are a birthright of citizenship. Second, the Trump administration wants to jack up the price of admission to our most spectacular public lands while moving to cut the Park Service budget by almost $300 million. The new fees would add $70 million. Go figure. His attacks on the parks would be the biggest cut to the agency since World War II.” [New York Times, [11/3/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/03/opinion/national-parks-entrance-cost.html)]

## Rhetoric: Trump Budget Increases Spending on National Park Infrastructure

**ZINKE:** “The budget calls for a $35 million increase, for a total of $600 million -- or $766 million for national park infrastructure. Even though the budget is tight, we -- we increased it. And that includes also an $18 million for the first phase matching grant, Department of Transportation for the Memorial Bridge. The Memorial Bridge project alone is $262 million. And as secretary, I was amazed at what I owned and what I didn’t own.” [U.S. House Appropriations Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

### Reality: Budget Decreases National Park Facilities and Maintenance Funds

**Trump Budget Increases National Park Service Infrastructure Spending by $33 Million.** “President Donald J. Trump today proposed a $2.55 billion Fiscal Year 2018 budget for the National Park Service (NPS), including funding increases for top Trump Administration priorities like deferred maintenance. The budget makes a balanced investment in daily park and program operations and parks’ long-term needs while putting the federal government on track for a balanced budget by 2027. Priorities receiving increased funding include $33.3 million in programmatic increases for more construction, planning and deferred maintenance, $25.7 million across all activities for fixed costs, and $1.1 million for new responsibilities at existing parks. [National Park Service Press Release, [5/23/17](https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1207/05-23-2017-budget-proposal.htm)]

**National Park Facilities Operations and Maintenance Funds Decreased By Over $92 Million Under Trump Budget.** “The administration’s budget would reduce the Park Service’s facilities operations and maintenance funds to $685.9 million, a cut of $92.7 million from the omnibus deal. Those funds support the rehabilitation of high-priority park infrastructure assets as well as daily routine maintenance work. Deborah Weatherly, a former GOP staff director of the House Appropriations Committee, argued that the green book undercuts Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke’s claims about the NPS budget request…” [E&E News, [5/24/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/05/24/stories/1060055087)]

**National Parks Conservation Association President: “If Enacted, This Budget Would Represent The Largest Cut To The National Park Service Since World War II.”** “Parks advocates have called on lawmakers to reject the president’s budget request for NPS. ‘If enacted, this budget would represent the largest cut to the National Park Service since World War II,’ Theresa Pierno, the president and CEO of the National Parks Conservation Association, said in a statement. ‘It’s critical that they not only reject this budget, but also pass another budget deal to avoid additional damage to national parks.’” [E&E News, [5/24/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/05/24/stories/1060055087)]

## Rhetoric: Consider Privatizing National Parks to Make Up Deferred Maintenance

**ZINKE**: “Well, I’ll say this is that I’ve commissioned a -- a quick study. You know, and -- and everyone loves our parks. Absolutely. It’s amazing that about half of the parks we don’t charge at all. We don’t charge at all. And we divided our parks into tiers. And a lot of our parks don’t even follow that, the -- the tier system. So we are looking at -- we wanna make sure our parks are a value especially for families and -- and, you know, want to go to our parks. So we’re not Disneyland, to your point about -- about our -- our fee... but there are -- I think we do gotta be innovative forming a committee on public-private partnerships…that we should be able to -- I mean the airlines do it. So we should be able to have Wi-fi. We should -- we should on our fees coming in, there has to be an incentive for a superintendent to at least follow the rules. And the incentive is -- is that a lot of that should come back to that specific park and get some latitude how to spend it. So there has to be incentive in -- in -- structurally how to do it. And there’s a lot of really good people that love our parks.” [U.S. House Appropriations Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

**Zinke Called for Outsourcing Campgrounds to Private Parties in Speech to RV Industry.** “Speaking in front of the Recreational Vehicle Industry Association, Zinke suggested that the Department of the Interior could begin addressing the park service’s $11.9 billion deferred maintenance backlog by outsourcing campgrounds to private concessionaires. In a tip of his hat to the RV industry (and a punch in the gut to park rangers in his own department), the Secretary finished, ‘My folks will never be as good as you are.’” [Westwise, [6/15/17](https://medium.com/westwise/wi-fi-and-food-trucks-welcome-to-your-next-national-park-camping-trip-e3f87c58478)]

### Reality: Private Concessionaires Often Prioritize Profit Over Maintenance

**CAP: Concession Companies Already Contributed to Existing Maintenance Backlog.** “But recent research by the Center for American Progress suggests that concessionaires don’t necessarily prioritize upkeep over profits. In fact, a close review of the $11.9 billion backlog uncovered $389 million worth of maintenance costs that should be paid by concession companies. Despite being contractually obligated to cover the upkeep of privately-run park facilities, American taxpayers are being saddled with concessionaire responsibilities.” [Westwise, [6/15/17](https://medium.com/westwise/wi-fi-and-food-trucks-welcome-to-your-next-national-park-camping-trip-e3f87c58478)]

**Failed Valles Caldera Experiment Demonstrated Pitfalls of Privatization**. “In the late 1990s, recognizing public support for a purchase, Senator Republican Pete Domenici struck a deal with President Bill Clinton. “Instead of being run by the Forest Service or National Park Service, the Valles Caldera would be managed by a presidentially appointed citizens’ board. This “Trust” would continue to lease land for grazing, but also manage the preserve…And it had 15 years to make the whole thing financially self suffieient... To help cover costs, the preserve charged high fees. Grazing fees were around 10 times what they are on other federal lands. Hikers, bikers and skiers, who were restricted to a few trails, were charged $10 per person, per day, per activity, when most national park units charged $10 to $20 per vehicle for seven days and most national forests and BLM lands could be visited for free…Eventually [the Trust] reimrepreted its mandate: It would aim only to recover the cost of programs like grazing and recreation, rather than to make the entire preserve self sufficient.” In 2015, Valles Caldera was added to the national park system, “ending a 14 year experiment in semi-private public alnd management.” [High Country News, [3/7/16](http://www.hcn.org/issues/48.4/at-valles-caldera-a-new-national-park-unit-takes-shape)]

## Rhetoric: Interior Senior Executive Service Reorganization “Far from Unprecedented.”

**ZINKE:** “Well, first, let me address the issue. The SAS is far from unprecedented, moving people. The SAS by definition gets moved. Secondly is the movements. We went through a board and are shifting people to either an area where their skills are better suited or getting people out of headquarters and moving to the field. The reorganization plan overall is this, is that we had 330 million visitors to our parks last year, and it’s time maybe we’ll look at more of a Powell-Pinchot model of reorganization and coordinating ecosystems and watersheds.” [Senate Appropriations Committee Hearing on the Interior Budget, 6/21/17]

### Reality: Former Interior Senior Officials Believed Reorganization Was Unprecedented in Scale, Would Lead to Intimidation

**Former U.S. Fish And Wildlife Director Dan Ashe: “Anything At This Scale Is Unprecedented.”** “Dan Ashe, who headed the Fish and Wildlife Service under the Obama administration and worked at the agency for more than two decades, said in an interview that having closely watched every transition since Ronald Reagan took the helm of the federal government from Jimmy Carter in 1981, ‘anything at this scale is unprecedented.’ ‘I’ve never seen anything like it,’ Ashe said, adding that the officials being moved from posts at Fish and Wildlife ‘have records of exceptional service.’” [E&E News, [6/16/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/06/16/stories/1060056181)]

**Dan Ashe: Interior Shake-Up Meant to Intimidate Officials.** “Former Fish and Wildlife Service Director Dan Ashe this afternoon slammed changes Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke is making to the leadership of the bureau Ashe headed during much of the Obama administration. The effect of the shake-up of Senior Executive Service members, Ashe predicted, ‘will be to intimidate people and to send a message to them that — at least at the executive level — if you’re not in line, then we’ll mess with you.’” [E&E News, [6/16/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/06/16/stories/1060056181)]

**Dan Ashe:** **“If I Were A GS-15 At Any Of These Bureaus, Why Would I Compete For An SES Position? Then I’m Subjecting Myself And My Family To This Kind Of Treatment. So I Think It Sends A Chilling Effect To Talented People Who May Otherwise Aspire To Serve In The Senior Executive Service.”** [E&E News, [6/16/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/06/16/stories/1060056181)]

**Partnership for Public Service: 92% of SES Officials from Government, Only 8% Changed Agencies.** “The Senior Executive Service was established in 1978 ‘to create a mobile group of senior executives who could take on the most important, complicated jobs in the government,’ according to Max Stier, president and chief executive of the nonprofit Partnership for Public Service. Stier said Friday that while the idea was to move these officials among agencies and better compensate them, ‘it never fulfilled that vision’ because pay caps meant they got more responsibility without additional pay. Ninety-two percent of SES officials come from within government, he said, and only 8 percent change agencies once they reach SES rank.” [Washington Post, [6/16/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/zinke-moving-dozens-of-senior-interior-officials-in-shake-up/2017/06/16/11801d3a-5295-11e7-b064-828ba60fbb98_story.html?utm_term=.fc30dda8f360)]

## Rhetoric: SES Members “Have a Choice” in Reorganization Process

**ZINKE:** “As far as the decisions go [on SES reorganization], I can’t give you a list, because I don’t know who’s going to go, because they have a choice. And they were given notification through a board process, lining up, and they are given a choice and there’s a privacy issue until they’ve made that choice. After they make the choice, I would be glad to give you a list, but until that time, until that make a decision, I’m going to honor the privacy part of it, which is part of our procedures, and I believe it’s under law.” [Senate Appropriations Committee Hearing on the Interior Budget, 6/21/17]

### Reality: Scientist Believed Move to Unrelated Job Was Retaliation for Climate Work; Filed Complaint With Special Counsel

**Op-Ed: I’m A Scientist And I’m Blowing The Whistle On The Trump Administration.** I believe I was retaliated against for speaking out publicly about the dangers that climate change poses to Alaska Native communities. During the months preceding my reassignment, I raised the issue with White House officials, senior Interior officials and the international community, most recently at a U.N. conference in June. It is clear to me that the administration was so uncomfortable with this work, and my disclosures, that I was reassigned with the intent to coerce me into leaving the federal government. On Wednesday, I filed two forms — a complaint and a disclosure of information — with the U.S. Office of Special Counsel. I filed the disclosure because eliminating my role coordinating federal engagement and leaving my former position empty exacerbate the already significant threat to the health and the safety of certain Alaska Native communities. I filed the complaint because the Trump administration clearly retaliated against me for raising awareness of this danger. Our country values the safety of our citizens, and federal employees who disclose threats to health and safety are protected from reprisal by the Whistleblower Protection Act and Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act.” [Washington Post, [7/19/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/im-a-scientist-the-trump-administration-reassigned-me-for-speaking-up-about-climate-change/2017/07/19/389b8dce-6b12-11e7-9c15-177740635e83_story.html?utm_term=.4e9dd5760202)]

**Interior Restored Webpage With Employee Discrimination Complaint Data.** “The Interior Department has restored its webpage containing data on employee discrimination complaints. The webpage with the most recent data on complaints was back up around 7 p.m., at least two hours after POLITICO observed the page had disappeared. Interior spokeswoman Heather Swift said in an email that the agency’s equal opportunity office had ‘reorganized their website.’ The discrimination complaints filed against the Interior Department by employees and job applicants had disappeared one day after a whistleblower complaint filed by Joel Clement contended that he had been reassigned to a desk job in the agency’s royalty collection division to stop him from talking about the impacts of climate change on Alaska coastal communities. Clement was among dozens of senior executive staff Zinke moved to other positions in June. A link to the data that previously existed at the bottom of the agency’s homepage had not been restored.” [Politico, [7/20/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/07/interior-restores-webpage-with-employee-discrimination-complaint-data-090901)]

**Senate Democrats Asked Interior IG To Probe Career Staff Reshuffle.**”Senate Energy and Natural Resources ranking Democrat Maria Cantwell and seven of her colleagues today asked the Interior Department’s inspector general to investigate the agency’s recent reassignment of a number of senior executive staff. Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke in June reassigned about 50 senior executive employees, including Joel Clement, who was moved from a managerial position involving climate change issues to a job collecting royalties from oil and gas companies. Moving senior executives from the positions in which they may best use their expertise to jobs ‘where their talents are wasted would constitute a serious act of mismanagement, a gross waste of public funds, and an abuse of authority,’ the senators said in the letter to Deputy Inspector General Mary Kendall. The senators acknowledged that Zinke is allowed to shuffle senior executives around. But they argued the law requires for reassignments to be made to best accomplish the agency’s mission, promote program continuity and to provide for an executive system that is free from improper political interference. ‘Any suggestion that the department is reassigning SES employees to force them to resign, to silence their voices or to punish them for the conscientious performance of their public duties is extremely troubling and calls for the closest examination,’ the letter said.” [Politico, [7/24/17](https://www.politicopro.com/energy/whiteboard/2017/07/senate-democrats-ask-interior-ig-to-probe-career-staff-reshuffle-090969)]

### Reality: SES Members’ Choices Were Report to New Jobs, Leave Public Service, Or Appeal to Special Counsel

**Reorganized SES Members Have 60 Days to Report to New Jobs, Leave Public Service, or Appeal to Office of Special Counsel.** “Job reassignments for most of those FWS officials are set to take place June 28. Those whose new jobs would require a move have 60 days to make arrangements. In such situations, the only recourse open to SES members — the top civil servants in the federal government — is to leave the public service or appeal their reassignment to the Office of Special Counsel if they think they’ve been targeted unfairly. ‘None of these people, as best I can tell, have been consulted about this,’ Ashe said, referring to the officials mentioned in the Post story. ‘They were handed an ultimatum. Nobody in the Fish and Wildlife Service, at least nobody that I’ve heard of, was consulted by the department about this.’” [E&E News, [6/16/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/06/16/stories/1060056181)]

**Reassignment Required 15-Day Notice.** “A reassignment requires a 15-day notice, while a relocation requires a 60-day notice; individuals can move earlier if they waive the right to these time restrictions. SES personnel can appeal their reassignments to the Office of Special Counsel if they think they have been singled out unfairly.” [Washington Post, [6/16/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/zinke-moving-dozens-of-senior-interior-officials-in-shake-up/2017/06/16/11801d3a-5295-11e7-b064-828ba60fbb98_story.html?utm_term=.fc30dda8f360)]

## Rhetoric: Democrats and “Resistance Movement” to Blame for Lack of Confirmed Nominations

ZINKE: “I can’t think of a better person I’d have in there, and yet it’s just -- in my opinion, it’s being slow-rolled, and it’s not the White House. The White House has approved the slate to their degree. They have to go through the Office of Government Ethics. But when you have 22 rounds of questions for an individual that has a TS, SBI, SCI (ph), and has been in government service, and has done orbits around the Earth, I think they’re pretty qualified people.”

**Interviewer:** “How many openings do you have that you are still trying to fill?”

**Secretary Zinke:** “Oh, man. And it has been very frustrating. I would say it is from the resistance movement. At every corner, they try to stop President Trump from winning, and some of their methodologies is to hold back, stop the Senate-confirmed positions, the just simple, you know, positions, getting in the office and doing the work of the people. You look at the problems in the Senate confirmation hearings, I have 17 Senate-confirmed positions. Today, I have three.”

**Interviewer:** “So basically, you have 14 that are still on hold?”

**Secretary Zinke:** “And that’s just the top-tier Senate-confirmed. Next to it, I still don’t have a director of our parks. I still don’t have a director in the BLM. I still don’t have a director of Fish and Wildlife and parks. And I believe it to be willful and intentional.

Interviewer: For those kind of openings like that, what does that mean for the Park Service, and for the Bureau of Land Management, and all the different areas where there still is that hole, how is that hurting those particular areas?”

**Secretary Zinke:** “Well, you know, I’m out in the field talking to our front line superintendents, and all of us in the Park Service, you know, want stability, we want a director. And I’ve chosen an imminently qualified, former superintendent, that’s well-respected, a veteran. There is absolutely no reason why he shouldn’t have been through the system, you know, months ago. But it does, it hurts us all. And I’ve always said, from a military officer and a congressman and a state senator, now a Secretary of the Interior point of view, is that critical things to fund in the government is the military and our park system.”

[Westwise, [9/29/17](https://medium.com/westwise/zinke-blames-the-resistance-for-his-failure-to-fill-open-positions-55a9be8bb8af)]

### Reality: White House Has Nominated Seven of Seventeen Key Department of Interior Positions

**Department of Interior Has Three Confirmed Positions.** The Department of Interior has confirmed the Secretary, Deputy Secretary and Assistant Secretary for Insular Affairs. [Washington Post, accessed [9/29/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/trump-administration-appointee-tracker/database/)]

**Department of Interior Has Four Nominees Awaiting Confirmation.** The Department of Interior was awaiting confirmation on the Solicitor, Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management, and Budget, the Assistant Secretary for Lands and Minerals Management, and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. [Washington Post, accessed [9/29/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/trump-administration-appointee-tracker/database/)]

**Department of Interior Has Ten Positions Without a Nominee.** The Department of Interior has not nominated an Inspector General, Assistant Secretaries of Indian Affairs, Fish, Wildlife and Parks, and Water and Science, Directors of the BLM, NPS, OSMRE, USFW, USGS, and the Special Trustee for American Indians. [Washington Post, accessed [9/29/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/trump-administration-appointee-tracker/database/)]

**Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnel Prioritized Obamacare Repeal Over Confirmations.** “The Secretary has nominated an additional four appointees, all of whom have passed through the relevant committee and are on the Senate’s executive calendar. But there’s limited time in the Senate calendar and Senate Majority Leader McConnell has prioritized Obamacare repeal over a timely confirmation process.” [Westwise, [9/29/17](https://medium.com/westwise/zinke-blames-the-resistance-for-his-failure-to-fill-open-positions-55a9be8bb8af)]

## Rhetoric: Thirty Percent of Interior Employees “Not Loyal to the Flag.”

**Ryan Zinke: “I Got 30 Percent Of The Crew That’s Not Loyal To The Flag.”** “Zinke promised a ‘huge’ change by restructuring staff positions and possibly shifting decision-making positions in the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation from Washington to points out West in the speech Monday to the National Petroleum Council. His remarks were first reported by the Associated Press. ‘I got 30 percent of the crew that’s not loyal to the flag,’ the secretary said, according to participants. Zinke, a former Navy SEAL, invoked military and seafaring jargon to describe his approach to running the department. He compared his experience taking over Interior to capturing a pirate ship where ‘only the captain and the first mate row over’ to take over the vessel. The audience laughed in response.” [Washington Post, [9/26/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/09/26/zinke-says-a-third-of-interiors-staff-is-disloyal-to-trump-and-promises-huge-changes/?utm_term=.2127a5ad5c1f)]

### Reality: Zinke Lacked “Fundamental [Understanding] of the Role of Federal Civil Service”

**U.S. Senator Maria Cantwell (D-WA): Zinke’s Comments “Betray A Fundamental Misunderstanding Of The Role Of Federal Civil Service.”** “Sen. Maria Cantwell (D-Wash.), the ranking member on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, slammed the speech. ‘The public servants at [Interior] deserve respect from the man charged with leading them — not cheap shots in the press,’ Cantwell said. Zinke’s comments ‘betray a fundamental misunderstanding of the role of federal civil service,’ she added. ‘They are nonpolitical employees charged with implementing and enforcing laws passed by Congress.’ Other groups — the Coalition to Protect America’s National Parks, Public Lands Foundation and Association of Retired Fish and Wildlife Service Employees — also took issue with the remarks. ‘Saying that over 20,000 employees in his department are not loyal to the flag is simply ludicrous, and deeply insulting,’ the groups said in a joint statement. They called on the secretary to apologize.” [Washington Post, [9/26/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/09/26/zinke-says-a-third-of-interiors-staff-is-disloyal-to-trump-and-promises-huge-changes/?utm_term=.2127a5ad5c1f)]

**Center For Western Priorities: “Secretary Zinke Clearly Views Our Parks And Public Lands As A Battlefield And Himself As A General Fighting On Behalf Of Oil And Gas Companies.”** “Secretary Zinke clearly views our parks and public lands as a battlefield and himself as a general fighting on behalf of oil and gas companies. In the past two days, he has declared war on his own agency in front of oil executives and told clean energy groups that public lands are best suited for drilling. ‘Less than a year into the job, Secretary Zinke has abandoned Western values in an attempt to drill, mine and log our public lands at all costs.” [Center for Western Priorities, [9/26/17](http://westernpriorities.org/2017/09/26/response-to-interior-secretary-zinkes-attacks-on-interior-department-employees/)]

## Rhetoric: We Don’t Pick Winners and Losers At DOI

**ZINKE:** “This is not about giving one section of our energy a step up or a step down. We don’t pick winners and losers. The market has got to react to that.” [Daily Caller, [4/27/17](http://dailycaller.com/2017/04/27/trump-will-overturn-obamas-permanent-arctic-offshore-drilling-ban/)]

### Reality: DOI Budget Cuts Renewable Energy and Boosts Fossil Fuels

**$34 Million for Faster Permitting and Leasing Processes for Fossil Fuels; 40 Percent Cut for Renewable Energy Permitting and a 50 Percent Reduction in Staff.** “While DOI proposes to spend at least $34 million to speed permitting and leasing for fossil fuels, it slashes funding for renewable energy. BLM’s budget shrinks comparable renewable energy permitting by $13 million (a cut of more than 40 percent), and lays off more than half of its renewable energy management program workforce. BOEM’s budget proposes to cut spending on renewable energy-related activities and support functions by $2.5 million.” [Oil Change International, [6/20/17](http://priceofoil.org/2017/06/20/interior-budget-boosts-fossil-fuels/); BOEM, FY 2018, Accessed [6/28/17](https://www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/uploads/fy2018_boem_budget_justification.pdf)]

### Reality: Trump’s Budget Slashes Renewable Energy Research, Incentivizes Drilling

**Trump Budget Would Cut Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy By 70 Percent.** “The Trump administration is expected to propose massive cuts to federal government research on wind and solar energy next week, according to current and former Energy Department officials familiar with budget discussions. The department’s Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE), which funds research on advanced vehicles as well as other aspects of clean energy, would face a roughly 70 percent cut in 2018, carving about $ 1.45 billion from its $2.09 billion 2017 budget.” [Washington Post, [5/18/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/05/18/trumps-budget-expected-to-massively-slash-research-on-renewable-energy-and-clean-coal/?utm_term=.de690a17fd25)]

**Trump Budget Would Open Up Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and End Revenue Sharing Program with Offshore Drilling States.** “The Trump administration’s fiscal 2018 budget proposal pitches a variety of legislative changes to boost federal revenue from the oil and gas industry, including the sale of oil and gas drilling leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and ending a revenue sharing program with states that allow offshore drilling. The administration also proposed to reduce — presumably by selling — crude oil held in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve by half. The policy proposals are likely to face significant opposition from lawmakers from Gulf Coast states over the revenue sharing plan, and Democrats in particular over opening up ANWR to potential development. But for the Trump administration, they speak to two key priorities: A combined $22 billion contribution to eliminating the deficit over the next 10 years while expanding economic opportunities for the oil and gas industry.” [Roll Call, [5/23/17](http://www.rollcall.com/news/policy/trump-budget-allow-anwr-drilling-end-oil-revenue-sharing)]

**Trump Budget Would Raise Billions from Opening Public Lands for Drilling, Cut Billions from Energy Research Programs.** “Mr. Trump’s budget, released Tuesday, says it will raise about $36 billion over the next 10 years by selling off major American energy resources and infrastructure, opening up vast new areas of public land for oil and gas drilling, and redirecting state revenues from oil and gas royalties back to Washington. At the same time, the budget would cut $3.1 billion from energy research programs at the Energy Department, an 18 percent reduction from last year’s spending. These programs are aimed at developing innovative technologies like better batteries for electric vehicles or carbon capture for coal and gas plants — all of which could one day help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and combat global warming.” [New York Times, [5/23/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/23/climate/trump-budget-energy.html?_r=0)]

### Reality: Fossil Fuel Companies Benefit From $7 Billion a Year In Corporate Subsidies

**Fossil Fuel Companies Get $7 Billion A Year in Corporate Subsidies.** “The Federal government already hands fossil fuel companies more than $7 billion a year related to their production on federal lands and waters. For onshore oil, gas, and coal production, that includes a giveaway of more than $3.3 billion from below-market royalty rates, unpaid and foregone royalties, inadequate permitting fees, and below-market lease rental rates. And American taxpayers are cheated out of $2.2 billion each year in lost royalties from offshore drilling because of “royalty relief,” which exempts roughly 20% of oil and gas production in the Outer Continental Shelf from paying royalties.” [Oil Change International, [6/20/17](http://priceofoil.org/2017/06/20/interior-budget-boosts-fossil-fuels/)]

## Rhetoric: Off-Shore Energy Could Help Close NPS Funding Gap

**ZINKE:** “And let me give you an extent, when we talk about the budget. If you go back to 2008, we made about $18 billion in offshore -- offshore alone. That was our revenue per year. Last year, we made $2.6 billion. That’s a drop of $15.5 billion a year in revenue. So when I’m faced with a $11.5 billion deficit in maintenance, in backlog of our parks, about half of that is roads, and the $11.5 in the parks represents about 72 percent of our total backlog in maintenance and repair. Dropping $15.5 billion a year, we would have caught up our entire backlog of maintenance in one year and had $3 billion to invest in new infrastructure and capitalization. That’s the scale of what has occurred. And when you add timber and on-shore and the reduction of that, the balance sheet gets worse.” [U.S. House Appropriations Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

### Reality: Low Oil Prices Partly to Blame for Lack of Interest in Offshore Drilling

**Energy Experts Believed Low Price of Oil Would Discourage Offshore Production.** “Energy experts also say the relatively low price of oil could discourage companies from the often expensive task of off-shore exploration. ‘The lifting of the ban does not necessarily make drilling in the Arctic a compelling proposition and it will probably be many years before we see any activity in the Arctic again,’ said Jill McLeod, a former in-house lawyer with oil giant ConocoPhillips who is now a partner at the international law firm Dorsey & Whitney. ‘With oil prices hovering around $50 a barrel and the steep costs of doing business in the Arctic, the oil industry will be hesitant to jump back into exploration efforts there.’” [USA Today, [4/28/17](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2017/04/28/president-trumps-executive-order-could-lead-more-offshore-drilling/100998440/)]

**Interior Secretary Zinke: “Some Of It Has Been Due To Oil And Gas Pricing, But Not All Of It.”** “‘Revenues is a concern,’ he said on a call with reporters earlier this week. ‘In 2008 the department brought in just over $18 billion a year in offshore revenue. Last year that number was just north of $2 billion.’ ‘Some of it has been due to oil and gas pricing, but not all of it,’ Zinke continued. ‘A lot of it is uncertainty that we have not been a good partner with industry.’” [Think Progress, [6/15/17](https://thinkprogress.org/budget-fossil-fuel-taxpayers-interior-164d4e7d9ed7)]

### Reality: 2016 Oil Leasing Revenue Was $200 Million More Than Zinke Stated At Hearing

**Department of Interior: Offshore Leasing Revenue Was $2.8 Billion in 2016.** “As a featured speaker at the Offshore Technology Conference in Houston, TX, on Offshore Energy Policies: Harnessing the Full Potential of America’s Offshore, Zinke highlighted that OCS production currently accounts for about 18 percent of domestic crude oil and four percent of domestic natural gas supply. In Fiscal Year 2016, federal leasing revenues for the OCS were about $2.8 billion. By contrast, in 2008 federal leasing revenues for the OCS were nearly $18 billion dollars. ‘That’s a drop of more than $15 billion that would otherwise go to the Treasury or toward funding important conservation programs like the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Historic Preservation Fund,’ Zinke noted.” [U.S. Department of Interior Press Release, 5/1/17]

### Reality: Taxpayers Paid Billions in Subsidies for Onshore and Offshore Oil Production

**Oil Change International: Fossil Fuel Development on Public Lands Cost Taxpayers $7 Billion in 2014.** “Fossil fuel production on federal lands – onshore and offshore territories – was subsidized to the tune of at least $7 billion in 2014. This number is likely a low estimate, as it does not account for the many subsidies that we identified, but did not include, for which reliable cost estimates were not available. It also does not include subsidies from the federal government and in the tax code not explicitly directed to fossil fuel production on federal lands.” [Oil Change International, [5/24/17](http://priceofoil.org/2017/05/24/unequal-exchange-taxpayers-burden-fossil-fuel-federal-lands/)]

## Rhetoric: $15.5 Billion Drop In U.S. Offshore Oil Revenue Between 2008 And 2016 Partially Due To Obama Administration Policies

**ZINKE**: “In 2008, the Department of Interior made $18 billion alone just in offshore. Last year, we made $2.6 billion. That’s a drop of $15.5 billion a year in revenue just in offshore. When you add onshore, timber production, and the rest of the extraction in revenue sources, it gets even worse. So it was commented about the parks. We are $11.5 billion behind in deferred maintenance and repair. That is a priority. But we would have made that up in scale in one year and had $3 billion of additional funds to invest, invest in our schools, invest in our treaty obligations, invest in making sure that our parks remain world-class.” [Senate Appropriations Committee Hearing on the Interior Budget, 6/21/17]

**ZINKE:** “Well, we had a lease yesterday, matter of fact the first successful lease in the Cook Inlet, about a $3 million lease. That was I think -- I think an indicator that we’re going to be a partner rather than an advocate. But you have to be -- on leases there is -- a gain, if you are going to operate on public land, then the responsibility is just to make sure it’s done right and transparent. What we’re doing is we’re doing our seismic surveys, we’re moving ahead on that, that’s important. But also it’s an indicator that the rules are not going to be arbitrary. I can go through some horrific stories of compensatory mitigation of arbitrariness rules that the industry looks at, looked at us as not a good partner, and they would prefer to drill elsewhere.” [House Natural Resource Committee Hearing on the Interior Budget, 6/22/17]

### Reality: 2008 Was an Outlier Year for Offshore Drilling Revenue

**2008 Was “By Far the Banner Year” for Offshore Oil Revenue.** “Data from the Department of the Interior’s Office of Natural Resources Revenue show that 2008 was by far the banner year for offshore oil and gas revenues, vastly outstripping the years before or after it. The mid-2000s were exceptional years for offshore leasing and drilling for multiple reasons, including high oil prices, advances in deepwater drilling technology and shifting geopolitics overseas that made it increasingly difficult for oil majors to drill in other countries.” [E&E News, [6/26/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/06/26/stories/1060056542)]

**More than Half of the $18 Billion in 2008 Offshore Oil Revenue Came from Bonus Bids.** “In 2008, for example, the data show almost $9.5 billion of the $18 billion in revenues came from companies paying bonus bids, or an upfront payment to the government by the company that is awarded the lease.” [E&E News, [6/26/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/06/26/stories/1060056542)]

**CAP Public Lands Director Kate Kelly: “There's A Reason That Zinke Cherry-Picks 2008. It Was An Anomaly For A Lot Of Reasons, Including The High Price Of Oil.”** [E&E News, [6/26/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/06/26/stories/1060056542)]

**Offshore Oil Production Was Highest in 2010, Followed by 2015 and 2016; Domestic Oil and Gas Increased Every Year Under the Obama Administration.** “According to data from Interior, while natural gas production offshore has been falling since 2007, oil production peaked in 2010 at more than 603 million barrels. The second- and third-highest oil production years were 2015 and 2016, each with more than 550 million barrels of oil produced. Federal onshore gas production has stayed relatively steady, while onshore oil production steadily increased during the Obama administration. Despite taking steps to develop a comprehensive policy on climate change, the administration said domestic oil and gas production increased every year during the former president’s tenure.” [E&E News, [6/26/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/06/26/stories/1060056542)]

### Reality: Legislation Required In Order to Send More Drilling Revenue from Treasury to DOI

**Zinke Would Need Act of Congress to Send Offshore Drilling Revenue from Treasury to Interior.** “Zinke’s critics say he’s also ignoring the fact that it would take a major act of Congress to send any additional revenues from offshore drilling from the Treasury to the Interior. Kelly said the bigger issue with Zinke’s push for more offshore drilling is that ‘he doesn’t appear to fully appreciate that offshore revenues go directly to the Treasury.’ ‘He doesn’t get to earmark them to offset the huge cuts in Trump’s budget proposal,’ she said. As spelled out in the 1953 Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act — the law that drives offshore leasing policy — nearly all of the money that comes in from drilling goes straight to the general fund. More recently, Congress has passed laws that siphon some of the money to fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to pay Gulf states a share of the revenues.” [E&E News, [6/26/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/06/26/stories/1060056542)]

**Congressional Budget Office: Offshore Oil Production Unlikely to Change By Changes Meant to Increase Revenue.** “A 2016 report by the Congressional Budget Office found levels of offshore production would be largely unchanged if the government took steps to bring in more money. Boosting competitiveness, adding a fee on nonproducing leases or raising royalty rates would boost revenues by $25 million to $500 million over 10 years but would not increase production. Furthermore, the turnaround time for oil and gas companies to begin producing oil from a newly leased tract of land is counted in years, not months. The majority of the leased areas in production today were auctioned off royalty-free in the 1990s or in 2005, Book said.” [E&E News, [6/26/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/06/26/stories/1060056542)]

**Central Issue for Offshore Oil Production Was Low Gas Prices.** “While the Obama administration’s regulatory regime for offshore drilling wasn’t the most friendly to interested companies — especially after the Deepwater Horizon disaster — a central problem facing the new administration is that with oil prices hovering near a historically low price per barrel, it won’t be easy to simultaneously entice industry to put new areas into production and raise more revenues by hiking royalties or some other mechanism. Changing the terms of leases or lease lengths might work, but relaxing fiscal or environmental regulations only benefits industry, Book said. The same is true with reducing royalty rates, which might boost drilling, but maybe not.” [E&E News, [6/26/17](https://www.eenews.net/climatewire/2017/06/26/stories/1060056542)]

## Rhetoric: DOI Has Placed “Energy Wealth” On Public Lands “Out of Reach”

**TRUMP:** “It will be a lot easier now under the Trump Administration…for too long the Federal government has put up restrictions and regulations that has put this energy wealth out of reach, just totally out of reach. It's been really restricted, the development itself has been restricted and vast amounts of deposits of coal and other resources have been taken out of your hands and we're going to have that changed.” [CNN, [6/28/17](https://www.iqmediacorp.com/ClipPlayer/?ClipID=2c63dd0f-b77a-4430-9041-b7c6b2c451c6&ps=2)]

### Reality: Industry Has Not Purchased Leases Offered; Requested 7,000 Fewer Permits

**Industry Passed on 25 Million Acres Offered by BLM; Requested 7,000 Fewer Permits.** A report by the Western Values Project notes that industry “…voluntarily passed on [over 23 million acres of oil and gas leases](https://www.blm.gov/sites/blm.gov/files/oilandgas_ogstatistics_t12acresofferedforleasesold.pdf) offered for sale by BLM between 2009 and 2016” and “requested almost 7,000 fewer drilling permits between [2013 and 2015](https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42432.pdf) than it did between [2007 and 2009](http://www.gao.gov/assets/660/657176.pdf).” [Western Values Project, [6/28/17](http://westernvaluesproject.org/rigged-industrys-real-burden-low-energy-prices/)]

### Reality: Environmental Safeguards Have Cut Pollution While the Economy Has Grown

**1970 – 2015: GDP Is Up, Pollution Is Down.** “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 Clean Air Act Overview, Accessed [6/28/17](https://www.epa.gov/clean-air-act-overview/progress-cleaning-air-and-improving-peoples-health#pollution)]

**Federal Onshore Oil Production Increased by 77 Percent Between 2007 and 2015.** [Western Values Project, [6/28/17](http://westernvaluesproject.org/rigged-industrys-real-burden-low-energy-prices/)]

## Rhetoric: Public Lands “in Better Shape” Once Mining Moratorium Ends

**TRUMP**: “I cancelled the moratorium on a new coal leasing -- and you know what was happening -- the new coal leasing on federal lands, it was being so terribly restricted.  And now with Ryan and with a group, it’s going to be open, and the land will be left in better shape than it is right now.  Is that right?  Better shape.”  [Remarks by President Trump, [6/29/17](https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/06/29/remarks-president-trump-unleashing-american-energy-event)]

### Reality: Trump Argument Is “Implausible”

**Washington Post Energy 202: Trump Argument is “Implausible.”** “Despite the typical image of a West Virginian coal miner, Wyoming has [long been](http://www.wsgs.wyo.gov/energy/coal-production-mining) the largest coal producer in the United States. Most of that extraction is done through surface mining, a process in which trees and topsoil are removed to get at coal seams. The same will likely be true of surface mining expanded to other Western federal lands.

Trump could argue that the environmental cost of mining coal is worth the economic benefit of the energy it produces and the jobs it creates. But instead, Trump is arguing, implausibly, that there will be absolutely no environmental cost at all.” [Washington Post, [6/30/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/paloma/the-energy-202/2017/06/30/the-energy-202-four-misleading-claims-trump-made-in-his-big-energy-week-speech/59553373e9b69b7071abc98d/?utm_term=.ea4a2944cb17)]

# 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%3A/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)]

## Rhetoric: We addressed water issues in Flint, Michigan

**Pruitt**: *How do we improve investment in water infrastructure to prevent Flint, Michigan and Gold King, Colorado? How do we eradicate lead from our drinking water? You know, those are issues that we can focus upon today that are tangible, beneficial outcomes to our citizens. And we're not speculating about what may be happening in the year 2100 or beyond.* [CBS News, [1/17/18](https://www.cbsnews.com/video/scott-pruitt-talks-with-major-garrett-full-interview/)]

### Reality: Obama EPA Brought Flint into Compliance

**Drinking Water In Flint Was In Compliance With Federal Regulations On Lead And Copper Content In January Of 2017**. According to the New York Times, “The drinking water in Flint, Mich., is now in compliance with federal regulations on lead and copper content, officials said on Tuesday. But they cautioned that it could be a year or more before it is safe for residents to drink from their faucets, because lead-tainted pipes need to be replaced. ‘We are not out of the woods yet,’ Mayor Karen Weaver said in a statement. She called the results of water tests ‘encouraging’ but said residents should continue to drink bottled water or use filters.” [New York Times, [1/24/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/24/us/flint-michigan-water.html)]

# Rejecting, Misinterpreting, and Undermining Science

## Rhetoric: Glaciers Have Seen “Consistent Melt” Rate Since the Ice Age

**ZINKE:** “In reference to Glacier Park, glaciers started melting in Glacier Park right after the end of the Ice Age. There’s been a consistent melt including Lake Missoula, which used to have an ice dam. And I grew up in Glacier Park. But I’ve seen the glaciers melt when eating lunch on -- on -- on a glacier. And the problem is is we don’t understand what the effects are.” [U.S. House Appropriations Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

### Reality: Melt Rate of Glacier National Park’s Glaciers Has Rapidly Accelerated

**Glacier National Park’s Glaciers Have Lost 39 Percent of Mass in Last 50 Years; Over 120 Lost Glacier Classification in Last Century.** “The glaciers in Montana’s Glacier National Park are rapidly disappearing. Some have been reduced by as much as 85 percent over the past 50 years, while the average loss is 39 percent, according to a new study from the U.S. Geological Survey and Portland State University. The researchers looked at historic trends for 39 glaciers, 37 of which are found in the park. The other two are on U.S. Forest Service land. The stark data actually calls into question whether all of these formations are still glaciers. In fact, the scientists found that only 26 of them are still larger than 25 acres — a common benchmark for determining whether a mass of ice is classified as a glacier. Early last century, the park had about 150 glaciers that passed that benchmark.” [NPR, [5/11/17](http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2017/05/11/527941678/disappearing-montana-glaciers-a-bellwether-of-melting-to-come)]

**USGS Scientist Expected Glaciers to Disappear Within Our Lifetime.** “In fact, they’ll all be gone within our lifetime, warns Daniel Fagre, a research ecologist with the USGS’s Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center. In order for the glaciers to survive, the area would need to experience ‘significant cooling,’ he said. But it’s likely too late. ‘Their fate is sealed,’ forecasted Fagre, who has studied the glaciers since 1991. The trend, he argues, could have an impact on the park and animal life.” [USA Today, [5/10/17](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2017/05/10/glacier-national-parks-glaciers-melting/315659001/)]

**USGS Scientist Believed Glaciers Were Melting Due to Climate Change.** “Fagre blames climate change for the melting. Glaciers, he explained, are steady barometers of long-term Earth changes and don’t react to year-to-year weather trends. ‘You know there’s a long-term trend when the glaciers are all simultaneously melting or growing,’ he said. The history of Glacier National Park paints a picture of Fagre’s theory. The park’s glaciers are estimated at 7,000 years old and ‘peaked,’ the USGS said, in the mid-1800s during the ‘Little Ice Age.’ In 1850, the park had an estimated 150 glaciers. Since that time, its lost about 85% of its ice area and now has less than 30 glaciers.” [USA Today, [5/10/17](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation-now/2017/05/10/glacier-national-parks-glaciers-melting/315659001/)]

## Rhetoric: “There’s No Model That Can Predict Yesterday”

**ZINKE:** “There’s no model that exists. And USGS has some terrific scientists, some terrific scientists. There’s no model that can predict yesterday (ph) from all the data we collect. But certainly the climate is changing in ways we don’t understand. Man has had an influence. But man has had a negative influence not only on CO2, but you look at arsenic, you look at the chemicals that -- that we have -- look at agriculture across -- so man has not been a particularly good influencer, anyway, on a -- on a lot of things. And -- and CO2 is a concern. But what should we do about it? What can we do about it? What is the right path forward?” [U.S. House Appropriations Committee Department of Interior Budget Hearing, 6/8/17]

### Reality: Models Help Scientists Understand Climate Change and Future Warming

**IPCC 2007: Models Can Be Limited, But Have Provided “Robust And Unambiguous Picture Of Significant Climate Warming In Response To Increasing Greenhouse Gases.”** “In summary, confidence in models comes from their physical basis, and their skill in representing observed climate and past climate changes. Models have proven to be extremely important tools for simulating and understanding climate, and there is considerable confidence that they are able to provide credible quantitative estimates of future climate change, particularly at larger scales. Models continue to have significant limitations, such as in their representation of clouds, which lead to uncertainties in the magnitude and timing, as well as regional details, of predicted climate change. Nevertheless, over several decades of model development, they have consistently provided a robust and unambiguous picture of significant climate warming in response to increasing greenhouse gases.” [IPCC 2007 Report Frequently Asked Questions, accessed [6/15/17](http://oceanservice.noaa.gov/education/pd/climate/factsheets/howreliable.pdf)]

**NASA Used Global Climate Model to Simulate Earth’s Climate System.** “The climate modeling program at GISS is primarily aimed at the development of coupled atmosphere-ocean models for simulating Earth’s climate system. Primary emphasis is placed on investigation of climate sensitivity —globally and regionally, including the climate system’s response to diverse forcings such as solar variability, volcanoes, anthropogenic and natural emissions of greenhouse gases and aerosols, paleo-climate changes, etc. A major focus of GISS GCM simulations is to study the human impact on the climate as well as the effects of a changing climate on society and the environment.” [NASA, accessed [6/15/17](https://www.giss.nasa.gov/projects/gcm/%27)]

**NOAA: Models Are Based on “Well-Documented Physical Processes.”** “Climate models are based on well-documented physical processes to simulate the transfer of energy and materials through the climate system. Climate models, also known as general circulation models or GCMs, use mathematical equations to characterize how energy and matter interact in different parts of the ocean, atmosphere, land. Building and running a climate model is complex process of identifying and quantifying Earth system processes, representing them with mathematical equations, setting variables to a set of initial conditions, and repeatedly solving the equations using powerful computers.” [NOAA, accessed [6/15/17](https://www.climate.gov/maps-data/primer/climate-models)]

**NOAA: “The Model Results Project That Global Temperature Will Continue To Increase, But Show That Human Decisions And Behavior We Choose Today Will Determine How Dramatically Climate Will Change In The Future.”** “Around the world, different teams of scientists have built and run models to project future climate conditions under various scenarios for the next century. The model results project that global temperature will continue to increase, but show that human decisions and behavior we choose today will determine how dramatically climate will change in the future.” [NOAA, accessed [6/15/17](https://www.climate.gov/maps-data/primer/climate-models)]

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]

**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]

**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 Epa Will Be About Transparency

***MAJOR GARRETT****: The first administrator of this agency, William Ruckelshaus, wrote an article recently. He talked about his "fishbowl memo," and I'll quote it directly. "We started to release my full schedule and the publication of written communications on a daily basis. We held regular brown bag lunches with reporters who covered the agency. And every reporter knew he or she could attend." This is all in the purpose of transparency as he defined it. Is that a standard you'd be comfortable with?*

***PRUITT****: Look, I-- I really believe both internally and externally-- that we should be about transparency.* [CBS News, [1/17/18](https://www.cbsnews.com/video/scott-pruitt-talks-with-major-garrett-full-interview/)]

### Reality: Pruitt has run EPA in secret

**New York Times: Scott Pruitt Is Carrying Out His E.P.A. Agenda In Secret, Critics Say.** According to the New York Times, “Mr. Pruitt, according to the employees, who requested anonymity out of fear of losing their jobs, often makes important phone calls from other offices rather than use the phone in his office, and he is accompanied, even at E.P.A. headquarters, by armed guards, the first head of the agency to ever request round-the-clock security. A former Oklahoma attorney general who built his career suing the E.P.A., and whose LinkedIn profile still describes him as ‘a leading advocate against the EPA’s activist agenda,’ Mr. Pruitt has made it clear that he sees his mission to be dismantling the agency’s policies — and even portions of the institution itself.” [New York Times, [8/11/17](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/11/us/politics/scott-pruitt-epa.html)]

**Politico: Pruitt's Commitment To Transparency Questioned**. According to Politico, “California Attorney General Xavier Becerra is the latest Democratic official from the Golden State to take on EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt — this time with a public records lawsuit alleging he has failed to promptly hand over documents related to his ethics arrangements. Becerra filed the suit Friday, Pro’s Alex Guillén reports. Pruitt, a prolific litigant challenging the Obama-era EPA, has agreed to stay away from lawsuits over the various rules he challenged in court, such as the Clean Power Plan or Waters of the U.S., although he says he is not barred from working to roll back the rules themselves. Becerra asked for documents outlining Pruitt’s ‘compliance with federal ethics regulations and obligations’ as well as agency ‘policies and procedures for determining who (if anyone) can assume the powers of the Administrator if he is recused or disqualified from participating in a matter.’” [Politico, [8/14/17](http://www.politico.com/tipsheets/morning-energy/2017/08/14/pruitts-commitment-to-transparency-questioned-221852)]

**Center For Biological Diversity Had To Sue For Full Release Of Pruitt Emails And Schedule**. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, “The Center for Biological Diversity filed a lawsuit under the Freedom of Information Act in May seeking a full release of Pruitt’s schedule, email and phone logs. ‘The public has every right to know who’s pulling the strings as Pruitt continues his quest to dismantle key environmental safeguards,’ said Meg Townsend, the Center’s open government staff attorney. ‘Pruitt is supposed to be protecting our air and water, not corporate profits. Missing details about who he’s meeting with and what they’re talking about raise troubling questions about who he’s really working for.’” [Center for Biological Diversity, [9/25/17](https://www.biologicaldiversity.org/news/press_releases/2017/scott-pruitt-09-25-2017.php)]

**EPA Removed Reporter From Pruitt Event In Iowa**. According to the US Press Freedom Tracker, “Ethan Stoetzer, a reporter with InsideSources Iowa, was removed from and prevented from covering an event with Scott Pruitt, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in Nevada, Iowa. On December 1, 2017, Pruitt spoke at the Couser Cattle Company about the EPA and its commitment to renewable fuels. The invite-only event was open to the press and was livestreamed to the public by the Des Moines Register. Stoetzer attended the event as press, and gave his name and the name of his outlet to an EPA press secretary at the event. In an article for InsideSources about the incident, Stoetzer wrote that he was approached by a Story County Sheriff’s Deputy, along with staff from both the EPA and the Couser Cattle Company, about 10 minutes after he arrived at the event. According to Stoetzer, the staffers and sheriff’s deputy refused to identify themselves when asked, but told him that he was not on the press list for the event and ordered him to leave the premises. ‘They’re asking you to leave, you didn’t RSVP properly, and it’s too late to do it now,’ Stoetzer recalled the sheriff’s deputy saying.” [US Press Freedom Tracker, [12/1/17](https://pressfreedomtracker.us/all-incidents/epa-removes-reporter-ethan-stoetzer-scott-pruitt-event-iowa/)]

## 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]

**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]

**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]

### 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)]

Rhetoric: Pruitt Brought Sense Of Urgency To The EPA

***Pruitt:*** *Another example, the lead and copper rule that's the basis for all these things came out in 1991. This agency spent a decade updating that rule. So without question, Major, before we ever arrived here, those types-- those types of decisions took way too long. And that's what's been so striking to me, is the lack of urgency.* [CBS News, [1/17/18](https://www.cbsnews.com/video/scott-pruitt-talks-with-major-garrett-full-interview/)]

Reality: EPA Has delayed rules time and again under Pruitt

**EPA Backed Utility Bid To Delay Cross-State Rule Case.**According to E&E News, “U.S. EPA is open to going along with a utility-proposed delay in proceedings in litigation over the agency’s Cross-State Air Pollution Rule update, according to a Friday court filing. But the agency isn’t happy at all with a related proposal to put its handling of the administrative reconsideration process under judicial supervision. The filing responded to a motion last week by the Utility Air Regulatory Group and other industry plaintiffs seeking a four-month extension in the briefing schedule because EPA had not yet addressed nine petitions seeking reconsideration of various aspects of the rule, often known by its acronym, CSAPR. In Friday’s reply, filed with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, EPA lawyers said they did not oppose the extension motion, as long as the revised schedule takes account of the December holidays. But they bristled at industry’s request that the court require EPA to report within 60 days on the status of the reconsideration petitions, most of which date back to December.” [E&E News, [8/14/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/08/14/stories/1060058739)]

**EPA Sought 16-Month Delay Of Texas Haze Deadline.**According to Politico, “EPA on Friday asked a federal court in D.C. to rewrite a consent decree reached with environmental groups under the Obama administration requiring the agency to take action on Texas pollution contributing to regional haze. The court had previously given EPA until Sept. 9 to either accept a state plan or write a federal plan, but on Friday EPA asked the court to give it until Dec. 31, 2018. The agency’s filing says that since the Trump administration took office, ‘EPA and Texas have engaged in a productive level of dialogue that has not occurred in many years.’ EPA and Texas regulators have agreed on a plan to write a rule ‘that would be more consistent with the [Clean Air Act’s] preference for cooperative federalism, and would produce a plan that more effectively addresses concerns raised by the State,’ the filing added. Environmentalists have until Aug. 29 to object in court, but they made their feelings clear in a Friday evening statement blasting EPA’s proposal as bad news for residents of Oklahoma who breathe in some of that Texas air. ‘Scott Pruitt just made it clear that he plans to abandon the residents of his home state to placate Texas polluters who don’t give a second thought about Oklahoma families or its natural places,’ said Johnson Bridgwater, director of the Sierra Club’s Oklahoma Chapter. The green groups noted that EPA was supposed to have done all this back in 2007, making the proposed delay that much more untenable.” [Politico, 8/21/17]

**EPA Fought 'Speculative' Bid To Vacate Ozone NAAQS Designations Delay**. According to Inside EPA, “EPA is fighting several states’ request for a federal appeals court to vacate the agency’s since-withdrawn notice delaying by one year designations for which areas are attaining the 2015 ozone air standard, saying it is ‘speculative’ for the states to say the delay was unlawful and that EPA should be prevented from trying it again. ‘Petitioners’ concern that the withdrawal could be reversed by the Court in some future action is highly speculative, and could be adequately addressed by the Court in its review of any such future action. Accordingly, that speculation provides no basis for the Court to reach out and vacate an action that the Agency has already withdrawn,’ EPA says in an Aug. 29 filing with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.” [InsideEPA, [8/30/17](https://insideepa.com/daily-news/epa-fights-speculative-bid-vacate-ozone-naaqs-designations-delay)]

**Pruitt Signed Proposed Rule To Delay The Effective Date Of EPA’s Risk Management Program**. According to the EPA, “U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Administrator Scott Pruitt signed a proposed rule this week to further delay the effective date of EPA’s Risk Management Program (RMP) Amendments to allow EPA time to complete the process for reconsidering the RMP Amendments issued on January 17, 2017. ‘We want to prevent regulation created for the sake of regulation by the previous Administration. Any expansion of the RMP program should make chemical facilities safer, without compromising our national security. And, any new RMP requirements should be developed in accordance with the explicit mandate granted to EPA by Congress,’ said Administrator Pruitt.” [EPA, [3/31/17](https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/epa-administrator-seeks-additional-time-review-rmp-rule)]

**EPA Delayed A Lawsuit Over A Rule Regulating Airborne Mercury Emissions From Power Plants**. According to the New York Times, “ Delayed a lawsuit over a rule regulating airborne mercury emissions from power plants. April 27 Who wanted it changed? Coal companies, along with Republican officials in several states, sued the government over this rule, which regulated the amount of mercury and other toxic pollutants that fossil fuel-fired power plants can emit into the air. They argued that the rule helped shutter coal plants, many of which are already compliant. Oral arguments in the case have been delayed while the E.P.A. reviews the rule.” [New York Times, [5/2/17](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/05/02/climate/environmental-rules-reversed-trump-100-days.html?_r=0)]

## Rhetoric: Zinke Wanted to Be The “Most Transparent Interior [Secretary].”

ZINKE: “Absolutely. And in fact, on the House side -- and I would offer the same thing to the Senate side -- as I meet with House members in a roundtable on both sides of the aisle quarterly, I intend to be the most transparent interior and I think in my lifetime on it, but I would offer the same thing to members of the Senate in a roundtable forum so we can discuss issues of significance and to be absolutely transparent and responsive.” [Senate Appropriations Committee Hearing on the Interior Budget, 6/21/17]

**Zinke Frequently Called for Local Input Into National Monuments Review; Stated There Was “No Pre-Determined Outcome On Any Monument.”** “Throughout the national monument review, Secretary Zinke has fallen all over himself saying he wants to hear from all Americans, including monument supporters. He has urged monument advocates to submit electronic comments, saying their voice would be heard. From the beginning of the review, Zinke has repeatedly said ‘there is no pre-determined outcome on any monument.’” [Westwise, [8/16/17](https://medium.com/westwise/zinke-vs-zinke-on-national-monuments-1aeddfc112f5)]

### Reality: Zinke’s Monuments Review Was a “Guessing Game” and “Reality Show Charade” Lacking Clear Process

**National Monument Review Process Was “Guessing Game.”** “Zinke said Thursday that he was recommending no changes for the two Washington and Idaho monuments, though the final decision is the president’s to make. Interior provided no explanation of the process that led to the secretary’s announcement or any analysis to support it. Zinke said he called on his training as a geologist — ‘I realize Craters of the Moon is a living timeline of geologic history,’ he said — and his experience as a sportsman. Like-minded people ‘from all over the country go to Hanford Reach for some of the best fishing and bird hunting around,’ he noted. His comments drew a swift rebuke from the Center for American Progress. ‘The only thing that’s been consistent throughout Zinke’s review is its arbitrariness,’ said Kate Kelly, the organization’s public lands director. ‘From the get-go, it’s been a guessing game on … how the review is being conducted and what is driving Zinke’s decisions.’ Kelly praised the decision to leave Hanford Reach and Craters of the Moon alone but said ‘the fate of 25 more monuments rests in the hands of a process without logic or transparency.’” [Washington Post, [7/13/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/07/13/two-national-monuments-are-no-longer-up-for-review-interior-says-that-leaves-25/?utm_term=.1e62d42bbd24)]

**CWP: Zinke’s Monument’s Review Was a “Week-by-Week Reality Show Charade.”** “In response to Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke’s announcement removing Grand Canyon–Parashant National Monument from his efforts to shrink or eliminate national monument designations, the Center for Western Priorities released the following statement from Executive Director Jennifer Rokala: ‘It’s time for Secretary Zinke to end this week-by-week reality show charade. Does he really expect us to say ‘thank you’ for taking the only legal option available to him? By pardoning a landscape-scale monument of more than one million acres, he’s acknowledging both the value and legal status of all of America’s national monuments. ‘The people of Arizona and the West deserve better from the Interior Department. The small business owners and rural economies that thrive because of our national monuments need Secretary Zinke to provide certainty right now, not one week at a time.’” [Center for Western Priorities, [8/4/17](http://westernpriorities.org/2017/08/04/statement-on-interior-secretary-zinkes-pardon-of-grand-canyon-parashant-national-monument/)]

**U.S. Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-AZ): “The Secretary Has Not Been Forthcoming With The Criteria … We Haven’t Had Transparency With Who He’s Meeting.”** “While Rep. Raúl Grijalva, D-Ariz., was glad Zinke decided to remove Grand Canyon-Parashant from the list of monuments under review, he said, ‘It didn’t belong on the list anyway.’ In a phone interview on Friday. Grijalva questioned a lack of transparency in Zinke’s review process. ‘The secretary has not been forthcoming with the criteria … we haven’t had transparency with who he’s meeting,’ he said. ‘Pulling rabbits out of a hat is not the proper way.’ Environmental advocates, too, criticized Zinke for providing few details surrounding the review process. ‘Zinke is holding America’s national monuments hostage and we have no idea what the terms are,’ Randi Spivak, public lands director for the Tucson-based Center for Biological Diversity, said in an emailed statement.” [Arizona Central, [8/4/17](http://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-environment/2017/08/04/grand-canyon-parashant-national-monument-emerges-unscathed-trump-review/541167001/)]

**Department of Interior Press Release Made No Mention of Process or Justification for Decision.** “Zinke said Thursday that he was recommending no changes for the two Washington and Idaho monuments, though the final decision is the president’s to make. Interior provided no explanation of the process that led to the secretary’s announcement or any analysis to support it.” [Washington Post, [7/13/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/07/13/two-national-monuments-are-no-longer-up-for-review-interior-says-that-leaves-25/?utm_term=.899a45436ed6)]

### Reality: Zinke Refused to Release Final Monuments Review Report to the Public; Disregarded Millions of Comments in Favor of Maintaining Existing Boundaries

**Unclear When Final Monuments Review Report Would be Released to the Public.** “A White House official confirmed that Trump had received the report but would not say when it would be released or when the president would act on Zinke’s recommendations. The secretary had earlier taken six monuments off the review list without any detailed explanation of why.” [Washington Post, [8/24/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/08/24/interior-secretary-recommends-trump-alter-a-handful-of-national-monuments-but-declines-to-reveal-which-ones/?utm_term=.1f635ea1d760)]

[Alexander Kaufman @AlexCKaufman](https://twitter.com/AlexCKaufman)

White House just told me monuments report [@SecretaryZinke](https://twitter.com/SecretaryZinke) submitted today won’t be made public until a draft is finalized in coming weeks.

[Twitter, [8/24/17](https://twitter.com/AlexCKaufman/status/900809458091257857)]

[Rep. Ruben J. Kihuen @RepKihuen](https://twitter.com/RepKihuen)

Disappointed in the lack of specificity & transparency from [@SecretaryZinke](https://twitter.com/SecretaryZinke/) regarding our monuments! [#MonumentsForAll](https://twitter.com/search?q=%23MonumentsForAll)

[Twitter, [8/24/17](https://twitter.com/RepKihuen/status/900779167129763840)]

[Rep. Jacky Rosen @RepJackyRosen](https://twitter.com/RepJackyRosen)

Is this the kind of transparent process you had in mind, [@SecretaryZinke](https://twitter.com/SecretaryZinke/)? [#KeepItPublic](https://twitter.com/search?q=%23KeepItPublic) [nbcnews.com/politics/white…](https://t.co/jtAxf1yKm3)

[Twitter, [8/24/17](https://twitter.com/RepJackyRosen/status/900880160655896576)]

**CWP: Monuments Review Designed to End as a “Publicity Stunt.”** “By executive order, Zinke’s report is due on Thursday. The secretary has given roses to a half dozen monuments already, but left the fate of more than 20 others uncertain. Now it appears he’s trying to talk about anything other than his attack on national monuments, as he heads to Montana on Thursday, then celebrates the National Park Service’s 101st anniversary on Friday. All this comes on the heels of his romantic getaway to the Mediterranean, which he took instead of visiting any of the 19 monuments he had not yet been to as part of his review. Unless Interior and the White House come clean quickly, it appears the national monuments review will end as it began — as a publicity stunt, ignoring the pleas of 2.7 million Americans who told Secretary Zinke and President Trump in no uncertain terms to leave their national monuments alone.” [Westwise, [8/23/17](https://medium.com/westwise/the-white-house-cant-keep-its-own-story-straight-about-trump-s-national-monuments-review-5e815516479)]

**Ryan Zinke Believed Majority Of Comments In Favor Of Monuments “Demonstrated A Well-Orchestrated National Campaign Organized By Multiple Organizations.”** “‘Comments received were overwhelmingly in favor of maintaining existing monuments and demonstrated a well-orchestrated national campaign organized by multiple organizations,’ Zinke said in the statement on Thursday. He acknowledged supporters’ point that monuments can bring economic benefits to local communities. But he also noted opponents’ concerns that designations had translated into reduced public access, confusing management plans ‘and pressure applied private land owners … to sell.’” [Washington Post, [8/24/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/08/24/interior-secretary-recommends-trump-alter-a-handful-of-national-monuments-but-declines-to-reveal-which-ones/?utm_term=.1f635ea1d760)]

[Western Priorities‏ @WstrnPriorities](https://twitter.com/WstrnPriorities)

.[@SecretaryZinke](https://twitter.com/SecretaryZinke) demonstrates how to disregard 2.7 million opinions in a single paragraph. [#KeepItPublic](https://twitter.com/hashtag/KeepItPublic?src=hash)

[Twitter, [8/24/17](https://twitter.com/WstrnPriorities/status/900779127749222400)]

### Reality: Interior Department Prevented Facebook Founder Mark Zuckerberg from Meeting With USGS Climate Scientist at Glacier National Park

**Interior Department Told Glacier National Park’s Top Climate Scientist That Could No Longer Meet With Facebook Founder.** “Facebook founder Mark Zuckerberg visited Glacier National Park last weekend and saw firsthand how climate change is shrinking the glaciers in Montana’s northern Rockies. But the area’s top climate scientist was not permitted to share his expertise on global warming’s role in the retreating ice sheets with Zuckerberg, one of the most prominent business leaders to denounce President Trump’s June withdrawal from the Paris climate accord. Three days before the tech leader’s July 15 visit to Glacier, research ecologist Daniel Fagre said he was told that his scheduled tour with Zuckerberg of Logan Pass on the Continental Divide was off.” [Washington Post, [7/18/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2017/07/18/mark-zuckerberg-went-to-glacier-to-learn-about-climate-change-but-couldnt-meet-with-the-resident-climate-scientist/?utm_term=.d7d87808984d)]

**USGS Research Ecologist Daniel Fagre: “I’ve Gotten Nothing Back [On Why The Briefing Was Cancelled]. We’ve Definitely Been Left In The Dark.”** “‘I literally was told I would no longer be participating,’ Fagre, who works for the U.S. Geological Survey, said in an interview Tuesday from his office inside the park. He said he asked the public-affairs officer who notified him why the briefing was being canceled. ‘I’ve gotten nothing back,’ he said. ‘We’ve definitely been left in the dark.’” [Washington Post, [7/18/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2017/07/18/mark-zuckerberg-went-to-glacier-to-learn-about-climate-change-but-couldnt-meet-with-the-resident-climate-scientist/?utm_term=.d7d87808984d)]

**National Parks Conservation Foundation Glacier Program Director: “Dan’s Highly Respected. He’s A Straight-Up, This-Is-How-It-Is Scientist.”** [Washington Post, [7/18/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2017/07/18/mark-zuckerberg-went-to-glacier-to-learn-about-climate-change-but-couldnt-meet-with-the-resident-climate-scientist/?utm_term=.d7d87808984d)]

**Interior Department Spokeswoman Heather Swift: “Allocating Government Funds, Personnel, And Resources Responsibly Is The Definition Of Good Government And Something We Are Dedicated To Advancing At The Department.”** [Washington Post, [7/18/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2017/07/18/mark-zuckerberg-went-to-glacier-to-learn-about-climate-change-but-couldnt-meet-with-the-resident-climate-scientist/?utm_term=.d7d87808984d)]

### Reality: Zinke’s Methane Secretarial Order and Decision to Shut Down Resource Advisory Councils Failed Transparency Goal

**Environmental Groups Believed Zinke’s Methane Secretarial Order Would Decrease Transparency.** “The latest request comes from environmental advocates including the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society and Greenpeace. It lands a day after Western-based religious and conservation organizations as well as a veterans group urged Zinke to conduct a fact-based, thorough review of the Bureau of Land Management rule curbing greenhouse gas emissions from oil and gas flaring, venting and leakage on public lands. Today’s letter focused on a broad secretarial order Zinke signed in March that mandated a 21-day review of the department’s rules on climate change, mitigation and energy development. That directive stems from President Trump’s larger executive order on energy independence. The groups said they have ‘grave concerns’ that the review process outlined in the secretarial order will result in major decisions being made ‘behind closed doors’ on development and management strategies for public lands and without proper public input. ‘These decisions will effectively scrap decades of work by public servants furthering the public interest as required under law,’ said today’s letter.” [E&E News, [4/13/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/04/13/stories/1060053060)]

**CWP Executive Director Greg Zimmerman: “[Cancelling BLM RAC Meetings] Sends A Clear Signal That Secretary Zinke Intends To Make Decisions Behind Closed Doors And Not Through An Open And Transparent Public Process.”** “That concerns Greg Zimmerman, Deputy Director Of The Center For Western Priorities**.** ‘The Trump administration and Interior Secretary Zinke talk a big game about including Western communities in decision-making on public lands, but this action proves it’s nothing more than talk,’ Zimmerman said. ‘They are shutting out input from communities just as the administration takes unprecedented steps toward wiping national monuments from the map.’ It’s a particular concern for BLM, critics say. Canceling the BLM RAC meetings ‘sends a clear signal that Secretary Zinke intends to make decisions behind closed doors and not through an open and transparent public process,’ Zimmerman said.” [E&E News, [5/5/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/2017/05/05/stories/1060054139)]

### Reality: Interior Department Considered Limiting Freedom of Information Act Requests During Closed Door Meeting

**Interior Department Considered Limiting Freedom of Information Act Requests During Closed Door Meeting.** “During the Sept. 21 webinar, the BLM and its guests discussed ways to water down NEPA and more. They talked about working around environmental analyses that determine whether infrastructure projects harm ecosystems, about stripping conservation groups of the power to sue the BLM if it wrongly approves a project and about limiting the number of federal Freedom of Information Act requests that allow the public to scrutinize how decisions were made. ‘We’re seeking a better decision-making process that’s more productive and getting decisions faster,’ Leah Baker, the BLM division chief for planning and NEPA, said in an interview Tuesday. ‘We heard through this process that we should try and streamline regulations … and that the agency leaves a little to be desired in how effectively we coordinate’ with states and local governments.” [Washington Post, [10/5/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/energy-environment/wp/2017/10/05/notes-from-closed-meeting-show-how-interior-aims-to-weaken-environmental-laws/?utm_term=.99fe66962692)]

Reality: Zinke Invited Democrats to “[Play] National Security Games” Instead of Discussing Important Interior Related Issues

**U.S. Representative Jared Huffman (D-CA): “We Were Playing National Security Games In The SCIF With The Secretary Of Interior At A Time When We Should Be Asking Hard Questions About Why Climate Scientists Are Being Reassigned To Desk Jobs, About Why Are Public Lands Are Being Given Away To Crony Capitalists.”** “The California Democrat added: ‘We were playing national security games in the SCIF with the secretary of Interior at a time when we should be asking hard questions about why climate scientists are being reassigned to desk jobs, about why are public lands are being given away to crony capitalists.’ Grijalva said he and other Democrats were frustrated by the lack of time for their questions on issues like the department’s monuments review and reorganization effort. ‘What kind of happened was [Zinke’s presentation] consumed the whole time, and we didn’t get to what we needed to get to,’ Grijalva said, adding that in his 14 years in Congress, this was the first classified meeting he has gone to for the Natural Resources Committee. ‘So, whether intended or not, the substance of what we came to talk about, the majority of the members came to talk about, never got talked about.’” [E&E News, [10/24/17](https://www.eenews.net/eenewspm/2017/10/24/stories/1060064509)]

## Rhetoric: Others Are “Slow Rolling” DOI Nominations

ZINKE: “I can't think of a better person I'd have in there, and yet it's just -- in my opinion, it's being slow-rolled, and it's not the White House. The White House has approved the slate to their degree. They have to go through the Office of Government Ethics. But when you have 22 rounds of questions for an individual that has a TS, SBI, SCI (ph), and has been in government service, and has done orbits around the Earth, I think they're pretty qualified people.”

### Reality: White House Has Nominated Two of Seventeen Key Department of Interior Positions

**White House Has Nominated Only Two out of Seventeen Key Department of Interior Positions.** The White House has nominated Department of Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke and Deputy Secretary Ryan Zinke.[Washington Post, accessed [6/26/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/trump-administration-appointee-tracker/database/)]

Rhetoric: “I Got Sued Six Times In The First Morning I Was At The Department Of Interior.”

**ZINKE:** “Well, I got sued six times in the first morning I was at the Department of Interior. So I would imagine we’re going to -- I’m going to be in court over it, so -- which should take six months. Will probably take a couple of years, you know, on it. But we’ll go through the process. We’ll do it legally and transparent. There’s going to be a number of periods of -- as there should -- of public comment. I think that’s a valuable part of our democracy.” [Senate Appropriations Committee Hearing on the Interior Budget, 6/21/17]

Reality: No Evidence That Zinke Was Sued Six Times on His First Day of Work

**Ryan Zinke’s First Day of Work Was March 2, 2017.** “Newly minted Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke rode a horse to his first day of work at the department’s Washington, D.C., headquarters, Thursday morning. Zinke wore a cowboy hat, boots and jeans for the Thursday morning ride, which preceded a welcoming event in the lobby of the building.” [The Hill, [3/2/17](http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/321962-new-interior-chief-rides-horse-to-work)]

**No Parties Filed Civil or Criminal Lawsuits Against Ryan Zinke on March 2, 2017.** [PACER, accessed 6/26/17]

**No Parties Filed Civil or Criminal Lawsuits Against the Department of Interior, U.S. Department of Interior, or United States Department of Interior on March 2, 2017.** [PACER, accessed 6/26/17]

## Rhetoric: “Zero Tolerance” for Sexual Harassment

**Zinke Stated That He Would Have “Zero Tolerance” for Sexual Harassment at Confirmation Hearing.** “Facing few tough questions from the Republican-led panel, he promised to visit many lawmakers’ home states, build ‘collaborative’ relationships and restore confidence in ‘the front line,’ his term for on-the-ground employees of the many agencies. In response to questions about a sexual harassment scandal that has plagued the park service, he said he would have ‘zero tolerance’ for sexual harassment.” [Los Angeles Times, [1/17/17](http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-pol-ryan-zinke-confirmation-20170117-story.html)]

### Reality: National Park Service Superintendent Accused of Sexual Harassment Received New Job and Bonus

**March 2017: National Park Service Superintendent Accused of Sexual Harassment Received New Job and Bonus.** “Investigators say Jorge Acevedo during his tenure at De Soto National Memorial gave unwanted hugs and made inappropriate sexual comments toward a woman under his supervision. In one case, he lay across her desk as she was trying to work (E&E News PM, March 9). Though Acevedo is no longer supervising employees, he continues to work for NPS as partnerships manager at the Tuskegee Airmen and Tuskegee Institute national historic sites and the Selma to Montgomery National Historic Trail. He retains his $82,000 salary, and before transferring to his new role in March, Acevedo received a $1,000 bonus.” [E&E News, [8/4/17](https://www.eenews.net/greenwire/stories/1060058423/search?keyword=ryan+zinke)]

* **National Park Service Issued One-Page Talking Point Praising NPS Superintendent Accused of Sexual Harassment.** “Then, the Park Service issued a one-page set of talking points for media inquiries. The talking points, obtained by The Washington Post, instructed staff to praise the superintendent, Jorge Acevedo, for making ‘a substantial contribution’ during his four-year tenure at De Soto National Memorial, a coastal park near Bradenton.” [Washington Post, [8/4/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/after-zero-tolerance-vow-a-park-chief-cited-for-sexual-harassment-gets-a-bonus-and-new-job/2017/08/03/bb7e01be-72e1-11e7-8f39-eeb7d3a2d304_story.html?utm_term=.28786200faaa)]

## Rhetoric: “There Are Times When We Have To Use Charter Flights”

**Zinke Defended Private Plane Use.** “‘I believe taxpayers absolutely have a right to know about official travel costs,’ the secretary said. Zinke listed three occasions when he used charter planes to fly to Alaska for a bipartisan trip arranged by Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee Chair Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska), the flight to Montana and trips between the Virgin Islands. Zinke did not mention the costs of those flights or whether staffers traveled with him. Zinke went on to say that he’s flown U.S. military jets at least twice, once at the invitation of Agriculture Department Secretary Sonny Perdue and again at the invitation of President Trump. Using taxpayer funds wisely is good government, Zinke said, but ‘there are times when we have to use [charter flights] as an option.’” [Washington Post, [9/28/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/2017/09/28/59533ed8-a4b8-11e7-ade1-76d061d56efa_story.html?utm_term=.9561a19d9561)]

### Reality: Zinke Wasted Taxpayer Money on Private Charter Flights

**Zinke Took $12,375 Private Plane from Las Vegas, Nevada to Kalispell, Montana.** “In June, Zinke and his staffers took a four-hour flight from Las Vegas to Kalispell, Mont., aboard a private plane owned by the executives of a Wyoming oil-and-gas exploration firm, aviation and business records show. The landing in Kalispell put Zinke a short drive from his home in Whitefish, Mont., where he spent the night, documents show. The flight cost taxpayers $12,375, according to an Interior Department spokeswoman. Commercial airlines run daily flights between the two airports and charge as little as $300.” [Washington Post, [9/28/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/2017/09/28/59533ed8-a4b8-11e7-ade1-76d061d56efa_story.html?utm_term=.9561a19d9561)]

**Zinke Took Private Flight After Speaking to Donor’s Professional Hockey Team.** “Zinke took the private charter flight in late June after giving a motivational speech to the Vegas Golden Knights, the city’s new National Hockey League team. The team is owned by Bill Foley, chairman of Fidelity National Financial. Employees and political action committees associated with the financial services company donated a total of $199,523 to Zinke’s two congressional campaigns, Federal Election Commission records show.” [Washington Post, [9/28/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/2017/09/28/59533ed8-a4b8-11e7-ade1-76d061d56efa_story.html?utm_term=.9561a19d9561)]

* **Zinke Could Have Flown Commercially If He Skipped Hockey Team Speech.** “Two commercial flights bound for Salt Lake City departed Las Vegas as Zinke was attending the hockey dinner. Travelers on those Delta Air Lines flights, leaving at 5:50 p.m. and 6:50 p.m., could have caught a connecting SkyWest Airlines flight that landed in Kalispell at 11:56 p.m., according to FlightStats. Zinke’s private chartered plane touched down in Kalispell at 1:30 a.m. MDT. Swift dismissed a question about whether Zinke’s attendance at the hockey dinner affected his ability to take a cheaper flight. ‘Suggesting that by cancelling meetings and events the Secretary could make a different flight is not a valid argument,’ she said. ‘That point could be made for every person who ever books flights. It’s important for the Secretary to be in the field talking with the American people and meeting with local and state officials, which was exactly what he was doing on both legs of that trip.’” [E&E News, [9/29/17](https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060062089)]

**Center For Western Priorities: “There Was No Legitimate Reason For The Secretary To Be There In The First Place… Then He Saddles Taxpayers With The Bill For A Private Plane When He Could Have Easily Flown Commercial.”** “Aaron Weiss of the Center for Western Priorities, a nonprofit conservation and advocacy group, said, ‘Secretary Zinke’s entire Nevada trip appears to be a flimsy excuse for a political event in Tahoe and a thank-you dinner with his biggest campaign bundler. ‘There was no legitimate reason for the secretary to be there in the first place,’ Weiss said. ‘Then he saddles taxpayers with the bill for a private plane when he could have easily flown commercial.’” [Washington Post, [9/28/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/2017/09/28/59533ed8-a4b8-11e7-ade1-76d061d56efa_story.html?utm_term=.9561a19d9561)]

**Zinke Flew Private Plane to Virgin Islands.** “Zinke also attended a Virgin Islands GOP event and spoke on behalf of President Trump. John Canegata, chairman of the Republican group, said in a statement then that ‘Secretary Zinke’s visit to our islands in his first month on the job is a reaffirmation of the strong commitment that President Trump made to the Virgin Islands during his campaign.’ He added, ‘By contrast, the now-former administration failed to send the Interior secretary to the territory until the final months of its second term.’ Swift said several high-ranking government officials attended and reiterated that the department has jurisdiction over territories such as the Virgin Islands. She said the flights were taken because no commercial flights were available at the time. She could not give a cost estimate for the private airfare but said tickets for Zinke and staff were paid out of the agency’s budget. Swift said in an e-mail that Zinke’s Virgin Islands ‘itinerary included SEVERAL HOURS of official government events,’ such as meetings with American military veterans.” [Washington Post, [9/28/17](https://www.washingtonpost.com/investigations/2017/09/28/59533ed8-a4b8-11e7-ade1-76d061d56efa_story.html?utm_term=.9561a19d9561)]

# 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/)]