

May 30, 2017

Administrator E. Scott Pruitt
Office of the Administrator, Code 1101A
Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20460

Kevin S. Minoli
Acting General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (2310A)
Washington, D.C. 20460

Re: Administrator's March 30, 2017 Letter to Governors Regarding the Clean Power Plan

Dear Administrator Pruitt and Acting General Counsel Minoli:

The undersigned public health and environmental organizations write in response to Administrator Pruitt's March 30, 2017 letter to the governors of states covered by the Clean Power Plan.¹

The March 30 letter does not purport to be a final agency action. However, it does suggest a position the EPA might take in the future concerning the tolling of Clean Power Plan deadlines. The letter states that "case law and past practice of the EPA supports the application of day-to-day tolling."

That is not an accurate summary of the legal and equitable principles governing tolling, whether applied to the Clean Power Plan or to any other regulation subject to a judicial stay. Therefore, neither states nor companies have grounds to rely on the March 30 letter's suggestions. We are providing a copy of this correspondence to the governors who received the March 30 letter.

¹ *E.g.*, Letter from E. Scott Pruitt, EPA Administrator, to Hon. Matt Bevin, Governor of Kentucky (Mar. 30, 2017) ("March 30 Letter"), available at https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2017-03/documents/ky_bevin.pdf. While we are responding to a letter signed by Administrator Pruitt, Administrator Pruitt has recused himself from the Clean Power Plan litigation, *West Virginia v. EPA*, D.C. Cir. Nos. 15-1363, *et al.*, and has also stated that previously he "has not participated in" any of these cases as Administrator. See Memorandum: My Ethical Obligations 3 (dated May 4, 2017) (available at https://www.eenews.net/assets/2017/05/05/document_pm_06.pdf). Insofar as the March 30 letter addresses the effect of the Supreme Court's stay in the Clean Power Plan litigation, it appears to address a matter as to which the Administrator is recused. Accordingly, we also address this response to the Acting General Counsel.

“Day-to-day” tolling of compliance deadlines is not required by case law, past practice, or the terms of the Supreme Court’s stay order. Indeed, the March 30 letter cites no precedent that would support such a result. Any tolling of deadlines would necessarily rest, instead, upon an equitable determination requiring consideration of all relevant factors, including those that weigh in favor of prompt implementation of Clean Air Act programs – such as the need to protect public health and welfare from harmful air pollution, the feasibility and cost of achieving compliance at the earliest reasonable date, and any applicable statutory deadlines. Thus, an automatic application of day-to-day tolling would be contrary to law. It would also be arbitrary in light of overwhelming scientific evidence concerning the unfolding disaster of climate change, and the eminent feasibility and cost-effectiveness of the emission reduction targets in the Clean Power Plan.

The Supreme Court stay order neither imposes nor justifies day-to-day tolling of out-year deadlines. In a brief Administrator Pruitt signed as Oklahoma Attorney General, the states challenging the Clean Power Plan sought only relief from deadlines “that will occur *during this litigation*.”² EPA has previously noted the “equitable” nature of tolling and concluded that “it is not clear whether and to what extent [the Clean Power Plan] deadlines will necessarily be tolled once the stay is lifted.”³ As EPA has recognized, that question is to be decided by the court in light of the facts and circumstances at the relevant time.

Leading legal experts have pointed out that the relevant case law also does not support a blanket day-to-day tolling policy.⁴ The D.C. Circuit did not apply day-to-day tolling when it dissolved its stay of the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule (CSAPR) in 2014.⁵ Rather, after receiving briefing from all parties in the case, the D.C. Circuit granted EPA’s motion to toll the CSAPR deadlines by three years. This tolling period was based on a consideration of equitable factors, including administrative simplicity and feasibility of compliance, not an arbitrary tolling rule.⁶ And importantly, the reasonableness of tolling in CSAPR depended on the fact that there were pre-existing, enforceable regulations applicable to the same pollution (the Clean Air Interstate Rule) already in place.⁷ Indeed, as Oklahoma Attorney General, Administrator Pruitt argued that the pre-existing regulations limiting emissions of the same pollution regulated by

² Reply of 29 States and State Agencies in Support of Appl. For Immediate Stay, *West Virginia v. EPA*, No. 15A773 29-30 (S. Ct. Feb. 5, 2016) (emphasis added).

³ Proposed Rule, Clean Energy Incentive Program Design Details, 81 Fed. Reg. 42,940, 42,945 (June 30, 2016).

⁴ See Richard L. Revesz and Alexander Walker, *Understanding the Stay: Implications of the Supreme Court’s Stay of the Clean Power Plan* (Apr. 2016), available at http://policyintegrity.org/documents/PPP_Stay_PolicyBrief.pdf.

⁵ *EME Homer City Generation, L.P. v. EPA*, No. 11-1302 (D.C. Cir. Oct. 23, 2014) (order granting motion to lift the stay).

⁶ Respondents’ Motion to Lift the Stay Entered on December 30, 2011 at 15-16, *EME Homer City*, No. 11-1302 (D.C. Cir. June 26, 2014) (ECF No. 1499505).

⁷ See Order Granting Stay, *EME Homer City Generation, LP v. EPA*, No. 11-1302, ECF No. 1350421, (Dec. 30, 2011) (granting stay and stating that “EPA is expected to continue administering the Clean Air Interstate Rule pending the court’s resolution of these petitions for review.”). See also *North Carolina v. E.P.A.*, 550 F.3d 1176, 1178 (D.C. Cir. 2008); *EME Homer City Generation, L.P. v. E.P.A.*, 696 F.3d 7, 38 (D.C. Cir. 2012), *rev’d and remanded*, 134 S. Ct. 1584 (2014).

CSAPR were a factor in determining the appropriate length of the CSAPR stay.⁸ There is no such backup federal regime in place here for carbon dioxide emissions from power plants.

The suggestion that every day a rule is stayed must automatically result in a day of delay after the stay is lifted—regardless of the facts on the ground and the impact on the parties and public of delay or compliance—is not only unreasonable and unsupported by precedent, but also incompatible with the protective values reflected in the Clean Air Act, which emphasizes the *timely* abatement of pollution. *See, e.g.*, 42 U.S.C. 7411(b)(1), (d)(1); *Sierra Club v. E.P.A.*, 294 F.3d 155, 161-62 (D.C. Cir. 2002); *see also Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 426-27 (2009) (in exercise of equitable power to stay agency action pending litigation, courts should give weight to public’s interest on “prompt execution” of the law). Day-to-day tolling would be especially inapt given EPA’s current position in the Clean Power Plan litigation that resolution of the case should be deferred indefinitely.

The emission reduction targets in the Clean Power Plan take effect in 2022, and phase in gradually through 2030. It would be premature, as well as inequitable and unlawful, to opine about any specific tolling of those deadlines without considering all the relevant factors, including the implications for time-sensitive environmental and public health benefits and the feasibility of compliance given the actual realities of the power sector.

In summary, the March 30 letter is inconsistent with the equitable standards courts apply in assessing whether tolling is appropriate. Furthermore, any agency action to modify the deadlines in the Clean Power Plan would have to follow proper statutory procedures, including publication of a proposal, opportunity for public comment, and an opportunity for judicial review. *See* 42 U.S.C. 7607(b), (d). It would be ill-advised for any state or regulated entity, in undertaking planning or investment decisions that might be affected by the Clean Power Plan, to rely on the inaccurate suggestions in the letter.

⁸ Joint Opposition of State and Local Petitioners to Motions to Lift the Stay, D.C. Cir. No. 11-1302 at 1 (filed July 31, 2014) (ECF No. 1505491).

Sincerely,

Tomás Carbonell

Tomás Carbonell
Director of Regulatory Policy
Environmental Defense Fund
1875 Conn. Avenue, N.W. Ste. 600
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 572-3610
Counsel for Environmental Defense Fund

Ann Weeks s/TC

Ann Brewster Weeks
Legal Director
Clean Air Task Force
18 Tremont Street, Suite 530
Boston, MA 02108
(617) 624-0234, ext. 156
*Counsel for American Lung Association,
Clean Air Council, Clean Wisconsin,
Conservation Law Foundation, and The
Ohio Environmental Council*

Vera Pardee s/TC

Vera P. Pardee
Senior Counsel, Supervising Attorney
Center for Biological Diversity
1212 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612
(415) 632-5317
Counsel for Center for Biological Diversity

David Doniger s/TC

David Doniger
Director, Climate and Clean Air Program
Natural Resources Defense Council
1152 15th Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 513-6256
*Counsel for Natural Resources Defense
Council*

Joanne Spalding s/TC

Joanne Spalding
Chief Climate Counsel
The Sierra Club
2101 Webster Street, Suite 1300
Oakland, CA 94612
(415) 977-5725
Counsel for Sierra Club

Bill DePaulo s/TC

William V. DePaulo
122 N Court Street, Suite 300
Lewisburg, WV 24901
(304) 342-5588
*Counsel for West Virginia Highlands
Conservancy, Ohio Valley Environmental
Coalition, Coal River Mountain Watch,
Kanawha Forest Coalition, Mon Valley Clean
Air Coalition, and Keepers of the
Mountains Foundation*

cc: Hon. Kay Ivey, Governor of Alabama
Hon. Doug Ducey, Governor of Arizona
Hon. Asa Hutchinson, Governor of Arkansas
Hon. Jerry Brown, Governor of California
Hon. John Hickenlooper, Governor of Colorado
Hon. Dannel Malloy, Governor of Connecticut
Hon. John Carney, Governor of Delaware
Hon. Rick Scott, Governor of Florida
Hon. Nathan Deal, Governor of Georgia
Hon. Butch Otter, Governor of Idaho
Hon. Bruce Rauner, Governor of Illinois
Hon. Eric Holcomb, Governor of Indiana
Hon. Kim Reynolds, Governor of Iowa
Hon. Sam Brownback, Governor of Kansas
Hon. Matt Bevin, Governor of Kentucky
Hon. John Bel Edwards, Governor of Louisiana
Hon. Paul LePage, Governor of Maine
Hon. Larry Hogan, Governor of Maryland
Hon. Charlie Baker, Governor of Massachusetts
Hon. Rick Snyder, Governor of Michigan
Hon. Mark Dayton, Governor of Minnesota
Hon. Phil Bryant, Governor of Mississippi
Hon. Eric Greitens, Governor of Missouri
Hon. Steve Bullock, Governor of Montana
Hon. Pete Ricketts, Governor of Nebraska
Hon. Brian Sandoval, Governor of Nevada
Hon. Chris Sununu, Governor of New Hampshire
Hon. Chris Christie, Governor of New Jersey
Hon. Susana Martinez, Governor of New Mexico
Hon. Andrew Cuomo, Governor of New York
Hon. Roy Cooper, Governor of North Carolina
Hon. Doug Burgum, Governor of North Dakota
Hon. John Kasich, Governor of Ohio
Hon. Mary Fallin, Governor of Oklahoma
Hon. Kate Brown, Governor of Oregon
Hon. Tom Wolf, Governor of Pennsylvania
Hon. Gina Raimondo, Governor of Rhode Island
Hon. Henry McMaster, Governor of South Carolina
Hon. Dennis Daugaard, Governor of South Dakota
Hon. Bill Haslam, Governor of Tennessee
Hon. Greg Abbott, Governor of Texas
Hon. Gary Herbert, Governor of Utah
Hon. Terry McAuliffe, Governor of Virginia
Hon. Jay Inslee, Governor of Washington
Hon. Jim Justice, Governor of West Virginia
Hon. Scott Walker, Governor of Wisconsin
Hon. Matt Mead, Governor of Wyoming