

FRED UPTON, MICHIGAN
CHAIRMAN

HENRY A. WAXMAN, CALIFORNIA
RANKING MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115

Majority (202) 225-2927
Minority (202) 225-3641

October 25, 2013

The Honorable Gina McCarthy
Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20460

Dear Administrator McCarthy:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Energy and Power on Wednesday, September 18, 2013, to testify at the hearing entitled "The Obama Administration's Climate Change Policies and Activities."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

Also attached are Member requests made during the hearing. The format of your responses to these requests should follow the same format as your responses to the additional questions for the record.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions and requests by the close of business on Friday, November 8, 2013. Your responses should be e-mailed to the Legislative Clerk in Word format at Nick.Abraham@mail.house.gov and mailed to Nick Abraham, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,



Ed Whitfield
Chairman
Subcommittee on Energy and Power

cc: The Honorable Bobby L. Rush, Ranking Member,
Subcommittee on Energy and Power

Attachments

Attachment 1—Member Requests for the Record

During the hearing, Members asked you to provide information for the record and you indicated that you would provide that information. For your convenience, descriptions of the requested information based on the relevant excerpts from the hearing transcript are provided below.

The Honorable Ed Whitfield

1. During the hearing, you testified that “there are four plants that are planning on and designing in CCS at levels that would beat anything that we had proposed in our earlier proposal.” Please list those four plants and for each plant provide the (i) currently estimated costs of construction; (ii) the amount(s) of government funding or financial assistance received; (iii) the date on which construction of the plant began; (iv) the date by which construction is expected to be completed; and (v) the date by which each plant is expected to be operational. In addition, please identify the source of EPA’s cost and scheduling information relating to these facilities.

The Honorable Joe Pitts

1. During the hearing, you testified that EPA keeps “close track” of whether climate change-related programs are accomplishing what they were pre-determined to accomplish, and that the Agency makes this information available to the public. Please identify where that information is available and accessible by the public.

Attachment 2—Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Ed Whitfield

1. Recently 17 Attorneys General and a senior environmental regulator sent a white paper to you raising concerns that in developing New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) standards or guidelines applicable to existing fossil fuel-fired power plants that EPA will not properly defer to states in establishing and implementing standards, and will require existing power plants to operate less or shut down.
 - a. What assurances can you provide that in developing the agency's upcoming greenhouse gas regulations affecting existing fossil fuel-fired plants that EPA will not force existing coal plants to operate less or shut down?
2. According to an Aug. 29 *Bloomberg press report*, certain EU Members sought to exclude from the final summary document for the upcoming IPCC assessment any reference to the global warming "hiatus" or "pause" that has occurred over the last 15 years. According to that article, U.S. regulators are also trying to make certain changes to the summary document.
 - a. What is EPA's role with regard to the development of the IPCC assessment?
 - b. Did EPA participate with other U.S. regulators in developing comments on the summary document?
 - c. What changes to the summary document did EPA and U.S. regulators propose?
3. For the President's Climate Action Plan, has there been an assessment done of the costs to the government to fully implement the plan? If yes, what is the estimated cost?
4. For the President's Climate Action Plan, has there been an assessment done of the costs to consumers to fully implement the plan? If yes, what is the estimated cost?
5. With regard to potential regulation of GHG emissions from aircraft:
 - a. Which U.S. agencies are involved in international negotiations relating to greenhouse gas emissions from aircraft?
 - b. What is the current status of international negotiations relating to greenhouse gas emissions from aircraft? What is the schedule for conclusion of those negotiations?
 - c. What is the current status of EPA's planned rulemaking to address GHG emissions from aircraft, and what is the agency's current schedule for that rulemaking?
 - d. What is the range of potential costs to U.S. consumers for any international or domestic GHG emissions standards from aircraft?

The Honorable Joe Barton

1. Describe the climate change related research and technology programs or activities engaged in by your agency, including programs or activities undertaken with other Federal agencies.

2. Describe the climate change adaptation, mitigation, or sustainability related activities engaged in by your agency, including activities undertaken with other Federal agencies.
3. Identify all climate change related interagency task forces, advisory committees, working groups, and initiatives in which your agency currently participates or has participated since January 2005.
4. Identify all climate change or clean energy related funding, grants or financial assistance programs in which your agency currently participates or has participated, and the amounts of climate change or clean energy related funding, grants, or financial assistance distributed by your agency, if any, since January 2005.
5. Identify all climate change related regulations or guidance documents, including regulations or standards to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, issued, or proposed by your agency since January 2005, and/or under development by your agency.
6. Identify all climate change related international negotiations, agreements, partnerships, working groups, or initiatives in which your agency currently or has previously participated, and the role of your agency in those activities, since January 2005.
7. Provide the approximate amount of annual agency funds attributed to climate change activities for each of the years 2005 through 2012.
8. Describe the actions your agency has undertaken to respond to the Executive Order 13514 including the approximate costs, personnel, and other resources dedicated by your agency to implementing this executive order.
9. Provide a list of each sub-agency, division and/or program office within your agency that is currently engaged in climate change related activities, and provide an estimate of the approximate number of your agency employees and/or contractors currently engaged part-time or full-time in climate change related activities.

The Honorable David B. McKinley

Administrator McCarthy, during the September 18, 2013 hearing on the Obama Administration's Climate Change Policies and Activities before the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, an analysis of the minimal impacts of unrealistic draconian reductions in U.S. greenhouse gas emissions was mentioned. The analysis was conducted using the Model for the Assessment of Greenhouse Gas Induced Climate Change (MAGICC) that uses the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UNIPCC) Fourth Assessment Report (AR4) model results and UNIPCC emission assumptions.

However, we need to understand how your agency has used MAGICC and what the model projects under a range of different scenarios.

Please provide answers to the following:

1. A description of the version of MAGICC in current use by EPA, including the emissions module, the temperature module and the sea level rise module.
2. A description of the climate model run library, including the specific models from the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project (CMIP3) archive.

3. The observational data used by EPA to validate MAGICC prior to its use for policy, including the results of the model runs.
4. The name(s) of the individuals responsible for validating the model under EPA's Information Quality Act guidelines.
5. The results (both graphic and table data) of all MAGICC model runs used in any policy activities since January 20, 2009 including:
 - a. U.S. and global CO₂ emissions (with and without policy change);
 - b. Global-mean surface air temperature projection (with and without policy change);
 - c. Sea level rise projection (with and without policy change); and
 - d. A list of all input settings for each run.
6. A description of the use of MAGICC in the two recent Social Cost of Carbon reports (2010, 2013).

Additionally, we would also like to understand what MAGICC projects under the following scenarios:

7. Results (both graphic and table data) for a base case using Energy Information Administration (EIA) 2013 and International Energy Outlook (IEO) 2013 reference forecast emissions through 2040 and Business as Usual emissions beyond 2040 for the following Climate Sensitivities (CS):
 - a. 3.0
 - b. 1.5
 - c. 1.0
 - d. 0.5
8. Results for the Case 7.a. CS above assuming ALL CO₂ energy emissions, including coal, natural gas and oil combustion emissions, go to zero in 2014.
9. Results for the Annual Energy Outlook 2013 GHG25 (assumes a fee on CO₂ emissions that starts at \$25 per metric ton in 2014 and increases by 5 percent per year through 2040) restricted coal side case emissions using the Case 7.a. CS.

MAGICC versus Integrated Assessment Models (IAM):

10. Please provide the detailed comparison between each of the Integrated Assessment Models (DICE, FUND, PAGE) used in the 2013 Social Cost of Carbon Technical Source Document and EPA's reference MAGICC case for:
 - a. Global-mean surface air temperature projections,
 - b. Sea level rise projections,

- c. U.S. CO2 emissions, and
 - d. Global CO2 emissions through year 2100.
11. Identify the individual(s) responsible for validating the IAM models used by EPA under EPA's Information Quality Act guidelines.

The Honorable Cory Gardner

The Energy Star program has been used by consumers for many years as a guide to purchase sensible, energy efficient products. In your previous role as Assistant Administrator for Air, you oversaw the entire Energy Star program. Historically, industry and retailers in the Windows, Doors and Skylights sector have strongly supported the program. However, today virtually all are questioning both the process for revising product standards and, as a result, the standards themselves.

Manufacturers and retailers believe that, in the name of saving the most energy possible, the EPA proposed Energy Star standards can only be met by products too expensive for consumers to justify the added expense. This is especially true when the payback period is significantly longer than the average length of time a homeowner stays in their house.

1. If manufacturers and retailers, who are closer to the consumer than Energy Star technicians, believe there is a problem, how can the program be successful?
2. Isn't it in the interests of the retailers and manufacturers to promote the most energy efficient AND economically efficient product possible?
3. Energy Star products cost more than other products. So, if the President believes that everyone has a role in reducing greenhouse gases emissions, then how does it make sense to discourage consumers from purchasing Energy Star products, since they won't see that added investment paid back for a decade or more?

The Honorable H. Morgan Griffith

1. EPA issued a rule to defer regulation of CO2 emissions from biomass because it recognized that biogenic carbon wasn't considered in the endangerment finding and it might need different treatment to reflect the natural carbon cycle of biomass. In July, the DC Circuit Court overturned the rule that deferred regulation of CO2 emissions from biomass combustion under the air permitting program, although the Court's mandate has not been formally issued. When does EPA plan to issue the Accounting Framework it has been working on for two years? And when will EPA revise the current Tailoring rule to permanently address the treatment of biogenic emissions in the air permitting program?
2. Does EPA need any additional statutory authority to retain the internationally accepted principle of carbon neutrality for biomass?
3. If EPA has determined that CCS is the best system of emission reductions, then shouldn't CCS apply to all power generation, regardless of fuel type?
4. In his first year in office, the President outlined a goal of 17 percent reduction in 2005 greenhouse gas levels by 2020. He mentioned this same goal in his climate speech in June at Georgetown University. I

assume he picked that number – 17 percent -- because he believes it's achievable and economical. Can you provide a total greenhouse gas reduction benefit of EPA's programs and policies over the last 5 years? If that number is unavailable, wouldn't you agree that we can't possibly set policies that set a target number for 7 years from now if we don't know where we are today?

The Honorable John D. Dingell

1. Does the EPA see a future for coal as a viable energy source in light of the impending greenhouse gas regulations?
2. I understand that there will be a different proposal for modified sources (units that have been updated) and for existing sources (that have not been modified).
 - a. Can you tell me if EPA is reaching out to all stakeholders concerned about both components of the greenhouse gas rule?
3. The debate about climate change is not just about air, but also water. You may know that the Great Lakes contain 20 percent of the world's fresh water. Luckily, water levels are up slightly this year after years of inadequate ice cover on the Lakes and too little rain and snow. Lower lake levels affect not only shipping and boating recreation but also make it easier for algae blooms to form, endanger fishery habitats, and threaten drinking water sources as well as cooling water intakes.
 - a. In dealing with water quality, do you believe EPA has adequate clarification of its jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act to ensure protection of water sources?
4. You may have seen a recent map published in National Geographic showing what would happen if all of the world's ice were to melt. While this is a somewhat drastic scenario that shows almost all of Florida and New Jersey submerged, it was what was not on the map that intrigued me the most. The map showed little or no effect on the Great Lakes. Do you believe that EPA, along with other federal agencies, have the tools necessary to predict what effects climate change might have on the Great Lakes region?