

**ORAL ARGUMENT SCHEDULED FOR JUNE 2, 2016**

---

No. 15-1363 (and consolidated cases)

---

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

---

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA, *et al.*,  
*Petitioners,*

v.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, *et al.*,  
*Respondents.*

---

**On Petitions for Review of Final Agency Action of the  
United States Environmental Protection Agency  
80 Fed. Reg. 64,662 (Oct. 23, 2015)**

---

**REPLY BRIEF OF PETITIONERS ON CORE LEGAL ISSUES**

---

Ken Paxton  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
Jeffrey C. Mateer  
First Assistant Attorney General  
Scott A. Keller  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 12548  
Austin, TX 78711-2548  
Tel: (512) 936-1700  
scott.keller@texasattorneygeneral.gov  
  
*Counsel for Petitioner State of Texas*

Patrick Morrissey  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WEST  
VIRGINIA  
Elbert Lin  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
J. Zak Ritchie  
Assistant Attorney General  
State Capitol Building 1, Room 26-E  
Charleston, WV 25305  
Tel: (304) 558-2021  
Fax: (304) 558-0140  
elbert.lin@wvago.gov  
  
*Counsel for Petitioner State of West Virginia*

**DATED: April 15, 2016**

*Counsel for Petitioner State of West Virginia*

*Additional counsel listed on following pages*

---

F. William Brownell  
Allison D. Wood  
Henry V. Nickel  
Tauna M. Szymanski  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
bbrownell@hunton.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Utility Air Regulatory  
Group and American Public Power Association*

Peter S. Glaser  
Carroll W. McGuffey III  
Justin T. Wong  
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP  
401 Ninth Street N.W., Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 274-2998  
peter.glaser@troutmansanders.com

*Counsel for Petitioner National Mining  
Association*

Peter D. Keisler  
Roger R. Martella, Jr.  
C. Frederick Beckner III  
Ryan C. Morris  
Paul J. Ray  
SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 736-8027  
pkeisler@sidley.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Chamber of Commerce of  
the United States of America; National  
Association of Manufacturers; American Fuel  
& Petrochemical Manufacturers; and National  
Federation of Independent Business*

Luther Strange  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ALABAMA  
Andrew Brasher  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
501 Washington Avenue  
Montgomery, AL 36130  
Tel: (334) 353-2609  
abrasher@ago.state.al.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Alabama*

Mark Brnovich  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ARIZONA  
John R. Lopez IV  
*Counsel of Record*  
Dominic E. Draye  
Keith J. Miller  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Maureen Scott  
Janet Wagner  
Janice Alward  
Arizona Corp. Commission,  
Staff Attorneys  
1275 West Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  
Tel: (602) 542-5025  
john.lopez@azag.gov  
dominic.draye@azag.gov  
keith.miller@azag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner Arizona Corporation  
Commission*

Thomas A. Lorenzen  
D.C. Cir. Bar No. 394369  
Daniel W. Wolff  
Sherrie A. Armstrong  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 624-2500  
tlorenzen@crowell.com  
dwolff@crowell.com  
sarmstrong@crowell.com

*Counsel for Petitioners National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; Big Rivers Electric Corporation; Brazos Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; Buckeye Power, Inc.; Central Montana Electric Power Cooperative; Central Electric Power Cooperative, Inc., Corn Belt Power Cooperative; Dairyland Power Cooperative; East River Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; Georgia Transmission Corporation; Kansas Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation; Northwest Iowa Power Cooperative; Oglethorpe Power Corporation; PowerSouth Energy Cooperative; Prairie Power, Inc.; Rushmore Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Southern Illinois Power Cooperative; Sunflower Electric Power Corporation; and Upper Missouri G. & T. Electric Cooperative, Inc.*

Leslie Rutledge  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ARKANSAS  
Lee Rudofsky  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Jamie L. Ewing  
Assistant Attorney General  
323 Center Street, Suite 400  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
Tel: (501) 682-5310  
lee.rudofsky@arkansasag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Arkansas*

Cynthia H. Coffman  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF COLORADO  
Frederick Yarger  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
1300 Broadway, 10th Floor  
Denver, CO 80203  
Tel: (720) 508-6168  
fred.yarger@state.co.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Colorado*

*Of Counsel*

Rae Cronmiller  
Environmental Counsel  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RURAL  
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES  
4301 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22203  
Tel: (703) 907-5500  
rae.cronmiller@nreca.coop

*Counsel for Petitioner National Rural Electric  
Cooperative Association*

Eric L. Hiser  
JORDEN BISCHOFF & HISER, PLC  
7272 E. Indian School Road, Suite 360  
Scottsdale, AZ 85251  
Tel: (480) 505-3927  
ehiser@jordenbischoff.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Arizona Electric Power  
Cooperative, Inc.*

Brian A. Prestwood  
Senior Corporate and Compliance  
Counsel  
ASSOCIATED ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,  
INC.  
2814 S. Golden, P.O. Box 754  
Springfield, MO 65801  
Tel: (417) 885-9273  
bprestwood@aeci.org

*Counsel for Petitioner Associated Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.*

Pamela Jo Bondi  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF FLORIDA  
Jonathan L. Williams  
Deputy Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Jonathan A. Glogau  
Special Counsel  
Office of the Attorney General  
PL-01, The Capitol  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050  
Tel: (850) 414-3818  
Fax: (850) 410-2672  
jonathan.williams@myfloridalegal.com  
jonathan.glogau@myfloridalegal.com

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Florida*

Samuel S. Olenz  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF GEORGIA  
Britt C. Grant  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
40 Capitol Square S.W.  
Atlanta, GA 30334  
Tel: (404) 656-3300  
Fax: (404) 463-9453  
bgrant@law.ga.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Georgia*

David Crabtree  
Vice President, General Counsel  
DESERET GENERATION & TRANSMISSION  
CO-OPERATIVE  
10714 South Jordan Gateway  
South Jordan, UT 84095  
Tel: (801) 619-9500  
Crabtree@deseretpower.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Deseret Generation &  
Transmission Co-operative*

John M. Holloway III  
SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP  
700 Sixth Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 383-0100  
Fax: (202) 383-3593  
jay.holloway@sutherland.com

*Counsel for Petitioners East Kentucky Power  
Cooperative, Inc.; Hoosier Energy Rural Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.; Minnkota Power Cooperative,  
Inc.; and South Mississippi Electric Power  
Association*

Gregory F. Zoeller  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF INDIANA  
Timothy Junk  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Indiana Government Ctr. South  
Fifth Floor  
302 West Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46205  
Tel: (317) 232-6247  
tim.junk@atg.in.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Indiana*

Derek Schmidt  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF KANSAS  
Jeffrey A. Chanay  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Bryan C. Clark  
Assistant Solicitor General  
120 S.W. 10th Avenue, 3rd Floor  
Topeka, KS 66612  
Tel: (785) 368-8435  
Fax: (785) 291-3767  
jeff.chanay@ag.ks.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Kansas*

Patrick Burchette  
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP  
800 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 469-5102  
Patrick.Burchette@hklaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners East Texas Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.; Northeast Texas Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.; Sam Rayburn G&T Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.; and Tex-La Electric  
Cooperative of Texas, Inc.*

Christopher L. Bell  
GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP  
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 1700  
Houston, TX 77002  
Tel: (713) 374-3556  
bellc@gtlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Golden Spread Electrical  
Cooperative, Inc.*

Andy Beshear  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF KENTUCKY  
Mitchel T. Denham  
Assistant Deputy Attorney General  
Joseph A. Newberg, II  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
700 Capital Avenue  
Suite 118  
Frankfort, KY 40601  
Tel: (502) 696-5611  
joe.newberg@ky.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner Commonwealth of  
Kentucky*

Jeff Landry  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF LOUISIANA  
Steven B. “Beaux” Jones  
*Counsel of Record*  
Duncan S. Kemp, IV  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Environmental Section – Civil Division  
1885 N. Third Street  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804  
Tel: (225) 326-6085  
Fax: (225) 326-6099  
jonesst@ag.state.la.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Louisiana*

Mark Walters  
Michael J. Nasi  
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.  
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100  
Austin, TX 78701  
Tel: (512) 236-2000  
Fax: (512) 236-2002  
mwalters@jw.com  
mnasi@jw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners San Miguel Electric  
Cooperative, Inc. and South Texas Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.*

Randolph G. Holt  
Jeremy L. Fetty  
PARR RICHEY OBREMSKEY FRANDSEN &  
PATTERSON LLP  
Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.  
722 N. High School Road  
P.O. Box 24700  
Indianapolis, IN 46224  
Tel: (317) 481-2815  
R\_holt@wvpa.com  
jfetty@parrlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Wabash Valley Power  
Association, Inc.*

Herman Robinson  
Executive Counsel  
Donald Trahan  
*Counsel of Record*  
Elliott Vega  
LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
Legal Division  
P.O. Box 4302  
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-4302  
Tel: (225) 219-3985  
Fax: (225) 219-4068  
donald.trahan@la.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Louisiana  
Department of Environmental Quality*

Monica Derbes Gibson  
Lesley Foxhall Pietras  
LISKOW & LEWIS, P.L.C.  
701 Poydras Street, Suite 5000  
New Orleans, LA 70139  
Tel: (504) 556-4010  
Fax: (504) 556-4108  
mdgibson@liskow.com  
lfpietras@liskow.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Louisiana Public Service  
Commission*

Megan H. Berge  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Western Farmers Electric  
Cooperative*

Steven C. Kohl  
Gaetan Gerville-Reache  
WARNER NORCROSS & JUDD LLP  
2000 Town Center, Suite 2700  
Southfield, MI 48075-1318  
Tel: (248) 784-5000  
skohl@wnj.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Wolverine Power Supply  
Cooperative, Inc.*

Bill Schuette  
ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE PEOPLE  
OF MICHIGAN  
Aaron D. Lindstrom  
Michigan Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 30212  
Lansing, MI 48909  
Tel: (515) 373-1124  
Fax: (517) 373-3042  
lindstroma@michigan.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner People of the State of  
Michigan*

Jim Hood  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF  
MISSISSIPPI  
Harold E. Pizzetta  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Litigation Division  
Office of the Attorney General  
Post Office Box 220  
Jackson, MS 39205  
Tel: (601) 359-3816  
Fax: (601) 359-2003  
hpizz@ago.state.ms.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Mississippi*



Christina F. Gomez  
Lawrence E. Volmert  
Garrison W. Kaufman  
Jill H. Van Noord  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
555 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3200  
Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 295-8000  
Fax: (303) 295-8261  
cgomez@hollandhart.com  
lvolmert@hollandhart.com  
gwkaufman@hollandhart.com  
jhvan Noord@hollandhart.com

Patrick R. Day  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
2515 Warren Avenue, Suite 450  
Cheyenne, WY 82001  
Tel: (307) 778-4200  
Fax: (307) 778-8175  
pday@hollandhart.com

Emily C. Schilling  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
222 South Main Street, Suite 2200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101  
Tel: (801) 799-5800  
Fax: (801) 799-5700  
ecschilling@hollandhart.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Basin Electric Power  
Cooperative*

Donna J. Hodges  
Senior Counsel  
MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
P.O. Box 2261  
Jackson, MS 39225-2261  
Tel: (601) 961-5369  
Fax: (601) 961-5349  
donna\_hodges@deq.state.ms.us

*Counsel for Petitioner Mississippi Department of  
Environmental Quality*

Todd E. Palmer  
Valerie L. Green  
MICHAEL, BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP  
601 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2601  
Tel: (202) 747-9560  
Fax: (202) 347-1819  
tepalmer@michaelbest.com  
vlgreen@michaelbest.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Mississippi Public Service  
Commission*

Stacey Turner  
SOUTHERN COMPANY SERVICES, INC.  
600 18<sup>th</sup> Street North  
BIN 14N-8195  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
Tel: (205) 257-2823  
staturne@southernco.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Alabama Power Company, Georgia Power Company, Gulf Power Company, and Mississippi Power Company*

C. Grady Moore, III  
Steven G. McKinney  
BALCH & BINGHAM LLP  
1901 Sixth Avenue North, Suite 1500  
Birmingham, AL 35303-4642  
Tel: (205) 251-8100  
Fax: (205) 488-5704  
gmoore@balch.com  
smckinney@balch.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Alabama Power Company*

Margaret Claiborne Campbell  
Angela J. Levin  
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP  
600 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 5200  
Atlanta, GA 30308-2216  
Tel: (404) 885-3000  
margaret.campbell@troutmansanders.com  
angela.levin@troutmansanders.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Georgia Power Company*

Chris Koster  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MISSOURI  
James R. Layton  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 899  
207 W. High Street  
Jefferson City, MO 65102  
Tel: (573) 751-1800  
Fax: (573) 751-0774  
james.layton@ago.mo.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Missouri*

Timothy C. Fox  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MONTANA  
Alan Joscelyn  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
Dale Schowengerdt  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
215 North Sanders  
Helena, MT 59620-1401  
Tel: (406) 444-7008  
dales@mt.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Montana*

Terese T. Wyly  
Ben H. Stone  
BALCH & BINGHAM LLP  
1310 Twenty Fifth Avenue  
Gulfport, MS 39501-1931  
Tel: (228) 214-0413  
twyly@balch.com  
bstone@balch.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Mississippi Power  
Company*

Jeffrey A. Stone  
BEGGS & LANE, RLLP  
501 Commendancia Street  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
Tel: (850) 432-2451  
JAS@beggslane.com

James S. Alves  
2110 Trescott Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
Tel: (850) 566-7607  
jim.s.alves@outlook.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Gulf Power Company*

Douglas J. Peterson  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEBRASKA  
Dave Bydlaek  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
Justin D. Lavene  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
2115 State Capitol  
Lincoln, NE 68509  
Tel: (402) 471-2834  
justin.lavene@nebraska.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Nebraska*

Robert Lougy  
ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW  
JERSEY  
David C. Apy  
Assistant Attorney General  
John R. Renella  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Division of Law  
R.J. Hughes Justice Complex  
P.O. Box 093  
25 Market Street  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0093  
Tel: (609) 292-6945  
Fax: (609) 341-5030  
john.renella@dol.lps.state.nj.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of New Jersey*

James S. Alves  
2110 Trescott Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
Tel: (850) 566-7607  
jim.s.alves@outlook.com

*Counsel for Petitioner CO<sub>2</sub> Task Force of the  
Florida Electric Power Coordinating Group, Inc.*

John J. McMackin  
WILLIAMS & JENSEN  
701 8th Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 659-8201  
jjmcmackin@wms-jen.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Energy-Intensive  
Manufacturers Working Group on Greenhouse  
Gas Regulation*

William M. Bumpers  
Megan H. Berge  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

Kelly McQueen  
ENTERGY SERVICES, INC.  
425 W. Capitol Avenue, 27th Floor  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
Tel: (501) 377-5760  
kmcque1@entergy.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Entergy Corporation*

Wayne Stenehjem  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NORTH  
DAKOTA  
Margaret Olson  
Assistant Attorney General  
North Dakota Attorney General's Office  
600 E. Boulevard Avenue #125  
Bismarck, ND 58505  
Tel: (701) 328-3640  
maiolson@nd.gov

Paul M. Seby  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
State of North Dakota  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
1200 17th Street, Suite 2400  
Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 572-6500  
Fax: (303) 572-6540  
sebyp@gtlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner State of North Dakota*

Michael DeWine  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OHIO  
Eric E. Murphy  
State Solicitor  
*Counsel of Record*  
30 E. Broad Street, 17th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Tel: (614) 466-8980  
eric.murphy@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Ohio*

Paul J. Zidlicky  
SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 736-8000  
pzidlicky@sidley.com

*Counsel for Petitioners GenOn Mid-Atlantic, LLC; Indian River Power LLC; Louisiana Generating LLC; Midwest Generation, LLC; NRG Chalk Point LLC; NRG Power Midwest LP; NRG Rema LLC; NRG Texas Power LLC; NRG Wholesale Generation LP; and Vienna Power LLC*

David M. Flannery  
Kathy G. Beckett  
Edward L. Kropp  
STEPTOE & JOHNSON, PLLC  
707 Virginia Street East  
Charleston, WV 25326  
Tel: (304) 353-8000  
dave.flannery@steptoe-johnson.com  
kathy.beckett@steptoe-johnson.com  
skipp.kropp@steptoe-johnson.com

Stephen L. Miller  
STEPTOE & JOHNSON, PLLC  
700 N. Hurstbourne Parkway, Suite 115  
Louisville, KY 40222  
Tel: (502) 423-2000  
steve.miller@steptoe-johnson.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Indiana Utility Group*

E. Scott Pruitt  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OKLAHOMA  
Patrick R. Wyrick  
Solicitor General of Oklahoma  
313 N.E. 21st Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
Tel: (405) 521-4396  
Fax: (405) 522-0669  
fc.docket@oag.state.ok.us  
scott.pruitt@oag.ok.gov

David B. Rivkin, Jr.  
*Counsel of Record*  
Mark W. DeLaquil  
Andrew M. Grossman  
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP  
Washington Square, Suite 1100  
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 861-1731  
Fax: (202) 861-1783  
drivkin@bakerlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners State of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality*

F. William Brownell  
Eric J. Murdock  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
bbrownell@hunton.com  
emurdock@hunton.com

Nash E. Long III  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
Bank of America Plaza, Suite 3500  
101 South Tryon Street  
Charlotte, NC 28280  
Tel: (704) 378-4700  
nlong@hunton.com

*Counsel for Petitioner LG&E and  
KU Energy LLC*

Alan Wilson  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA  
Robert D. Cook  
Solicitor General  
James Emory Smith, Jr.  
Deputy Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
Tel: (803) 734-3680  
Fax: (803) 734-3677  
esmith@scag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of South Carolina*

Marty J. Jackley  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH  
DAKOTA  
Steven R. Blair  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
1302 E. Highway 14, Suite 1  
Pierre, SD 57501  
Tel: (605) 773-3215  
steven.blair@state.sd.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of South Dakota*

P. Stephen Gidiere III  
Thomas L. Casey III  
Julia B. Barber  
BALCH & BINGHAM LLP  
1901 6th Ave. N., Suite 1500  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
Tel: (205) 251-8100  
sgidiere@balch.com

Stephanie Z. Moore  
Vice President and General Counsel  
LUMINANT GENERATION COMPANY LLC  
1601 Bryan Street, 22nd Floor  
Dallas, TX 75201

Daniel J. Kelly  
Vice President and Associate General  
Counsel  
ENERGY FUTURE HOLDINGS CORP.  
1601 Bryan Street, 43rd Floor  
Dallas, TX 75201

*Counsel for Petitioners Luminant Generation  
Company LLC; Oak Grove Management  
Company LLC; Big Brown Power Company  
LLC; Sandow Power Company LLC; Big  
Brown Lignite Company LLC; Luminant  
Mining Company LLC; and Luminant Big  
Brown Mining Company LLC*

Sean Reyes  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF UTAH  
Tyler R. Green  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Parker Douglas  
Federal Solicitor  
Utah State Capitol Complex  
350 North State Street, Suite 230  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-2320  
pdouglas@utah.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Utah*

Brad D. Schimel  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WISCONSIN  
Misha Tseytlin  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Andrew Cook  
Deputy Attorney General  
Delanie M. Breuer  
Assistant Deputy Attorney General  
Wisconsin Department of Justice  
17 West Main Street  
Madison, WI 53707  
Tel: (608) 267-9323  
tseytlinm@doj.state.wi.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Wisconsin*

Ronald J. Tenpas  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 739-3000  
rtenpas@morganlewis.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Minnesota Power (an  
operating division of ALLETE, Inc.)*

Allison D. Wood  
Tauna M. Szymanski  
Andrew D. Knudsen  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
awood@hunton.com  
tszymanski@hunton.com  
aknudsen@hunton.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Montana-Dakota Utilities  
Co., a Division of MDU Resources Group, Inc.*

Peter K. Michael  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WYOMING  
James Kaste  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Michael J. McGrady  
Erik Petersen  
Senior Assistant Attorneys General  
Elizabeth Morrisseau  
Assistant Attorney General  
2320 Capitol Avenue  
Cheyenne, WY 82002  
Tel: (307) 777-6946  
Fax: (307) 777-3542  
james.kaste@wyo.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Wyoming*

Sam M. Hayes  
General Counsel  
*Counsel of Record*  
Craig Bromby  
Deputy General Counsel  
Andrew Norton  
Deputy General Counsel  
NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
1601 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-1601  
Tel: (919) 707-8616  
sam.hayes@ncdenr.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner North Carolina  
Department of Environmental Quality*



William M. Bumpers  
Megan H. Berge  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner NorthWestern  
Corporation d/b/a NorthWestern Energy*

Joshua R. More  
Jane E. Montgomery  
Amy Antonioli  
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 6600  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Tel: (312) 258-5500  
jmore@schiffhardin.com  
jmontgomery@schiffhardin.com  
aantonioli@schiffhardin.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Prairie State Generating  
Company, LLC*

Dennis Lane  
STINSON LEONARD STREET LLP  
1775 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 785-9100  
Fax: (202) 785-9163  
dennis.lane@stinson.com

Parthenia B. Evans  
STINSON LEONARD STREET LLP  
1201 Walnut Street, Suite 2900  
Kansas City, MO 64106  
Tel: (816) 842-8600  
Fax: (816) 691-3495  
parthy.evans@stinson.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Kansas City Board of  
Public Utilities – Unified Government of  
Wyandotte County/ Kansas City, Kansas*

Allison D. Wood  
Tauna M. Szymanski  
Andrew D. Knudsen  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
awood@hunton.com  
tszymanski@hunton.com  
aknudsen@hunton.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Tri-State Generation and  
Transmission Association, Inc.*

William M. Bumpers  
Megan H. Berge  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Westar Energy, Inc.*

Peter D. Keisler  
Roger R. Martella, Jr.  
C. Frederick Beckner III  
Ryan C. Morris  
Paul J. Ray  
SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 736-8027  
pkeisler@sidley.com

*Counsel for Petitioners American Chemistry  
Council; American Coke and Coal Chemicals  
Institute; American Foundry Society; American  
Forest & Paper Association; American Iron &  
Steel Institute; American Wood Council; Brick  
Industry Association; Electricity Consumers  
Resource Council; Lignite Energy Council;  
National Lime Association; National Oilseed  
Processors Association; and Portland Cement  
Association*

Jeffrey R. Holmstead  
Sandra Y. Snyder  
BRACEWELL LLP  
2001 M Street, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 828-5852  
Fax: (202) 857-4812  
jeff.holmstead@bracewelllaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner American Coalition for  
Clean Coal Electricity*

Geoffrey K. Barnes  
J. Van Carson  
Wendlene M. Lavey  
John D. Lazzaretti  
Robert D. Cheren  
SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS (US) LLP  
4900 Key Tower  
127 Public Square  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
Tel: (216) 479-8646  
geoffrey.barnes@squirepb.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Murray Energy  
Corporation*

Andrew C. Emrich  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
6380 South Fiddlers Green Circle  
Suite 500  
Greenwood Village, CO 80111  
Tel: (303) 290-1621  
Fax: (866) 711-8046  
acemrich@hollandhart.com

Emily C. Schilling  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
222 South Main Street, Suite 2200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101  
Tel: (801) 799-5753  
Fax: (202) 747-6574  
ecschilling@hollandhart.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Newmont Nevada  
Energy Investment, LLC and Newmont USA  
Limited*

Charles T. Wehland

*Counsel of Record*

Brian J. Murray

JONES DAY

77 West Wacker Drive, Suite 3500

Chicago, IL 60601-1692

Tel: (312) 782-3939

Fax: (312) 782-8585

ctwehland@jonesday.com

bjmurray@jonesday.com

*Counsel for Petitioners The North American Coal Corporation; The Coteau Properties Company; Coyote Creek Mining Company, LLC; The Falkirk Mining Company; Mississippi Lignite Mining Company; North American Coal Royalty Company; NODAK Energy Services, LLC; Otter Creek Mining Company, LLC; and The Sabine Mining Company*

Robert G. McLusky

JACKSON KELLY, PLLC

1600 Laidley Tower

P.O. Box 553

Charleston, WV 25322

Tel: (304) 340-1000

rmclusky@jacksonkelly.com

*Counsel for Petitioner West Virginia Coal Association*

Eugene M. Trisko  
LAW OFFICES OF EUGENE M. TRISKO  
P.O. Box 596  
Berkeley Springs, WV 25411  
Tel: (304) 258-1977  
Tel: (301) 639-5238 (cell)  
emtrisko7@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner International Brotherhood  
of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders,  
Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers*

Eugene M. Trisko  
LAW OFFICES OF EUGENE M. TRISKO  
P.O. Box 596  
Berkeley Springs, WV 25411  
Tel: (304) 258-1977  
Tel: (301) 639-5238 (cell)  
emtrisko7@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner International Brotherhood  
of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO*

Grant F. Crandall  
General Counsel  
UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA  
18354 Quantico Gateway Drive  
Triangle, VA 22172  
Tel: (703) 291-2429  
gcrandall@umwa.org

Arthur Traynor, III  
Staff Counsel  
UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA  
18354 Quantico Gateway Drive  
Triangle, VA 22172  
Tel: (703) 291-2457  
atraynor@umwa.org

Eugene M. Trisko  
LAW OFFICES OF EUGENE M. TRISKO  
P.O. Box 596  
Berkeley Springs, WV 25411  
Tel: (304) 258-1977  
emtrisko7@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner United Mine Workers of  
America*

Steven P. Lehotsky  
Sheldon B. Gilbert  
U.S. CHAMBER LITIGATION CENTER, INC.  
1615 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20062  
Tel: (202) 463-5337  
slehotsky@uschamber.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Chamber of Commerce of  
the United States of America*

Linda E. Kelly  
Quentin Riegel  
Leland P. Frost  
MANUFACTURERS' CENTER FOR LEGAL  
ACTION  
733 10th Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 637-3000  
qriegel@nam.org

*Counsel for Petitioner National Association of  
Manufacturers*

Richard S. Moskowitz  
AMERICAN FUEL & PETROCHEMICAL  
MANUFACTURERS  
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 457-0480  
rmoskowitz@afpm.org

*Counsel for Petitioner American Fuel &  
Petrochemical Manufacturers*

Karen R. Harned  
Executive Director  
Elizabeth A. Gaudio  
Senior Executive Counsel  
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF  
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS  
SMALL BUSINESS LEGAL CENTER  
1201 F Street, N.W., Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 314-2061  
karen.harned@nfib.org  
elizabeth.milito@nfib.org

*Counsel for Petitioner National Federation of  
Independent Business*



Megan H. Berge  
William M. Bumpers  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner National Association of  
Home Builders*

Kathryn D. Kirmayer  
General Counsel  
Evelyn R. Nackman  
Associate General Counsel  
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS  
425 3rd Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20024  
Tel: (202) 639-2100  
kkirmayer@aar.org

*Counsel for Petitioner Association of American  
Railroads*

Chaim Mandelbaum  
Litigation Manager  
FREE MARKET ENVIRONMENTAL LAW  
CLINIC  
726 N. Nelson Street, Suite 9  
Arlington, VA 22203  
Tel: (703) 577-9973  
chaim12@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Energy and Environment  
Legal Institute*

Catherine E. Stetson  
Eugene A. Sokoloff  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-1109  
Tel: (202) 637-5600  
Fax: (202) 637-5910  
cate.stetson@hoganlovells.com  
eugene.sokoloff@hoganlovells.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Denbury Onshore, LLC*

C. Boyden Gray  
Adam R.F. Gustafson  
*Counsel of Record*  
Derek S. Lyons  
James R. Conde  
BOYDEN GRAY & ASSOCIATES, PLLC  
1627 I Street, N.W., Suite 950  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 955-0620  
gustafson@boydengrayassociates.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Competitive Enterprise  
Institute; Buckeye Institute for Public Policy  
Solutions; Independence Institute; Rio Grande  
Foundation; Sutherland Institute; Klaus J.  
Christoph; Samuel R. Damewood; Catherine C.  
Dellin; Joseph W. Luquire; Lisa R. Markham;  
Patrick T. Peterson; and Kristi Rosenquist*

Sam Kazman  
Hans Bader  
COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE  
1899 L Street, N.W., 12th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 331-1010

*Counsel for Petitioner Competitive Enterprise  
Institute*

Robert Alt  
BUCKEYE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY  
SOLUTIONS  
88 E. Broad Street, Suite 1120  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Tel: (614) 224-4422  
robert@buckeyeinstitute.org

*Counsel for Petitioner Buckeye Institute for  
Public Policy Solutions*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
GLOSSARY OF TERMS .....	ix
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	5
I. EPA’s Assertion of Authority Is Unlawful Because It Lacks Clear Congressional Authorization.....	5
A. EPA Cannot Identify Clear Congressional Authorization for the Novel and Vast Authority Claimed in the Rule.....	5
B. EPA Seeks To Invade a Traditional State Regulatory Domain Without a Clear Statement from Congress. ....	9
II. Section 111 Unambiguously Forecloses EPA’s “Generation-Shifting” Best System of Emission Reduction.....	12
A. Section 111 Does Not Authorize EPA To Base Emission Reductions on Measures that Cannot Be “Appl[ied] ... to” Individual Regulated “Stationary Sources.” .....	12
1. EPA cannot dissociate its best system of emission reduction from the standards of performance that will be based on that system.....	13
2. EPA improperly redefines the statutory term “source.” .....	15
3. The Rule is unprecedented. ....	21
B. The Rule Does Not Provide for “Standards of Performance.” .....	23
1. Under the statute, a standard of performance cannot involve “generation-shifting.” .....	23
2. The Rule is at odds with the Clean Air Act’s structure.....	27
C. The Rule Is Inconsistent with Section 111 as a Whole. ....	29
III. The Section 112 Exclusion Unambiguously Prohibits the Rule. ....	32
A. EPA Fails To Defend the Interpretation of the Exclusion It Adopted in the Rule. ....	32
B. EPA’s Arguments Against the Unambiguous Meaning of the Exclusion Lack Merit. ....	34

1.	The statutory text, as it appears in the U.S. Code, is not ambiguous.....	34
2.	EPA’s non-textual arguments fail.....	36
C.	EPA’s Defense of the Erroneous Conforming Amendment Is Unpersuasive.....	39
IV.	The Rule Unlawfully Abrogates Authority Granted to the States by the Clean Air Act.....	41
A.	EPA Has Improperly Intruded on State Authority To “Establish[]” Performance Standards Under Section 111(d).....	41
B.	EPA Improperly Intrudes on State Authority To Consider a Source’s Remaining Useful Life and Other Factors.....	42
V.	The Rule Violates the Tenth Amendment.....	45
	CONCLUSION .....	49
	CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### FEDERAL CASES

	<u>Page</u>
<i>*Am. Bar Ass’n v. FTC</i> , 430 F.3d 457 (D.C. Cir. 2005) .....	2, 9, 10, 35
<i>*Am. Elec. Power Co. v. Connecticut</i> , 564 U.S. 410 (2011) .....	8, 32, 40
<i>Am.’s Cmty. Bankers v. FDIC</i> , 200 F.3d 822 (D.C. Cir. 2000) .....	33
<i>Ark. Elec. Coop. Corp. v. Ark. Pub. Serv. Comm’n</i> , 461 U.S. 375 (1983) .....	9
<i>*ASARCO Inc. v. EPA</i> , 578 F.2d 319 (D.C. Cir. 1978) .....	20, 21, 26
<i>Bond v. United States</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2077 (2014) .....	9
<i>Brown v. Gardner</i> , 513 U.S. 115 (1994) .....	34
<i>Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. NRDC</i> , 467 U.S. 837 (1984) .....	21
<i>Chickasaw Nation v. United States</i> , 534 U.S. 84 (2001) .....	39
<i>Clark v. Martinez</i> , 543 U.S. 371 (2005) .....	36
<i>Commodity Futures Trading Comm’n v. Schor</i> , 478 U.S. 833 (1986) .....	42
<i>Conn. Dep’t of Pub. Util. Control v. FERC</i> , 569 F.3d 477 (D.C. Cir. 2009) .....	10
<i>Dist. of Columbia v. Dep’t of Labor</i> , No. 14-5132, 2016 WL 1319453 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 5, 2016) .....	17, 22
<i>*FDA v. Brown &amp; Williamson Tobacco Corp.</i> , 529 U.S. 120 (2000) .....	2, 5, 7
<i>FERC v. Electric Power Supply Ass’n</i> , 136 S. Ct. 760 (2016) .....	10
<i>FERC v. Mississippi</i> , 456 U.S. 742 (1982) .....	47
<i>Gregory v. Ashcroft</i> , 501 U.S. 452 (1991) .....	9

---

\* Authorities upon which we chiefly rely are marked with asterisks.

<i>Harrison v. PPG Indus., Inc.</i> , 446 U.S. 578 (1980) .....	38
<i>Hodel v. Va. Surface Mining &amp; Reclamation Ass'n</i> , 452 U.S. 264 (1981) .....	45, 46
* <i>King v. Burwell</i> , 135 S. Ct. 2480 (2015) .....	5
<i>Massachusetts v. EPA</i> , 549 U.S. 497 (2007) .....	8
<i>Metro Life Ins. Co. v. Massachusetts</i> , 471 U.S. 724 (1985) .....	36
<i>Michigan v. EPA</i> , 268 F.3d 1075 (D.C. Cir. 2001) .....	2
<i>New Jersey v. EPA</i> , 517 F.3d 574 (D.C. Cir. 2008) .....	22
<i>New York v. United States</i> , 505 U.S. 144 (1992) .....	45, 46, 47
<i>Owner-Operator Indep. Drivers Ass'n v. U.S. Dep't of Transp.</i> , 724 F.3d 230 (D.C. Cir. 2013) .....	34
* <i>Pac. Gas &amp; Elec. Co. v. State Energy Res. Conservation &amp; Dev. Comm'n</i> , 461 U.S. 190 (1983) .....	10
<i>Portland Cement Ass'n v. Ruckelshaus</i> , 486 F.2d 375 (D.C. Cir. 1973) .....	30
<i>Printz v. United States</i> , 521 U.S. 898 (1997) .....	47
<i>Raygor v. Regents of Univ. of Minn.</i> , 534 U.S. 533 (2002) .....	9
<i>Rush Prudential HMO, Inc. v. Moran</i> , 536 U.S. 355 (2002) .....	36
<i>Rust v. Sullivan</i> , 500 U.S. 173 (1991) .....	48, 49
* <i>SEC v. Chenery Corp.</i> , 318 U.S. 80 (1943) .....	14
<i>Solid Waste Agency of N. Cook Cnty. v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng'rs</i> , 531 U.S. 159 (2001) .....	23
<i>Stenberg v. Carhart</i> , 530 U.S. 914 (2000) .....	24

<i>*Transbrasil S.A. Linhas Aereas v. Dep't of Transp.</i> , 791 F.2d 202 (D.C. Cir. 1986) .....	18, 19
<i>United States v. Jin Fuey Moy</i> , 241 U.S. 394 (1916) .....	48
<i>UNUM Life Ins. Co. of Am. v. Ward</i> , 526 U.S. 358 (1999).....	36
<i>*Util. Air Regulatory Grp. v. EPA</i> , 134 S. Ct. 2427 (2014) .....	2, 5, 7, 34, 37
<i>Van Hollen v. FEC</i> , 811 F.3d 486 (D.C. Cir. 2016) .....	28
<i>W. Minn. Mun. Power Agency v. FERC</i> , 806 F.3d 588 (D.C. Cir. 2015) .....	35
<i>West Virginia v. EPA</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1000 (2016) .....	48

### FEDERAL STATUTES<sup>a</sup>

Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1857c-6(d) (1970) .....	32
Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401, <i>et seq.</i> (2014)	
CAA § 110(a)(2)(A), 42 U.S.C. § 7410(a)(2)(A) .....	27
*CAA § 111(a)(1), 42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(1) .....	3, 12, 13, 19, 25, 44
CAA § 111(a)(2), 42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(2) .....	12, 30
CAA § 111(a)(7), 42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(7) .....	26
CAA § 111(b)(1)(A), 42 U.S.C. § 7411(b)(1)(A) .....	20
CAA § 111(b)(1)(B), 42 U.S.C. § 7411(b)(1)(B) .....	30
CAA § 111(b)(5), 42 U.S.C. § 7411(b)(5) .....	19
*CAA § 111(d)(1), 42 U.S.C. § 7411(d)(1) .....	12, 13, 42, 43, 45

---

<sup>a</sup> All applicable statutes are contained in the addendum attached hereto or in the Addendum to Opening Brief of Petitioners on Core Legal Issues, ECF 1599889.



CAA § 111(d)(1)(A)(i), 42 U.S.C. § 7411(d)(1)(A)(i) .....	32
CAA § 169A(b)(2)(A), 42 U.S.C. § 7491(b)(2)(A) .....	29
CAA § 169A(g)(2), 42 U.S.C. § 7491(g)(2) .....	29
*CAA § 302(k), 42 U.S.C. § 7602(k) .....	24, 25
CAA § 302(j), 42 U.S.C. § 7602(j) .....	24
CAA § 404(a)(1), 42 U.S.C. § 7651c(a)(1) .....	28
CAA § 405(b)(1), 42 U.S.C. § 7651d(b)(1) .....	28

## LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

136 CONG. REC. H12923 (daily ed. Oct. 26, 1990) .....	26
Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990, Pub. L. No. 101-549, 104 Stat. 2399 (1990) .....	33
H.R. Rep. No. 95-294 (1977), <i>reprinted in</i> 1977 U.S.C.C.A.N. 1077 .....	25, 26

## EXECUTIVE MATERIALS

White House Fact Sheet, Ex. B to State Pet'rs' Mot. for Stay & for Expedited Consideration of Pet. for Review, <i>West Virginia v. EPA</i> , No. 15-1363 (D.C. Cir. Oct. 23, 2015), ECF 1579999 .....	1
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

## FEDERAL REGULATIONS<sup>b</sup>

40 C.F.R. § 51.308(e)(1) .....	29
40 C.F.R. § 60.21(f) .....	22
40 C.F.R. § 60.24(c) .....	41, 42

---

<sup>b</sup> All applicable regulations are contained in the addendum attached hereto or in the Addendum to Opening Brief of Petitioners on Core Legal Issues, ECF 1599889.

40 C.F.R. § 60.24(d).....	43
40 C.F.R. § 60.24(f) .....	41, 42
40 C.F.R. § 60.5745(a)(7) .....	45
40 C.F.R. § 60.5780(a)(5)(iii) .....	45
40 C.F.R. § 60.5790(c)(1) .....	15

## FEDERAL REGISTER

*40 Fed. Reg. 53,340 (Nov. 17, 1975).....	42, 43
45 Fed. Reg. 26,294 (Apr. 17, 1980).....	31
60 Fed. Reg. 65,387 (Dec. 19, 1995) .....	29
70 Fed. Reg. 15,994 (Mar. 29, 2005) .....	38, 39
70 Fed. Reg. 28,606 (May 18, 2005) .....	22, 23
77 Fed. Reg. 9304 (Feb. 16, 2012).....	28, 29
80 Fed. Reg. 64,510 (Oct. 23, 2015).....	30
*80 Fed. Reg. 64,662 (Oct. 23, 2015) .....	3, 6, 7, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 30,
.....	31, 33, 34, 35, 38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47
80 Fed. Reg. 64,966 (Oct. 23, 2015).....	48

## MISCELLANEOUS

EPA, Legal Memorandum for Proposed Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Electric Utility Generating Units (undated), EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0602-0419 .....	39
EPA, Regulatory Impact Analysis Base Case for the final Clean Power Plan, Spreadsheet Base Case SSR.xlsx, <a href="https://www.epa.gov/airmarkets/power-sector-modeling">https://www.epa.gov/airmarkets/power-sector-modeling</a> .....	7

U.S. Energy Information Administration, Annual Energy Outlook 2015,  
Data Table: Electricity Generating Capacity: Electric Power  
Sector: Power Only: Total (Apr. 2015),  
<http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo> ..... 7

*West Virginia v. EPA*, 136 S. Ct. 1000 (2016) (No. 15A773)

Appl. by 29 States & State Agencies for Immediate Stay of Final  
Agency Action During Pendency of Petitions for Review..... 48

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Act (or CAA)	Clean Air Act
Core Br.	Opening Brief of Petitioners on Core Legal Issues, <i>West Virginia v. EPA</i> , No. 15-1363 (and consolidated cases) (D.C. Cir. filed Feb. 19, 2016), ECF 1599889
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
EPA Br.	Respondent EPA's Initial Brief, <i>West Virginia v. EPA</i> , No. 15-1363 (and consolidated cases) (D.C. Cir. filed Mar. 28, 2016), ECF 1605911
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
JA	Joint Appendix
Record Br.	Opening Brief of Petitioners on Procedural and Record-Based Issues, <i>West Virginia v. EPA</i> , No. 15-1363 (and consolidated cases) (D.C. Cir. filed Feb. 19, 2016), ECF 1599898
Rule	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units, Final Rule, 80 Fed. Reg. 64,662 (Oct. 23, 2015)

## INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

In its response brief, EPA ties itself in knots, torn between touting the Rule's significance and downplaying the extraordinary nature of what it seeks to do. On one hand, EPA describes the Rule as “a significant step forward in addressing the Nation's most urgent environmental threat,” necessary for “critically important reductions in carbon dioxide emissions” from fossil fuel-fired power plants. EPA Br. 1, 25. On the other hand, EPA claims the Rule is not “transform[ative],” because “industry trends” will result in “significant reductions in coal-fired generation ... even in the Rule's absence.” *Id.* at 26, 39-40.

The fact is that, through the Rule, EPA *does* seek fundamentally to “transform[] ... the domestic energy industry.” Core Br. 23 (quoting White House Fact Sheet, JA\_\_\_\_). The Rule is premised on the unprecedented assertion that EPA has the legal authority under section 111(d) to require emission reductions based on shutting down existing fossil fuel-fired power plants and building new, EPA-favored plants to replace them. Moreover, the Rule's “emission performance rates” cannot be met even if every existing regulated source installs what EPA has found to be the “best” state-of-the-art controls for new sources. Rather, a State can comply only by adopting a plan based on building new renewable facilities and shuttering existing fossil-fueled sources.

EPA's novel contention that it may require emission reductions premised on altering the nation's mix of electric generation—resulting in a Rule with sweeping

implications—cannot stand because EPA has not shown clear congressional authorization. *Util. Air Regulatory Grp. v. EPA*, 134 S. Ct. 2427, 2444 (2014) (“UARG”); *Am. Bar Ass’n v. FTC*, 430 F.3d 457, 471 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (“ABA”). In its 174-page brief, EPA does not even cite *ABA*, and devotes just two pages to *UARG*, failing to acknowledge the Supreme Court’s unequivocal statement that the Court “expect[s] Congress to speak clearly if it wishes to assign to an agency decisions of vast ‘economic and political significance.’” 134 S. Ct. at 2444 (quoting *FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 529 U.S. 120, 160 (2000)). Yet EPA cannot deny that altering how electricity is produced in this country is a decision of vast economic and political significance, and the notion that section 111 “clearly” confers that monumental power on EPA strains credulity.

In fact, section 111 plainly forecloses EPA’s unprecedented assertion of authority over the electric grid. EPA seeks to deflect attention from the critical statutory provisions, dismissing them as “textual snippets.” EPA Br. 60. Rather than confront the controlling statutory language, EPA instead attempts to justify its approach by claiming what it calls “generation-shifting” is a practice some utilities have engaged in, citing a smattering of State and corporate initiatives and other Clean Air Act (“Act” or “CAA”) programs. But “EPA is a federal agency—a creature of statute. It has ... only those authorities conferred upon it by Congress,” *Michigan v. EPA*, 268 F.3d 1075, 1081 (D.C. Cir. 2001), and what some States and companies have chosen to do voluntarily has no bearing on what Congress authorized EPA to

require under section 111. Similarly, EPA blithely ignores the key statutory differences in other CAA programs that allow trading and that evidence Congress's intent to set them apart.

EPA's principal textual response is that alleged "ambiguity" in the phrase "best system of emission reduction" gives it authority to treat the entire electric grid as a "complex machine" to which it can apply a single grid-wide "system" to reduce overall emissions. EPA Br. 29 (quoting 80 Fed. Reg. 64,662, 64,725 (Oct. 23, 2015), JA\_\_\_\_), 60-61. EPA's assertion bears no relationship to the statute. The statute requires that any emission limitation be "achievable" by an individual regulated source "through the application of" a best system of emission reduction. CAA § 111(a)(1). But *no* individual regulated source can achieve the Rule's emission performance rates, and EPA's grid-wide system of emission reduction is not a control system that *any* individual source can use to reduce emissions. EPA's justification that sources' "owners and operators" can meet the standard, even though "sources" cannot themselves do so, improperly conflates distinct statutory terms, resulting in a vast expansion of regulatory authority that Congress never authorized.

The Rule also regulates emissions from sources already regulated under section 112, even though the Section 112 Exclusion flatly forbids such double-regulation. EPA again tries to manufacture ambiguity, but as its previous admissions regarding the Exclusion's literal meaning demonstrate, section 111's text is entirely clear.

Contrary to EPA's claims, the Rule also usurps State authority under section 111(d) by mandating a specific level of emission reductions. Both section 111 and EPA's own implementing regulations confer on States the authority to establish performance standards for existing sources and allow States to adopt standards less stringent than EPA's guidelines. Furthermore, EPA's Rule denies to States their statutory right to set less stringent performance standards based on individual sources' "remaining useful lives" and other factors, and neither trading nor programs relaxing some sources' rates at the expense of others solves that problem.

Finally, the Rule violates the Tenth Amendment by commandeering and coercing state officials. EPA claims the Rule is simply an instance of "cooperative federalism," Br. 98-101, but the Rule forces States to carry out federal policy whether under a state or federal plan. The "choice" EPA purports to give the States between exercising authority to reconstitute their generation mix or facing blackouts is no choice at all.

At the end of the day, EPA urges this Court to uphold the Rule because it addresses what EPA views as "the Nation's most important and urgent environmental challenge." EPA Br. 1. But this case is not about the wisdom of any particular policy; it is about whether EPA acted within its delegated authority, as all federal agencies must do. Because it has not, the Rule must be vacated.



## ARGUMENT

### I. EPA's Assertion of Authority Is Unlawful Because It Lacks Clear Congressional Authorization.

#### A. EPA Cannot Identify Clear Congressional Authorization for the Novel and Vast Authority Claimed in the Rule.

The Rule is foreclosed not only by the plain language of section 111(d), *see* Core Br. 29-31, 41-48, but also by the lack of the clear statement from Congress required under *UARG*, *Brown & Williamson*, and *King v. Burwell*, 135 S. Ct. 2480 (2015), for transformative rules, *see* Core Br. 32-36.

EPA's primary response (Br. 41-42) is to dismiss those cases as limited to their facts, to deny the existence of a clear-statement rule for expansive assertions of agency authority "to regulate 'a significant portion of the American economy,'" *UARG*, 134 S. Ct. at 2444 (quoting *Brown & Williamson*, 529 U.S. at 159), and to claim deference under *Chevron*. But those arguments are precluded by binding precedent, which establishes that, in extraordinary cases like this one, agencies must point to clear statutory authorization, not merely allege vague text. The Supreme Court has instructed that it "expect[s] Congress to speak clearly if it wishes to assign to an agency decisions of vast 'economic and political significance.'" *Id.* (quoting *Brown & Williamson*, 529 U.S. at 160).

EPA tries to distinguish *UARG*, *King*, and *Brown & Williamson* by downplaying the Rule's practical significance, claiming it merely builds on existing industry trends. EPA Br. 18-19, 38-40, 42-43. But rules that "follow[] existing industry trends," *id.* at

18, are not usually announced by the President in an East Room ceremony. EPA's claim is belied by the many statements from senior EPA and Administration officials that the Rule will “aggressive[ly] transform[]” the power sector, bringing about a “decarboniz[ation]” of electric generation in favor of a new “clean energy” economy. Core Br. 2-3; *see also* EPA Br. 1. EPA cannot now claim the Rule is of little moment.

In truth, the Rule will have sweeping practical significance, far beyond anything the agency has ever sought to achieve under the narrow and rarely used section 111(d). *See infra* Section II.A.3. The Rule is based on “generation-shifting”—the agency's euphemism for permanently “replac[ing] ... higher emitting generation with lower- or zero-emitting generation”—from fossil-fueled generation to generation from other types of facilities, many of which (like renewables) are not even regulated sources. 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,728, JA\_\_\_\_. In EPA's own words, the Rule's “emission performance rates” for sources are “*effective* emission rates”—that is, mere “regulatory constructs” intended to be attainable only with “generation-shifting pollution-reduction measures,” rather than measures at an actual plant. EPA Br. 38. The Rule is thus specifically designed to force significant reductions in coal-fired generating capacity. And, by EPA's own admission, the Rule will succeed in doing so. *Id.* at 39; 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,728, JA\_\_\_\_ (“[M]ost of the CO<sub>2</sub> controls need to come in the form

of those other measures ... that involve, in one form or another, replacement of higher emitting generation with lower- or zero-emitting generation.”).<sup>1</sup>

The Rule also works an “enormous and transformative expansion” of EPA’s legal authority. *UARG*, 134 S. Ct. at 2444. EPA claims the power to require States to enforce emission reductions that are premised on changing the nation’s mix of electricity generation—a power that would permit EPA to effectively ban the sources of generation it disfavors. *See, e.g.*, 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,709 (claiming authority to “substitute” one type of generation for another), JA\_\_\_\_. That is precisely the sort of “unheralded power to regulate ‘a significant portion of the American economy’” that requires clear congressional authorization. *UARG*, 134 S. Ct. at 2444 (quoting *Brown & Williamson*, 529 U.S. at 159). And it is what distinguishes this Rule from the other environmental rules to which EPA refers. *Compare* EPA Br. 42-44, *with* Section II.A.3 *infra*.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unlike EPA (Br. 38-40), the U.S. Energy Information Administration (“EIA”), which was created by Congress to monitor the energy industry, does not see a significant “trend” in coal unit retirements and associated carbon dioxide emission reductions without the Rule. *See* EIA, Annual Energy Outlook 2015, Data Table: Electricity Generating Capacity: Electric Power Sector: Power Only: Total (Apr. 2015), <http://www.eia.gov/forecasts/aeo> (showing small reductions of coal capacity from 2016 forward), JA\_\_\_\_. EPA tries to manufacture such a trend by manipulating its “base case,” assuming, *contra* to EIA, nearly 20 percent of coal capacity will disappear this year even without the Rule. *Compare* EPA Regulatory Impact Analysis Base Case for the final Clean Power Plan (without the Rule), <https://www.epa.gov/airmarkets/power-sector-modeling>, spreadsheet estimate of 2016 coal capacity of 214 gigawatts, JA\_\_\_\_, *with* EIA’s estimate of 261 gigawatts, JA\_\_\_\_. EPA did not support its forecast with evidence of announced retirements. Without these phantom retirements, EPA’s “trends” evaporate. Core Br. 22.

While EPA labels this concern “hyperbolic,” Br. 38, the agency can point to nothing in its textual analysis that would prohibit it from banning disfavored types of generation. If EPA were to maintain that a complete shift to renewable generation were “achievable,” its asserted authority would enable it to completely “decarboniz[e]” the power sector by setting performance rates of zero. Nor has EPA shown that its rationale for an expansive interpretation of section 111(d) for electric generators would not apply to other industries. *See* Core Br. 33-34.

Finally, EPA turns to *American Electric Power Co. v. Connecticut*, 564 U.S. 410 (2011) (“*AEP*”), claiming that the case “confirms” Congress clearly authorized “generation-shifting measures” and that EPA has expertise in energy matters. EPA Br. 44, 52-53.<sup>2</sup> *AEP* does not bear the weight EPA places on it. While *AEP* referred to EPA’s authority to regulate carbon dioxide under section 111(d)—assuming EPA did not trigger one of that section’s exclusions, *see* 564 U.S. at 424 n.7—the Court did not determine *how* EPA may regulate. In fact, the Court warned that EPA did not have “a roving license to ignore the statutory text” and must “exercise discretion within defined statutory limits.” *Id.* at 427 (quoting *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 549 U.S. 497, 533 (2007)). Furthermore, the Supreme Court nowhere suggested that EPA had expertise beyond its past focus on source-specific emission controls or could make

---

<sup>2</sup> To the extent EPA is asserting (Br. 44) that the statute itself “clear[ly]” authorizes generation-shifting, that assertion is refuted not only by the plain text but by the agency’s consistent practice over 40 years. *See infra* Section II.A.3.

judgments on numerous aspects of the American power system. Indeed, EPA has conceded elsewhere that it is not expert in those matters. *See* Core Br. 35-36.

**B. EPA Seeks To Invade a Traditional State Regulatory Domain Without a Clear Statement from Congress.**

EPA must also point to a clear statement because the Rule regulates intrastate generation—“one of the most important of the functions traditionally associated with the police power of the States.” *Ark. Elec. Coop. Corp. v. Ark. Pub. Serv. Comm’n*, 461 U.S. 375, 377 (1983); Core Br. 36-41. In response, EPA fails to cite, let alone distinguish, *Bond v. United States*, 134 S. Ct. 2077, 2089 (2014), *Raygor v. Regents of University of Minnesota*, 534 U.S. 533, 544 (2002), *Gregory v. Ashcroft*, 501 U.S. 452, 460-61 (1991), or *ABA*, 430 F.3d at 471-72. These precedents require a clear statement of authority where an agency seeks to regulate a matter “traditionally [within] the province of the states,” regardless of whether the agency is directly regulating States and their officials. *ABA*, 430 F.3d at 471.

EPA claims (Br. 55-59) that this principle does not apply because it has not engaged in “direct regulation of energy markets.” According to EPA, the Rule is a garden-variety exercise of Clean Air Act authority, no more intrusive as to state authority than any other EPA regulation in the power sector. EPA’s claim is unconvincing.

*First*, while any air quality regulation might raise a particular unit’s costs and therefore “indirectly” affect how it is dispatched into the grid, *id.* at 55-56, the Rule

goes much further and aims directly at the mix of generation in each State, Core Br. 14, 20, 22. EPA’s “emission performance rates” are *premised* on “generation-shifting” and *intended* to shift generation. And they are set at a level where the only way to meet them is for plant owners and operators actually to move generation from existing fossil fuel-fired plants to new renewable plants, producing exactly what EPA’s own modeling predicts. *See* Core Br. 22. But the Supreme Court has long recognized (in another case not cited by EPA) that determining the mix of electric generation in a State is within the State’s traditional authority. *See Pac. Gas & Elec. Co. v. State Energy Res. Conservation & Dev. Comm’n*, 461 U.S. 190, 205 (1983) (The “[n]eed for new power facilities ... ha[s] been characteristically governed by the States.”).<sup>3</sup>

*Second*, the Rule “reach[es] into” the States’ traditional sphere of regulating utility resource planning by necessitating legislative or regulatory activity that States would not otherwise undertake. *ABA*, 430 F.3d at 471. The new renewable generation the Rule demands will not simply appear; States must adopt programs and accelerate the planning, siting, permitting, and constructing of new plants and associated transmission infrastructure to ensure this happens. *See* Core Br. 78-83. State utility commissions must also address stranded investments in prematurely retired coal

---

<sup>3</sup> Because forcing States to reorder their resource portfolios is the direct and intended consequence of the Rule, cases like *FERC v. Electric Power Supply Ass’n*, 136 S. Ct. 760, 784 (2016), and *Connecticut Department of Public Utility Control v. FERC*, 569 F.3d 477, 479-83 (D.C. Cir. 2009), provide no support for EPA’s position. *See* EPA Br. 56.

plants. *See* Former State Pub. Util. Comm’rs Amici Br. in Supp. of Pet’rs (Feb. 23, 2016), ECF 1600328 (explaining Rule’s impact on state electricity regulation). And, as EPA itself recognizes, the Rule depends on States exercising their “responsibility to maintain a reliable electric system” in the face of the widespread retirements the Rule will cause. 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,678, JA\_\_\_\_.

EPA asserts that the Rule provides “flexibility” and that States need not “engage in any particular legislative or regulatory activities to implement the Rule.” EPA Br. 17, 58. But while States may have some choices at the margin, most of the Rule’s required emission reductions are based on “generation-shifting,” *see* 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,728, JA\_\_\_\_, and EPA never claims that States could feasibly account for all or even most of these reductions by any other means. To the contrary, EPA acknowledges “the Best System ... includes ... strategies to increase utilization of cleaner forms of power generation.” EPA Br. 4. Further, much of the Rule’s claimed “flexibility” consists of the States’ authority to implement programs that reduce demand for electricity or increase demand for renewable generation. *See* 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,835-36, JA\_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_. EPA cannot justify the Rule’s interference with state regulation of energy production on the grounds that States may choose to alter their energy production in *other* ways to meet EPA’s demands.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> EPA’s assertion that the “logical extension” of Petitioners’ argument will “preclude EPA from implementing *any* Section 111(d) guidelines,” Br. 56, is wrong. The clear-statement rule will prohibit only those EPA regulations that are

## **II. Section 111 Unambiguously Forecloses EPA’s “Generation-Shifting” Best System of Emission Reduction.**

EPA’s Rule adopts a best system of emission reduction that cannot be implemented by any individual “stationary source” but instead requires sources to “shift generation” to other facilities, including many that are not regulated under section 111. Petitioners showed (Core Br. 43-48) that the language, history, and structure of section 111—including the statutory terms that authorize regulation, which EPA dismisses as “textual snippets,” EPA Br. 60—foreclose EPA’s assertion of the previously unheralded authority at the heart of the Rule.

### **A. Section 111 Does Not Authorize EPA To Base Emission Reductions on Measures that Cannot Be “Appl[ied] ... to” Individual Regulated “Stationary Sources.”**

EPA’s reliance on “generation-shifting” is unambiguously precluded by the statutory mandate that any section 111(d) standard—and therefore any “system” EPA designates—must be “appl[icable] ... to” individual sources within the source category and must yield emission limitations that are “achievable” by those sources individually. CAA § 111(a)(1), (2), (d)(1); Core Br. 41-42. “Generation-shifting” does not apply “to” any individual source or produce emission limitations that a source can “achiev[e].” Instead, it requires some plant owners and operators to close their units, and others, as a condition of continued operation, to purchase credits or directly invest in new renewable generation. Indeed, the “system” EPA adopted is specifically

---

transformative in nature or effect, or that invade a traditional state domain, such as intrastate energy generation, without clear congressional authorization.



designed *not* to “appl[y] ... to” individual sources, but rather “the source category as a whole,” Core Br. 43, 47 (quoting 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,727, JA\_\_\_\_), and indeed to the entire grid. EPA’s attempts to evade these textual limitations are unavailing.

**1. EPA cannot dissociate its best system of emission reduction from the standards of performance that will be based on that system.**

EPA’s central textual response attempts to separate the best-system-of-emission-reduction determination from the performance standards that must be set for, and be applicable to, stationary sources. EPA contends that “the fact that states set standards ‘for’ or ‘applicable to’ any existing source does not itself place any limits on the scope of measures that can be considered as part of the Best System” of emission reduction. EPA Br. 61.

The plain language of section 111 and the Rule’s own findings refute this contention. Foremost, EPA’s reading ignores that the term “best system of emission reduction” is part of the definition of “standard of performance.” CAA § 111(a)(1). A “standard of performance” is an “emission limitation” “for” and “appli[cable] ... to a[] particular source,” *id.* § 111(a)(1), (d)(1), that must be “achievable *through the application of* the best system of emission reduction,” *id.* § 111(a)(1) (emphasis added). In other words, a particular source must be able to achieve the emission limitation through application of EPA’s best system of emission reduction. *See* Record Br. 18, 50.

That limitation is critical: without it, EPA's authority would be virtually unbounded. Under EPA's reading, nearly *anything* could qualify as part of the best system of emission reduction. *See* 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,720 (defining "system of emission reduction" as "a set of measures that work together to reduce emissions"), JA\_\_\_\_. For instance, EPA could decide the "system" includes using only fossil fuels transported on low-emitting trains or ships.<sup>5</sup>

The Rule itself recognized this "important limitation," conceding that the best system of emission reduction may include only "measures that can be implemented—'appl[ie]d'—by the sources themselves." *Id.* EPA's new justification thus is foreclosed under *SEC v. Chenery Corp.*, 318 U.S. 80, 88 (1943). Indeed, EPA even recognizes elsewhere in its brief that the Rule rejected the rationale EPA now advances. Br. 28 (acknowledging the Rule found that "the 'system' must encompass actions the sources themselves can implement").

EPA understandably seeks to avoid this limitation, and the concession in the Rule, because it dooms the Rule. No individual source can achieve the Rule's

---

<sup>5</sup> EPA claims elsewhere in the brief (Br. 28) that there are "significant constraints" to its best system of emission reduction, citing 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,776, JA\_\_\_\_, because the system "must assure emission reductions from the affected sources." EPA's reading of this requirement renders it entirely ineffectual. EPA views the requirement as satisfied if a regulated source's owners or operators can contract with a non-source to "lower [its] effective emission rate," even if no actual emission reduction occurs at the regulated plant. EPA Br. 16-17, 161. That is legally incorrect, *see infra* pp. 15-19, 23-26, and really no constraint at all, as the enterprises with which a source could contract are essentially boundless.

performance rates through application of the agency's grid-wide best system of emission reduction. That is why EPA's brief argues that the Rule's emission performance rates need only be achievable based on applying a system of emission reduction to the entire electric grid, including new renewable facilities that are outside the scope of section 111 (and do not yet exist). *Id.* at 29-30, 36-37, 122-40. Those performance rates are a mere accounting construct that no existing facility can actually "achieve." *Id.* at 15. They can be met only virtually—by acquiring "credits" from lower- or zero-emitting plants to offset the affected unit's actual emissions. 40 C.F.R. § 60.5790(c)(1); Core Br. 46; EPA Br. 38 ("The guidelines are purposefully set in the form of *effective* emission rates," which are "regulatory constructs intended to reflect adjustments to actual emission rates."). The Rule thus demands that two or more facilities *together* achieve the required rate, in effect treating distant and unrelated facilities as a single "stationary source." Core Br. 46.

## **2. EPA improperly redefines the statutory term "source."**

Having found in the Rule that a best system of emission reduction must be "implementable" by individual sources, 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,735, 64,762, JA\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_, EPA nevertheless now maintains that the Rule can be reconciled with the statute. EPA's reconciliation, however, impermissibly contorts the term "source" in two different ways.

a. At page 61 of its brief, EPA finally turns to the principal legal rationale it presented in the Rule—that its authority concerning "standards of performance" for

“existing source[s]” empowers it to force a source’s *owner or operator* to build or subsidize new “low-emission” facilities. As EPA argues, “the guidelines are achievable by sources through generation-shifting” because “the owner or operator of a source ... will implement generation-shifting measures.” EPA Br. 62; *see also* 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,766 (“[best system of emission reduction] must consist of measures that can be undertaken by an affected source—that is, its owner or operator”), JA\_\_\_\_.

This argument improperly conflates the term “source” with the term “owner or operator.” Core Br. 43-45. EPA asserts (Br. 28) that “power plants reduce emissions by replacing higher-emitting generation with lower-emitting generation.” But “power plants” cannot engage in “generation-shifting.” Core Br. 45. Any “generation-shifting” that may occur on the grid is accomplished by utility owners and operators, not by changes to the plants and their operations.

This conflation of the term “source” and the term “owner or operator” is neither “unremarkable,” *id.* at 62, nor semantic. It is the conceptual linchpin of the Rule, 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,762, JA\_\_\_\_; *see also, e.g., id.* at 64,766-67, 64,772, JA\_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_, and an unprecedented reimagining of section 111 that transforms a program that for nearly a half-century has been limited to setting emission limitations “for” and “achievable” by “sources” into a program that now sets emission limitations based on systems “for” plants’ owners and operators, that are unachievable by individual “sources,” and that demand a reordering of the national electric utility system, Core Br. 45. As this Court held just weeks ago, “[t]o suddenly extend” a statute well beyond

its previous limits “would end-run the statute’s careful line-drawing and thwart the structure and targeted purpose of the statute.” *Dist. of Columbia v. Dep’t of Labor*, No. 14-5132, 2016 WL 1319453, at \*6 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 5, 2016) (“*District of Columbia*”).

EPA has no textual response to Petitioners’ demonstration that conflating “sources” with the “owners or operators” of sources violates the plain statutory text and congressional intent. Core Br. 43-45. EPA nods (Br. 61-62) to section 111(e), but that subsection supports Petitioners’ point that if Congress had intended to include a source’s owner or operator within the term “source,” it would not have separately specified the obligations of the “owner or operator,” nor separately defined those terms. Core Br. 44.

Bereft of textual support, EPA offers a handful of unconvincing arguments. *First*, it asserts (Br. 62) that the Rule does not actually conflate sources with owners or operators because it does not “direct states to set a single standard for the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from all of a particular *company’s* power operations.” EPA’s assertion supports Petitioners’ argument: while EPA agrees that the Rule would be unlawful if a single standard were applied to all of a particular company’s power operations, the Rule does something even worse by basing the limitation on a system of cumulative reductions for the entire *grid* and making the limitation itself one that is “achievable” only *collectively* by multiple sources and other facilities on the grid. *Compare* Core Br. 15, 18-19, 47, *with* EPA Br. 15-16.

*Second*, EPA claims (Br. 45) that “generation-shifting ... incorporate[s] changes in ‘production processes’ or ‘operations’ of an individual plant,” but the agency’s own explanation undermines this. EPA contends that the owner or operator of an individual regulated source can undertake “generation-shifting” precisely because, if the source alters its production to comply with the Rule, “other sources must decrease or increase commensurately ... to balance supply with demand.” *Id.* at 45-46. Thus, it is undisputed that a source must have the aid of “other sources” (including many not subject to EPA regulation) to accomplish the “generation-shifting” the Rule requires.

*Third*, EPA claims (Br. 62) that the Rule makes the individual source “the entity subject to the emission limit,” but that is just semantics. The emission limit is a mathematical “construct[],” EPA Br. 38, derived from actions that an owner or operator must undertake to subsidize generation at other locations.

*Fourth*, EPA contends (Br. 63) that the Rule’s requirements for source owners and operators are similar to those required under other CAA programs, asserting that “sources routinely rely on emissions-trading programs to meet a range of CAA requirements.” But neither voluntary choices by source owners or operators nor Congress’s decision to deploy trading regimes expressly in other CAA programs says anything about whether EPA may make such regimes an “integral part,” 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,734, JA\_\_\_\_, of a section 111 “best system of emission reduction.” As explained above, that term necessarily includes only measures that can be implemented at an individual source. See *Transbrasil S.A. Linhas Aereas v. Dep’t of Transp.*, 791 F.2d 202,

205 (D.C. Cir. 1986) (When Congress uses different terms in a statute, “the court must presume that Congress intended the terms to have different meanings.”) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Furthermore, EPA ignores the difference between programs like section 111(d) that establish standards based on at-the-source control systems, and options, like trading regimes, to *comply* with those standards. Under section 111(d), as EPA itself recognized, sources may comply with an emission limitation using measures that differ from the controls upon which the standard is based. *See* CAA § 111(a)(1), (b)(5). Thus, for example, although EPA excluded programs to reduce electricity demand from the final Rule’s best system of emission reduction as inconsistent with EPA precedent, demand reduction programs are still allowed as a compliance option. *See* 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,673, JA\_\_\_\_. This distinction is important. Permitting EPA to base performance rates only on controls that can be implemented at the source limits EPA to its expertise: identifying technological and operational improvements that can reduce emissions. On the other hand, allowing sources broader discretion in selecting control measures to comply with the rates encourages industry innovation and efficiency. Thus, Petitioners do not “seek to have it both ways.” EPA Br. 48. Instead, it is EPA that conflates two distinct issues.

b. EPA also contorts the term “source” in a different way, arguing that, while performance standards must be set for “particular sources,” the best system of emission reduction may be applied to “a particular *source category*,” *id.* at 7 (emphasis

added), in order to “establish the degree of emission limitation those standards must *collectively* achieve,” *id.* at 60 (emphasis added); *see also id.* at 15-16 (“EPA applied the Best System ... and quantified ... the reductions achievable for each subcategory”); Core Br. 47.

But the statute does not give EPA authority to require aggregate reductions from the source category. *Supra* pp. 12-15. As Petitioners demonstrated, Core Br. 47, when Congress wishes to refer to a source *category*, rather than individual sources, it knows how to do so, *see, e.g.*, CAA § 111(b)(1)(A) (requiring EPA to list “categor[ies] of sources”). Indeed, a Rule premised on “generation-shifting” across the electric grid strays even further from the statute, as it affects facilities both within the regulated source category and outside it (like renewables).

EPA argues that it was appropriate to consider total emission reductions across the source category in selecting a best system of emission reduction because it was appropriate to estimate the total air quality benefits of regulation. EPA Br. 64. This is a straw man. Regardless of whether EPA *may consider* the sum of each source’s reductions when selecting a best system, the text forbids EPA to select a system that *can be implemented* only by multiple sources and non-sources collaboratively—here, by the entire source category together with facilities outside the source category across the entire grid. *See supra* pp. 12-15.

For this reason, EPA’s argument that the best system of emission reduction can be determined without reference to individual sources is foreclosed by *ASARCO*



*Inc. v. EPA*, 578 F.2d 319 (D.C. Cir. 1978), which rejected EPA’s ability to redefine the term “source” and limited the term to “a single building, structure, facility, or installation” and not “a combination of such units,” *id.* at 327. EPA argues (Br. 63) that *ASARCO* did not define the terms at issue here, but the question this Court answered in *ASARCO* was whether the standard of performance obligation can be extended beyond “the units to which” it applies to a combination of facilities. 578 F.2d at 322, 326-27. Because the standard of performance here is defined by a “system” that applies collectively to generating facilities across the electric grid, this Court’s ban on aggregating sources is dispositive. And, as in *ASARCO*, allowing EPA to aggregate sources would defeat Congress’s intent to regulate emissions at the level of individual sources. *See id.* at 327-28.<sup>6</sup>

### 3. The Rule is unprecedented.

The Rule also departs from EPA’s prior practice by setting rates that can be met only by shutting down certain sources and constructing new, unregulated facilities—a fact strongly suggesting the Rule exceeds the statute’s bounds. Core Br.

---

<sup>6</sup> EPA questions whether *ASARCO* was undermined by *Chevron*. EPA Br. 63-64. It was not. *Chevron* concerned whether, under a different statutory program, a source may be defined as all emitting buildings within a single plant or whether each individual building must be a separate source. *Chevron, U.S.A., Inc. v. NRDC*, 467 U.S. 837, 840, 860-61 (1984). The Supreme Court agreed that EPA may define a source under that different program as all the emitting buildings within a plant’s boundaries, *id.* at 865—a definition with which Petitioners take no issue. *Chevron* never suggested that section 111’s definition of “stationary source” as a “building, structure, facility, or installation” may include all existing generating facilities connected to the grid, as under the Rule. Indeed, the Court acknowledged that section 111 was “not literally applicable to the permit program” at issue there. *Id.* at 860-61.

48-49. In response, EPA does not cite a single instance, from over one hundred new source performance standards and five existing source guidelines, in which it set rates that regulated sources were themselves categorically unable to meet and that required source owners to invest in other facilities. Nor does it point to any existing-source rule that has demanded building *new* facilities. And EPA cites no rule that identifies the best system of emission reduction for the entire source category in the aggregate. *See District of Columbia*, 2016 WL 1319453, at \*1 (The “novelty of [an agency’s] interpretation” and the fact that a statute “has *never* been applied” in this way “buttresses [a] conclusion” that the agency lacks the expanded authority it claims.).<sup>7</sup>

The only section 111 precedent EPA cites in support of its argument is the Clean Air Mercury Rule (“Mercury Rule”) and the phrase “allowance system,” which EPA added to its section 111(d) implementing regulations, 40 C.F.R. § 60.21(f), in the Mercury Rule. 70 Fed. Reg. 28,606, 28,649 (May 18, 2005), JA\_\_\_\_; EPA Br. 33-34, 58-69. That rule, along with the change to section 60.21(f), was vacated by *New Jersey v. EPA*, 517 F.3d 574 (D.C. Cir. 2008).<sup>8</sup> Its vacatur aside, the Mercury Rule does not help EPA because unlike the Rule, the Mercury Rule cap-and-trade program was

---

<sup>7</sup> Amicus, but not EPA, refers to a 1971 performance standard that “assumed” the best system of emission reduction involved “precombustion cleaning of coal.” Br. of the Inst. for Policy Integrity as Amicus Curiae in Supp. of Resp’ts 16-17 (Apr. 1, 2016), ECF 1606724. But on-site use of coal that was cleaned off-site is no different than on-site use of control systems, like scrubbers, constructed off-site.

<sup>8</sup> Because 40 C.F.R. § 60.21(f) and the phrase “establishing an allowance system” are a legal nullity after *New Jersey*, EPA errs in asserting (Br. 68) that its section 111(d) regulations independently “authorize[] trading programs.”

“based on control technology available in the relevant timeframe” that could be installed at each regulated source. 70 Fed. Reg. at 28,617, 28,620, JA\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_. These “technologies” were sufficient to support the Mercury Rule’s performance standards “[e]ven assuming, arguendo, that the term ‘standard of performance’ prohibited an emissions cap and allowance trading program.” *Id.* at 28,620 n.5, JA\_\_\_\_.<sup>9</sup> The Mercury Rule did *not* set rates that *no* source could meet, nor was it designed to force “generation-shifting.” The Mercury Rule certainly did not purport to “aggressive[ly] transform[]” the industry by “shifting” generation outside the regulated source category.

**B. The Rule Does Not Provide for “Standards of Performance.”**

**1. Under the statute, a standard of performance cannot involve “generation-shifting.”**

a. As Petitioners showed, Core Br. 24-25, EPA’s adoption of a section 111 rule premised on the “non-performance” of certain sources cannot be squared with Supreme Court case law. EPA’s assertion (Br. 65) that it can ignore the plain meaning of the word “performance” because it is part of “a statutorily defined term” is foreclosed by *Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*, 531 U.S. 159, 172 (2001) (“*SWANCC*”), which similarly involved an agency failing to give meaning to one word (“navigable”) in a defined term (“navigable waters”). EPA’s

---

<sup>9</sup> EPA points (Br. 34) to an isolated reference in the Mercury Rule to “dispatch changes,” but that merely referred to an alternative compliance option for the standard based on “control technology” and was in no way used to set the standard. 70 Fed. Reg. at 28,619, JA\_\_\_\_.

citation (Br. 65) of *Stenberg v. Carhart*, 530 U.S. 914 (2000), is unavailing because the dispute there was whether the colloquial understanding of a term trumped the statutory definition, not whether an agency's interpretation failed to give one of the words in the term any meaning at all. 530 U.S. at 942.

In the alternative, EPA asserts that the word “performance” refers to a source’s “emissions performance” rather than its “production performance.” EPA Br. 65 (emphases omitted). But this argument is merely a repackaging of the argument foreclosed by *SWANCC*. In any event, “generation-shifting” has no more to do with an individual plant’s emissions performance than its production performance. While “generation-shifting” seeks to reduce emissions, it does so not by improving a plant’s emissions rate but by assuming the plant simply will work *less*—or not at all.

b. As Petitioners further explained, a “standard of performance” must reflect an “emission limitation” that requires “continuous” emission reductions during operation. Core Br. 7-8, 52; CAA § 302(k); *see also id.* § 302(l). A standard that does not require better emission performance when a source is producing emissions is not a “continuous” limitation.

EPA asserts (Br. 66) that its Rule only identifies the “system” on which performance standards are based and that, unlike the standards, the system EPA selects “need not itself entail ‘continuous’ [emission] reduction” during source operations. But as discussed *supra*, pp. 13-15, and as EPA’s brief admits (Br. 28), in determining the “system” under section 111(d), the agency is subject to the statutory

“constraints” applicable to the emission standards precisely “because sources must be able to attain their emission standards.” Because the emission standards must limit emissions on a “continuous basis,” and because those standards must be “achievable through the application of the best system of emission reduction,” CAA §§ 111(a)(1), 302(k), the “system” EPA adopts must itself be premised upon measures to “continuously” limit emissions at the source.

EPA’s fallback response (Br. 66-67) is that the Rule does satisfy the “continuous basis” requirement because the numerical standard set for each unit imposes an “uninterrupted obligation” on the unit to comply. But continuous legal obligations to hold allowances simply do not “limit[] the quantity, rate, or concentration of emissions of air pollutants on a continuous basis.” CAA § 302(k). Nor does EPA have a good response to the legislative history that confirms the statute’s plain language. As EPA recognizes (Br. 67), Congress added the term “continuous” to the definitions of “emission limitation,” “emission standard,” and “standard of performance” in 1977 to prohibit “intermittent controls” and other “measures that simply disperse pollutants away from higher concentration areas,” which while continuously *in effect* do not continuously *reduce emissions*, H.R. Rep. No. 95-294, at 81 (1977), *reprinted in* 1977 U.S.C.C.A.N. 1077, 1159, JA\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_. But if section 302(k)’s continuous-limitation requirement means what EPA now says, it would have been ineffective at achieving Congress’s goal: EPA’s uninterrupted-obligation standard would authorize intermittent controls and other dispersion

measures that only periodically reduce emissions. Such measures are prohibited only if the word “continuous” requires consistently better emission performance. *See* Core Br. 52.

Finally, contrary to EPA’s assertions, Petitioners have not argued that section 111(d) mandates only “technological” controls, but simply that EPA may not adopt a control “system” that cannot be “appli[ed]” to an individual “source” to “achiev[e]” an “emission limitation.” EPA Br. 40-50 (citing CAA § 111(a)(7)). Control technologies (e.g., scrubbers), process design (e.g., low NO<sub>x</sub> burners), or operational processes (e.g., low-sulfur coal) all achieve such reductions. Congress inserted the word “technological” in 1977 to encourage new sources to install scrubbers instead of relying solely on low-sulfur coal to meet sulfur dioxide performance standards. This was done in part to make low-sulfur coal more affordable for existing sources. H.R. Rep. No. 95-294, at 166 (1977), *reprinted in* 1977 U.S.C.C.A.N. 1077, 1245, JA\_\_\_\_. With the adoption of the more comprehensive sulfur dioxide-focused Acid Rain Program in 1990, Congress removed “technological” from the section 111 definition to return to the range of systems and operational processes originally contemplated under section 111. 136 CONG. REC. H12923 (daily ed. Oct. 26, 1990), JA\_\_\_\_; *see also ASARCO*, 578 F.2d at 327 n.26 (Section 111 in 1970 was “designed to insure that new stationary sources are designed, built, equipped, operated, and maintained so as to reduce emissions.”).

## 2. The Rule is at odds with the Clean Air Act's structure.

As Petitioners explained (Core Br. 54-56), the distinction between “performance-based” and “air quality-based” programs that appears throughout the Act supports the plain-language reading of “standard of performance.” EPA argues, however, that this distinction does not “speak to whether the ‘best system of emission reduction’ *for interconnected power plants* can include ... generation-shifting.” Br. 68 (emphasis added). But on the face of the statute, performance-based programs like section 111 cannot apply to “interconnected power plants”—they can apply only to individual “sources.” *See supra* pp. 12-21.

EPA offers no persuasive response to the critical differences between those other CAA programs and section 111. *See* Core Br. 54-56. The suggestion that its section 111 authority is the same as the authority Congress provided in any other program, *see, e.g.*, EPA Br. 63, impermissibly overlooks differences in language, structure, and purpose that demonstrate differences of congressional intent, Core Br. 44. Thus, for example, EPA’s reliance on the section 110 trading-based Cross-State Air Pollution Rule ignores the critical fact that Congress *expressly* authorized a trading-based approach under section 110. CAA § 110(a)(2)(A) (authorizing not just “emission limitations” but “other control measures,” including “marketable permits[] and auctions of emissions rights”); *see also* Core Br. 55.

EPA also argues (Br. 67) that generation-shifting can satisfy the “continuous” requirement based on Congress’s use of the term “emission limitation” in Title IV’s

cap-and-trade program. In fact, in Title IV, Congress distinguished between “emission limitations” and “allowance trading,” providing “emission limitations” for identified generating units, *in addition to* a trading-based option for complying with the source-specific emission limitations. CAA § 404(a)(1) (“unlawful ... to emit sulfur dioxide in excess of the tonnage limitation ... unless ... owner or operator of such unit holds allowances”); *id.* § 405(b)(1) (“unlawful ... to exceed an annual sulfur dioxide tonnage emission limitation equal to ... 1.20 lbs/mmBtu, divided by 2,000, unless the owner or operator of such unit holds allowances”); *see also* Core Br. 56. The absence of such a trading program in section 111 confirms the more limited focus of that provision.<sup>10</sup> Br. for Members of Cong. as Amici Curiae in Supp. of Pet’rs 20-22 (Feb. 23, 2016), ECF 1600258.

The attempts by EPA and its supporters, *see* EPA Br. 33; Env’tl. Intervenors’ Br. 17 (Mar. 29, 2016), ECF 1606130, to analogize the Rule to other “performance-based” programs fall short because “generation-shifting” played no role in setting the standard under these programs. In its rule regulating hazardous power plant emissions, for example, EPA based the standards on the “maximum achievable control technology” for the regulated facilities. 77 Fed. Reg. 9304, 9394 (Feb. 16,

---

<sup>10</sup> *Van Hollen v. FEC*, 811 F.3d 486, 493 (D.C. Cir. 2016), undermines rather than supports EPA. EPA Br. 33. In *Van Hollen*, this Court, under *Chevron* step two, accepted the agency’s decision to limit its authority under one statutory provision in line with limitations in another parallel provision because the two were similar in intent. The opposite holds true here: the language of section 111(d) is clear, and other trading programs differ substantially in structure and purpose. *See, e.g.*, Core Br. 54-56.



2012). The provision EPA cites (Br. 33) merely allowed plants additional time to comply by building replacement resources if needed to avoid a power shortfall. Similarly, in the regional haze program, EPA based the standards on the emission performance of operational processes and control technology that can be implemented at the regulated source. CAA § 169A(b)(2)(A) & (g)(2); 40 C.F.R. § 51.308(e)(1). EPA provided flexibility to use a cap-and-trade program as a compliance option—not, as here, as a basis for the standard.<sup>11</sup>

### **C. The Rule Is Inconsistent with Section 111 as a Whole.**

Petitioners demonstrated EPA’s critical interpretive error in giving a fundamentally different reading to “best system of emission reduction” for purposes of the Rule than it gave in the parallel rulemaking for new units under section 111(b). Core Br. 57. By adopting a system based on “generation-shifting” under section 111(d)—but *not* section 111(b)—the Rule inverted the structure of section 111 and produced a bizarre outcome. *Id.* at 57-58. The Rule sets performance rates for *existing* sources that are significantly more stringent than for *new* sources, *id.* at 11-12, 15-16, in contrast with EPA’s prior consistent practice, *id.* at 59.

In response, EPA suggests the performance rates it set for new and existing sources cannot be compared. EPA Br. 71-72. But comparing these rates is perfectly

---

<sup>11</sup> Similarly, Environmental Intervenors (Br. 18) refer to a waste combustor regulation, 60 Fed. Reg. 65,387, 65,402 (Dec. 19, 1995), but that rule supports Petitioners because it offered averaging and trading merely as compliance mechanisms for plant-specific standards properly based on the use of controls or measures at the source, *id.*

appropriate: both the new-source and existing-source rules purport to limit the rate at which fossil fuel-fired units may emit carbon dioxide. *See* 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,667, JA\_\_\_\_; 80 Fed. Reg. 64,510, 64,513 (Oct. 23, 2015). EPA does not dispute that the actual, numerical performance rates for existing sources are *lower* than those for new sources. Core Br. 11-12, 15-16. And EPA does not dispute that even if existing sources were to adopt what EPA determined to be the “best system of emission reduction” for new sources, those existing sources still could not achieve the Rule’s performance rates. *Id.* at 16, 58-59.

EPA provides no credible explanation why the “phase-in” of the existing-source performance rates means they cannot be compared to the new-source performance rates. EPA Br. 71. Existing-source rates based on retrofitting require lead-in time for sources to comply; that fact has never before led EPA to make them more stringent than immediately-applicable new source rates. *See* CAA § 111(a)(2), (b)(1)(B) (new-source standards effective retroactively to date of proposal). EPA suggests that the new-source standards may be tightened in the future to align them more closely with the existing-source rates in the Rule, but the agency never found that technological developments would eventually justify making new-source standards as stringent as the existing-source rates. In any event, such prognostication would be simply the “‘crystal ball’ inquiry” this Court has forbidden as a basis for setting section 111 standards. *Portland Cement Ass’n v. Ruckelshaus*, 486 F.2d 375, 391 (D.C. Cir. 1973).

EPA also offers “[s]everal considerations” why it declined to adopt performance rates for new sources based on “generation-shifting.” Br. 70-71. For instance, EPA opines that, for new sources, the cost of “generation-shifting” combined with on-site improvements would be excessive. But because EPA found that “generation-shifting” brings about *more* reductions than the carbon capture technology contemplated for new coal units, the agency could, under its view of its own authority, simply have set the new-source standard based on “generation-shifting” alone. And EPA uses circular reasoning when it asserts (Br. 72) that it could adopt conflicting definitions of “system” because it allowed existing sources, but not new sources, to engage in trading. If EPA believes existing sources can comply by trading, then under its view new sources can too—indeed, the Rule even contemplates that States may allow new sources to trade with existing sources. 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,887-88, JA\_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_.

Finally, EPA points (Br. 72-73) to a single previous section 111(d) guideline under which “an occasional old plant may have a lower guideline fluoride emission rate than a new plant.” 45 Fed. Reg. 26,294, 26,295 (Apr. 17, 1980). But EPA explained there that emerging designs for new aluminum plants caused those plants to have “much greater uncontrolled emission rates” than some old plants. *Id.* Accordingly, emissions from a few aluminum plants were actually *more difficult* to control than emissions from some existing plants. EPA does not claim that such circumstances are present here.

### III. The Section 112 Exclusion Unambiguously Prohibits the Rule.

Separately, EPA's Rule is unlawful because the Act prohibits EPA from invoking section 111(d) to require States to regulate an existing "source category which is regulated under section [1]12." CAA § 111(d)(1)(A)(i); *see AEP*, 564 U.S. at 424 n.7 ("EPA may not employ § [1]11(d) if existing stationary sources of the pollutant in question are regulated under ... § [1]12.").<sup>12</sup> The agency itself in 1995, 2004, 2005, 2007, and 2014 acknowledged this "literal" reading of the Exclusion as it appears in the U.S. Code. Core Br. 62-63. And EPA has uniformly acted consistently with that understanding until this Rule, never once seeking to regulate under section 111(d) an existing source category already regulated under section 112. *Id.* at 67.

#### A. EPA Fails To Defend the Interpretation of the Exclusion It Adopted in the Rule.

In the Rule, EPA interpreted the Exclusion as it appears in the U.S. Code to be different in scope than the Exclusion as it existed before 1990. As originally enacted in 1970, section 111(d) prohibited EPA from regulating "any air pollutant" "included on a list published under ... [108](a) ... or [112](b)(1)(A)"—that is, any criteria air pollutant or hazardous air pollutant. 42 U.S.C. § 1857c-6(d) (1970). In 1990, Congress significantly revised the Exclusion by deleting the phrase "or 112(b)(1)(A)" and inserting the phrase "or emitted from a source category which is regulated under

---

<sup>12</sup> EPA's claim (Br. 94) that the Court's use of the phrase "of the pollutant in question" suggested a different understanding is grammatically wrong. The subject of the Supreme Court's verb phrase "are regulated under ... Section [1]12" is the noun phrase "existing stationary sources," not "the pollutant in question."

Section 112.” Pub. L. No. 101-549, § 108(g), 104 Stat. 2399, 2467 (1990), JA\_\_\_\_. EPA concluded in the Rule that this change prohibits “the regulation of [hazardous air pollutant] emissions under CAA section 111(d) and only when that source category is regulated under CAA section 112.” 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,714, JA\_\_\_\_. In other words, EPA interpreted the change to narrow the Exclusion from prohibiting regulation under section 111(d) of any hazardous air pollutants to only those hazardous air pollutants emitted from a source category actually regulated under section 112.

In its brief, EPA abandons this interpretation, urging instead that the Exclusion still prohibits the regulation of *any* hazardous air pollutants, just as it did before 1990. The Exclusion, EPA now says, “is most reasonably interpreted to mean *hazardous* pollutants.” EPA Br. 82; *id.* at 81 (“[T]he phrase ... exclud[es] ... only a source category’s emissions of *hazardous pollutants regulated under Section 112*.”). The post-1990 language in the U.S. Code, EPA asserts, did “not dramatically change [the Exclusion’s] scope.” *Id.* at 86.

This approach to the Exclusion is fatal to EPA’s position. To begin with, *Chenery* bars an agency from changing for litigation purposes the interpretation it adopted in rulemaking. *See, e.g., Am.’s Cmty. Bankers v. FDIC*, 200 F.3d 822, 835 (D.C. Cir. 2000). Moreover, by changing its interpretation, EPA offers no reasoned defense of its transformation of the Exclusion from a prohibition against regulating “any air pollutant ... emitted from a source category which is regulated under section [1]12” into a prohibition against “the regulation of [hazardous air pollutant] emissions under

CAA section 111(d) and only when that source category is regulated under CAA section 112.” 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,714, JA\_\_\_\_. EPA leaves entirely un rebutted Petitioners’ argument (Core Br. 64-68) that this is merely an impermissible effort to “rewrite clear statutory terms to suit [the agency’s] own sense of how the statute should operate.” *UARG*, 134 S. Ct. at 2446.

**B. EPA’s Arguments Against the Unambiguous Meaning of the Exclusion Lack Merit.**

Instead of defending its own reading of the statute, EPA focuses on attacking Petitioners’ interpretation. But these arguments do not withstand scrutiny.

**1. The statutory text, as it appears in the U.S. Code, is not ambiguous.**

There is no merit to EPA’s attempt, for the first time in 25 years, to manufacture ambiguity in the statutory text.

*First*, EPA argues (Br. 79-80) that Congress’s use of the word “or” to separate the three exclusions in section 111(d) could be read to treat the three exclusions as not operating independently. But “[a]mbiguity is a creature not of definitional possibilities but of statutory context,” *Brown v. Gardner*, 513 U.S. 115, 118 (1994); statutory text is ambiguous only where it “is reasonably susceptible to more than one meaning,” *Owner-Operator Indep. Drivers Ass’n v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, 724 F.3d 230, 235-36 (D.C. Cir. 2013) (internal quotation marks omitted). That is not true here as EPA itself rejected this alternative reading of “or” as “not a reasonable reading.” 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,713, JA\_\_\_\_. Moreover, *Chevron* deference applies only where the alleged ambiguity

is “such as to make it appear that Congress either explicitly or implicitly delegated authority to cure that ambiguity.” *ABA*, 430 F.3d at 469. The ambiguity EPA purports to identify in the “or” language is the relationship among three different exclusions. But there is no dispute here as to that question. *See* 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,713, JA\_\_\_\_. The only relevant dispute is the meaning of the Exclusion itself, on which the “or” language has no bearing.

*Second*, EPA incorrectly argues that the phrase “regulated under section [1]12” is ambiguous. EPA’s assertion that “one must ... ask not only ‘who’ is regulated under Section 112 ..., but also ‘what,’” EPA Br. 81, cannot be squared with *Western Minnesota Municipal Power Agency v. FERC*, 806 F.3d 588 (D.C. Cir. 2015). That case, which EPA does not address, involved a statute that gave preference to applications “by States and municipalities” for certain water permits. Noting that “[n]othing in th[e] [statutory] language qualifies or restricts which ‘states’ or which ‘municipalities’ are to be favored,” this Court rejected as “manufactured ambiguity” FERC’s claim that it had to read into the statute a limitation to municipalities “in the vicinity” of the water in question. *Id.* at 592, 594 (internal quotation marks omitted). EPA’s claimed ambiguity regarding the phrase “source category which is regulated under section [1]12” here is similarly manufactured, where Congress likewise chose not to put any

further qualifications on the phrase “source category which is regulated under section [1]12.”<sup>13</sup>

*Third*, EPA’s attempt to find ambiguity in the statutory term “any air pollutant” is similarly contrived. EPA appears to be asserting that this term, which appears only once in section 111(d), has two contradictory meanings. The phrase means “any” pollutant when considering which pollutants section 111(d) applies to, but this same phrase means “hazardous air pollutant” when looking at the Exclusion. EPA cites no case to support the novel proposition that one instance of three words can fundamentally change its nature when observed in different ways. *Clark v. Martinez*, 543 U.S. 371, 378 (2005).

## **2. EPA’s non-textual arguments fail.**

EPA next raises several non-textual arguments, urging first that Petitioners’ reading would “practically nullify the Section 111(d) program.” EPA Br. 83-84. The agency ignores the fact that since the 1990 Amendments, EPA has never once sought to regulate under section 111(d) a source category that was already regulated under section 112. Core Br. 62, 67. It is EPA’s interpretation that would revolutionize this rarely used program, potentially subjecting many existing source categories already

---

<sup>13</sup> The cases on which EPA relies—*Rush Prudential HMO, Inc. v. Moran*, 536 U.S. 355, 366 (2002), and *UNUM Life Insurance Company of America v. Ward*, 526 U.S. 358, 363 (1999)—concerned the very different phrase “regulates insurance,” which the Supreme Court has found ambiguous due in part to the unique challenges in discerning what constitutes the “business of insurance,” *Metro. Life Ins. Co. v. Massachusetts*, 471 U.S. 724, 743 (1985).



regulated under section 112's stringent standards to double-regulation under section 111(d).

EPA's charge (Br. 84) that Petitioners' reading would create "a gaping hole in the Act's coverage" is baseless. EPA fails to acknowledge that the 1990 Amendments "expanded section 112 from a program that covered only a small universe of extremely dangerous pollutants into an expansive program," and does not dispute that it has not "identified a single pollutant that the agency believes would meet the definition of pollutant under section 111 but not section 112." Core Br. 67. In any event, the Supreme Court has made clear that the CAA does not authorize EPA to regulate every pollutant, from every source, under every program, no matter what. *See UARG*, 134 S. Ct. at 2444.

EPA's "context[ual]" argument based upon section 112(d)(7) (Br. 84) is similarly meritless. As a threshold matter, section 112(d)(7) deals with the situation in which the section 111 rule predates a section 112 rule, whereas the Exclusion deals with the opposite sequence. There is no conflict between the two provisions.

EPA contends that it does not make sense that "EPA could regulate a source category under both Section 111(d) and 112 *so long as it regulated under Section 111(d) first*." EPA Br. 87. But EPA ignores that the focus of section 111 is the regulation of *new* sources under section 111(b), to which the Exclusion does not apply. Core Br. 5, 8. It is perfectly reasonable to believe that Congress had that primary purpose in mind when referring to section 111 in section 112(d)(7).

Moreover, EPA's own interpretation of the Exclusion is susceptible to the same criticism, undermining EPA's claims of "absurdity." EPA Br. 87. In the Rule, EPA claimed that the Exclusion prohibits the regulation under section 111(d) of a source category's hazardous air pollutants "only when that source category is regulated under CAA section 112." 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,714, JA\_\_\_\_. So it would also be true under EPA's (flawed) interpretation that "EPA could regulate a source category [for hazardous air pollutants] under both Section 111(d) and 112 so long as it regulated under Section 111(d) first." EPA Br. 87 (emphasis omitted).

Finally, EPA's assertion (Br. 85) that Petitioners have not identified any "statement[s]" in the 1990 legislative history to explain the change in the Exclusion does not help its cause. "[T]he theory of the dog that did not bark" in the legislative history is not a permissible interpretive doctrine. *Harrison v. PPG Indus., Inc.*, 446 U.S. 578, 592 (1980). This is particularly true here, given that EPA also has not identified any "statement" supporting the interpretation the agency adopted in the Rule, which would involve a significant change to the Exclusion's meaning.

In any event, the legislative history supports Petitioners' interpretation. EPA does not dispute that it previously explained that the historical record supports the conclusion that the House of Representatives intended to adopt precisely the meaning Petitioners urge here, in order to eliminate the problem of "duplicative or overlapping regulation." 70 Fed. Reg. 15,994, 16,031 (Mar. 29, 2005), JA\_\_\_\_. While an agency may

be “free to change its interpretation of a statute” in certain circumstances, EPA Br. 90, it cannot ignore historical facts it previously acknowledged.

**C. EPA’s Defense of the Erroneous Conforming Amendment Is Unpersuasive.**

EPA closes its argument by discussing the conforming amendment that was excluded from the U.S. Code by the non-partisan Office of the Law Revision Counsel. *Id.* at 77-78. Notably, this “Senate amendment” theory previously was EPA’s sole basis for avoiding the Exclusion’s “literal” terms, but is now essentially an afterthought. Legal Memorandum for Proposed Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Electric Utility Generating Units at 26 (undated), EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0602-0419, JA\_\_\_\_; *see also* 70 Fed. Reg. at 16,029-32, JA\_\_\_\_-\_\_\_\_.

*First*, EPA does not dispute that the Law Revision Counsel routinely and properly excludes from the U.S. Code “trivial or duplicative” amendments that cannot be executed. EPA Br. 89 n.70. And wisely so. “[A] failure to delete an inappropriate cross-reference in the bill that Congress later enacted into law” creates no ambiguity. *Chickasaw Nation v. United States*, 534 U.S. 84, 91 (2001).

EPA suggests that this is “the rare instance[]” where the “unexecuted text has substantive import” and “must be considered.” EPA Br. 89 n.70. But the agency offers no indication that the Senate amendment had “substantive import.” To the contrary, it is a trivial “drafting error,” 70 Fed. Reg. at 16,031, JA\_\_\_\_, as the agency acknowledged a mere five years after the 1990 Amendments, Core Br. 72.

*Second*, EPA offers no reasoning to support its *ipse dixit* assertion (Br. 91) that its interpretation “gave meaning to both” amendments. In fact, the Rule gives no effect whatsoever to the Senate amendment. In the Rule, EPA claims the Senate amendment would have “maintained the pre-1990 meaning” of the Exclusion. 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,712, JA\_\_\_\_. In contrast, EPA interprets the House amendment to prohibit something different: “the regulation of [hazardous air pollutant] emissions under CAA section 111(d) and only when that source category is regulated under CAA section 112.” *Id.* at 64,714, JA\_\_\_\_. EPA’s position in the Rule is that the House amendment is the Exclusion’s complete meaning, *id.*, which fails to give any effect—let alone “full effect”—to the Senate amendment.

*Finally*, EPA’s response (Br. 91-92) to Petitioners’ explanation that the Rule must still fall if both amendments are given full effect is wrong. EPA points out that section 111(d) is an “affirmative mandate,” *id.* at 92, but that misses the point. The only issue is the meaning of the amendments, which clearly concern *limitations* on section 111(d)’s affirmative mandate. Thus, both amendments may be given full effect only by imposing *both* limitations on EPA’s authority. *AEP*, 564 U.S. at 424 n.7.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> EPA suggests this Court could strike both amendments, or just the House amendment, putting the Exclusion back to its pre-1990 meaning. EPA Br. 92, 93 n.73. These arguments are foreclosed by the *Chenery* doctrine, since EPA did not base the Rule upon its pre-1990 understanding of the Exclusion. *See supra* p. 33. They also would require invalidating many statutes based upon what EPA admits are “trivial” drafting mistakes. EPA Br. 89 n.70.

#### **IV. The Rule Unlawfully Abrogates Authority Granted to the States by the Clean Air Act.**

##### **A. EPA Has Improperly Intruded on State Authority To “Establish[]” Performance Standards Under Section 111(d).**

EPA offers no persuasive response to Petitioners’ argument that EPA improperly claims power to establish “a minimum stringency for emission standards,” Core Br. 76—a power entrusted to the States by section 111 and explicitly recognized in EPA’s own regulations. Unlike section 111(b), which authorizes EPA to “establish[] Federal standards of performance for new sources,” section 111(d) provides that *States* “establish[] standards of performance for any existing source” pursuant to EPA “procedure[s].” Thus, EPA’s regulations provide that EPA will issue only an “emission guideline” based on the “application of the best system of emission reduction,” and that the States will establish the standards of performance, which may differ from and even be less stringent than EPA’s emissions guidelines. 40 C.F.R. § 60.24(f) (authorizing “less stringent emissions standards” for specific facilities or classes of facilities due to unreasonable cost, physical impossibility, and other factors); Core Br. 75.

EPA now claims (Br. 74) that its regulations have “stated since 1975” that it is actually “*EPA’s* job” to “establish a minimum level of stringency.” In support, EPA alleges that 40 C.F.R. § 60.24(c) requires that standards for pollutants the Administrator determines threaten public health “shall be no less stringent than the [EPA] guidelines.” *Id.* at 74 n.50 (quoting 40 C.F.R. § 60.24(c)).

But EPA's regulations do not make such a sweeping statement. In quoting 40 C.F.R. § 60.24(c), EPA omits the crucial introductory clause “[e]xcept as provided in paragraph (f) of this section.” (Emphasis added.) That subsection expressly provides that States may apply “less stringent emissions standards ... than those otherwise required by paragraph (c) of this section,” based on a State’s demonstration of “[u]nreasonable cost” or “[p]hysical impossibility” or “[o]ther factors specific to the facility (or class of facilities).” 40 C.F.R. § 60.24(f). Similarly, contrary to EPA’s suggestion, the 1975 preamble unambiguously explained that States shall be “free to vary from the levels of control represented by the emission guidelines.” 40 Fed. Reg. 53,340, 53,343 (Nov. 17, 1975), JA\_\_\_\_. Congress twice made major amendments to section 111 while these regulations have been in place and expressed no disagreement with EPA’s longstanding statutory interpretation. *See, e.g., Commodity Futures Trading Comm’n v. Schor*, 478 U.S. 833, 846 (1986).

**B. EPA Improperly Intrudes on State Authority To Consider a Source’s Remaining Useful Life and Other Factors.**

EPA also disputes that it has failed to comply with the statutory obligation to “permit the State[s] in applying a standard of performance to any particular source ... to take into consideration, among other factors, the remaining useful life of the existing source to which such standard applies.” CAA § 111(d)(1). Though it concedes (Br. 75) that the Rule forbids States from “mak[ing] additional goal adjustments based on remaining useful life and other facility-specific factors,” 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,870,

JA\_\_\_\_, EPA argues that the word “permit” is “commonly understood as granting authority that may be subject to conditions,” EPA Br. 75 n.53.

But it cannot be that the agency’s power to “establish a procedure” for States includes the power to set conditions that entirely deprive States of their statutory discretion, as EPA has done here.

*First*, the ability to adopt a trading regime (Br. 75) does not permit States to take remaining useful life into account. Trading is a general program that applies uniformly to *all* of a State’s regulated sources, including those with dramatically different remaining useful lives. Trading is thus clearly not the “appl[ication of] a standard of performance to *a[] particular source*,” because it does not permit States to adjust the performance rates for “any *particular source*” to reflect that source’s remaining useful life. CAA § 111(d)(1) (emphases added). Trading’s purported “flexibility” cannot replace source-by-source consideration of remaining useful life. *Cf.* 40 Fed. Reg. at 53,344 (“variances are also permissible” under 40 C.F.R. § 60.24(d) on top of regulation’s inherent “flexibility”), JA\_\_\_\_.

Furthermore, even with trading, EPA projects a substantial number of coal plants will be forced to close under the Rule—indeed, the only way the rates can be met is if coal-based generation is reduced dramatically. *See* Core Br. 14-22, 42. That is because trading allows sources to continue operating only by paying for emission credits—even when such payments would impair a source’s viability. And trading does not alter the Rule’s fundamental dynamic: forced replacement of existing sources

with new renewable generation. *See supra* p. 11. A Rule that will close plants early over a State's objections is hardly one that allows States—such as Kansas, which recently spent \$3 billion to upgrade coal-fired power plants at EPA's behest—to account for remaining useful life when applying standards of performance. Core Br. 77 n.40.

*Second*, EPA claims (Br. 75) that a State may relax an individual source's emission rate if the State imposes on other sources rates that are *more* stringent than what EPA has determined is the “emission limitation achievable through the application of the best system of emission reduction.” CAA § 111(a)(1). But under any reading of the statute, EPA lacks authority to require better reductions than could be achieved by the “best system of emission reduction.” EPA cannot force States either to forego considering remaining useful life or to submit to the unlawful condition of imposing requirements more stringent than authorized in section 111. Indeed, sources by definition cannot reasonably achieve emission reductions more stringent than can be attained by the “*best* system of emission reduction”; requiring them to do so is arbitrary and capricious.

EPA argues the statute is “silent” on whether States may “relax the overall degree of emission limitation.” EPA Br. 75 (emphasis and internal quotation marks omitted). But the statute *does* address that question. By allowing EPA to demand from any source, at most, only the reductions that can be attained by the best system of emission reduction, and by permitting States to deviate from a performance standard for a particular source in light of its remaining useful life or other facility-specific



factors, CAA § 111(d)(1), Congress necessarily allowed States to depart from “the overall degree of emission limitation,” which is the sum of sources’ reductions.

## **V. The Rule Violates the Tenth Amendment.**

EPA cites no authority, and there is none, upholding as constitutional a “cooperative” federalism program that the federal government cannot hope to administer without requiring States to adopt and administer federal policy choices in core areas of state responsibility.

The Rule is predicated on EPA’s determination that, rather than risk severe disruptions to their electric systems, States will exercise their “responsibility to maintain a reliable electric system” by following the Rule’s chosen federal electric generation policy. 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,678, 64,694 (noting the “numerous remedies” that state public utility commissions can use to address reliability), JA\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_; *see also* 40 C.F.R. §§ 60.5745(a)(7), 60.5780(a)(5)(iii). In so doing, the Rule places substantial duties on even those States that formally “decline[]” to administer it, thereby commandeering and coercing States and their officials. Core Br. 78.

The “textbook example[s] of cooperative federalism” EPA cites in response (Br. 98-101)—*Hodel v. Virginia Surface Mining & Reclamation Ass’n*, 452 U.S. 264 (1981), and *New York v. United States*, 505 U.S. 144 (1992)—are inapposite because neither concerned actions where the federal government conceded that direct federal administration would be insufficient. EPA admits that in *Hodel*, “the Court found no Tenth Amendment issue because ‘the States are not compelled to enforce the []

standards, to expend any state funds, or to participate in the federal regulatory program.” EPA Br. 99 (quoting *Hodel*, 452 U.S. at 288-89). Here, in contrast, the Rule acknowledges that States must participate in the federal regulatory program by exercising their “responsibility to maintain a reliable electric system,” 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,678, JA\_\_\_\_, and EPA’s brief (Br. 104) tacitly acknowledges that States must expend funds on other regulatory programs to facilitate the Rule.<sup>15</sup> Likewise, EPA acknowledges (Br. 99) that in *New York*, 505 U.S. at 174, the Court “found no Tenth Amendment issue where ‘any burden caused by a State’s refusal to regulate will fall on those who generate waste ... rather than on the State as a sovereign.’”

EPA’s argument (Br. 102-05) that the Rule passes constitutional muster because any federal plan would regulate individual sources (and not States) ignores reality. Even if a federal plan would be aimed nominally at individual sources, state officials nevertheless would have to exercise their “responsibility to maintain a reliable electric system.” 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,678, JA\_\_\_\_. States have no meaningful choice

---

<sup>15</sup> State and Municipal Respondent-Intervenors incorrectly suggest that *Hodel* requires this Court to disregard the ways in which the Rule requires States’ action outside any directly preempted activity. Br. for State & Municipal Intervenors in Supp. of Resp’ts 19-20 (Mar. 29, 2016), ECF 1606037. *Hodel* concerned a claim that a cooperative federalism scheme could have “conceivable effects” on state police powers. 452 U.S. at 289. *Hodel* did not consider a federal scheme that fundamentally relied on state administration to operate, as does this one.

whether to regulate because the federal government has no authority to carry out the regulatory actions needed to keep the lights on.<sup>16</sup>

That is why *FERC v. Mississippi*, 456 U.S. 742 (1982), does not support EPA's position. *Mississippi* “upheld the statute at issue because it did not view the statute as such a command” to regulate. *New York*, 505 U.S. at 161. Instead, all the statute did was require that States “‘consider’ federal standards ... as a precondition to continued state regulation of an otherwise pre-empted field.” *Printz v. United States*, 521 U.S. 898, 926 (1997). The Rule, by contrast, requires States to carry out federal policy and does not offer to relieve States from doing so through federal preemption.

EPA's “parade of horrors”—that everything from the Act's Acid Rain Trading Program to an increase in the federal minimum wage would be unconstitutional if Petitioners prevail—is fanciful. EPA Br. 104-05 & n.88. A ruling in Petitioners' favor on this ground would not bring about the results EPA fears. Rather, the Rule uniquely forces States to administer federal policy, even if they opt not to submit a state plan. The Rule is different in kind because “utilities provide an essential public service and are regulated and managed in ways unlike any other industrial activity.” 80 Fed. Reg. at 64,664, JA\_\_\_\_. EPA's decision to regulate them in a manner

---

<sup>16</sup> EPA's ability to address energy reliability issues in a federal plan is further constrained by the fact that FERC, not EPA, is the federal agency with jurisdiction over interstate electricity transmission and practices affecting wholesale rates. Core Br. 38-39.

that poses dire consequences for States that do not change their energy policies to facilitate EPA's decarbonization mandate is unprecedented.

Finally, EPA errs by suggesting (Br. 102) that the record does not support Petitioners' claims that the Rule commandeers and coerces them into changing energy regulation in order to avoid severe disruption. The administrative record is replete with comments from States and others explaining how EPA's Rule would require extensive State action to avoid disruptions. *See* Core Br. 22. So is the successful Supreme Court stay briefing. *See, e.g.*, Appl. by 29 States & State Agencies for Immediate Stay of Final Agency Action During Pendency of Petitions for Review, *West Virginia v. EPA*, 136 S. Ct. 1000 (2016) (No. 15A773). And EPA itself recognized this problem in its proposed federal plan for this Rule. *See* 80 Fed. Reg. 64,966, 64,981 (Oct. 23, 2015). EPA trumpets the Rule's supposed "flexibility" (Br. 100), but that is a façade: the Rule forces States and electric utilities to shift the national energy mix away from fossil fuels to renewables. *See supra* p. 11.

At a minimum, statutes "must be construed, if fairly possible, so as to avoid not only the conclusion that [they are] unconstitutional, but also grave doubts upon that score." *United States v. Jin Fney Moy*, 241 U.S. 394, 401 (1916). EPA's reliance on *Rust v. Sullivan*, 500 U.S. 173 (1991), is misplaced. Unlike this case, no alternative construction was readily available because the *Rust* petitioners' statutory construction arguments were weak (being based on "highly generalized" statements that "do not directly address the scope of" the challenged statutory provision) and their

constitutional arguments had only “some force.” *Id.* at 189, 191. This Court should thus adopt the compelling constructions of the CAA that avoid these constitutional concerns and limit EPA to its traditional role in regulating sources.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, the petitions should be granted and the Rule vacated.

Dated: April 15, 2016

/s/ F. William Brownell

F. William Brownell  
Allison D. Wood  
Henry V. Nickel  
Tauna M. Szymanski  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
bbrownell@hunton.com  
awood@hunton.com  
hnickel@hunton.com  
tszymanski@hunton.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Utility Air Regulatory  
Group and American Public Power Association*

/s/ Peter S. Glaser

Peter S. Glaser  
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP  
401 Ninth Street N.W., Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 274-2998  
peter.glaser@troutmansanders.com

Carroll W. McGuffey III  
Justin T. Wong  
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP  
600 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 5200  
Atlanta, GA 30308  
Tel: (404) 885-3000  
mack.mcguffey@troutmansanders.com  
justin.wong@troutmansanders.com

*Counsel for Petitioner National Mining  
Association*

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Elbert Lin

Patrick Morrissey  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WEST  
VIRGINIA  
Elbert Lin  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
J. Zak Ritchie  
Assistant Attorney General  
State Capitol Building 1, Room 26-E  
Charleston, WV 25305  
Tel: (304) 558-2021  
Fax: (304) 558-0140  
elbert.lin@wvago.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of West Virginia*

/s/ Scott A. Keller

Ken Paxton  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
Jeffrey C. Mateer  
First Assistant Attorney General  
Scott A. Keller  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 12548  
Austin, TX 78711-2548  
Tel: (512) 936-1700  
scott.keller@texasattorneygeneral.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Texas*

/s/ Peter D. Keisler

Peter D. Keisler  
Roger R. Martella, Jr.  
C. Frederick Beckner III  
Ryan C. Morris  
Paul J. Ray  
SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 736-8027  
pkeisler@sidley.com  
rmartella@sidley.com  
rbeckner@sidley.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America; National Association of Manufacturers; American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers; National Federation of Independent Business; American Chemistry Council; American Coke and Coal Chemicals Institute; American Foundry Society; American Forest & Paper Association; American Iron & Steel Institute; American Wood Council; Brick Industry Association; Electricity Consumers Resource Council; Lignite Energy Council; National Lime Association; National Oilseed Processors Association; and Portland Cement Association*

/s/ Andrew Brasher

Luther Strange  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ALABAMA  
Andrew Brasher  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
501 Washington Avenue  
Montgomery, AL 36130  
Tel: (334) 353-2609  
abrasher@ago.state.al.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Alabama*

/s/ John R. Lopez IV

Mark Brnovich  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ARIZONA  
John R. Lopez IV  
*Counsel of Record*  
Dominic E. Draye  
Keith J. Miller  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Maureen Scott  
Janet Wagner  
Janice Alward  
Arizona Corp. Commission,  
Staff Attorneys  
1275 West Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  
Tel: (602) 542-5025  
john.lopez@azag.gov  
dominic.draye@azag.gov  
keith.miller@azag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner Arizona Corporation Commission*

/s/ Thomas A. Lorenzen

Thomas A. Lorenzen  
D.C. Cir. Bar No. 394369  
Daniel W. Wolff  
Sherrie A. Armstrong  
CROWELL & MORING LLP  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 624-2500  
tlorenzen@crowell.com  
dwolff@crowell.com  
sarmstrong@crowell.com

*Counsel for Petitioners National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; Big Rivers Electric Corporation; Brazos Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; Buckeye Power, Inc.; Central Montana Electric Power Cooperative; Central Electric Power Cooperative, Inc., Corn Belt Power Cooperative; Dairyland Power Cooperative; East River Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; Georgia Transmission Corporation; Kansas Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; North Carolina Electric Membership Corporation; Northwest Iowa Power Cooperative; Oglethorpe Power Corporation; PowerSouth Energy Cooperative; Prairie Power, Inc.; Rushmore Electric Power Cooperative, Inc.; Seminole Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Southern Illinois Power Cooperative; Sunflower Electric Power Corporation; and Upper Missouri G. & T. Electric Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Lee Rudofsky

Leslie Rutledge  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ARKANSAS  
Lee Rudofsky  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Jamie L. Ewing  
Assistant Attorney General  
323 Center Street, Suite 400  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
Tel: (501) 682-5310  
lee.rudofsky@arkansasag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Arkansas*

/s/ Frederick Yarger

Cynthia H. Coffman  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF COLORADO  
Frederick Yarger  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
1300 Broadway, 10th Floor  
Denver, CO 80203  
Tel: (720) 508-6168  
fred.yarger@state.co.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Colorado*



*Of Counsel*

Rae Cronmiller  
Environmental Counsel  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RURAL  
ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES  
4301 Wilson Blvd.  
Arlington, VA 22203  
Tel: (703) 907-5500  
rae.cronmiller@nreca.coop

*Counsel for Petitioner National Rural Electric  
Cooperative Association*

/s/ Eric L. Hiser

Eric L. Hiser  
JORDEN BISCHOFF & HISER, PLC  
7272 E. Indian School Road, Suite 360  
Scottsdale, AZ 85251  
Tel: (480) 505-3927  
ehiser@jordenbischoff.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Arizona Electric Power  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Brian A. Prestwood

Brian A. Prestwood  
Senior Corporate and Compliance  
Counsel  
ASSOCIATED ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,  
INC.  
2814 S. Golden, P.O. Box 754  
Springfield, MO 65801  
Tel: (417) 885-9273  
bprestwood@aeci.org

*Counsel for Petitioner Associated Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Jonathan L. Williams

Pamela Jo Bondi  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF FLORIDA  
Jonathan L. Williams  
Deputy Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Jonathan A. Glogau  
Special Counsel  
Office of the Attorney General  
PL-01, The Capitol  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-1050  
Tel: (850) 414-3818  
Fax: (850) 410-2672  
jonathan.williams@myfloridalegal.com  
jonathan.glogau@myfloridalegal.com

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Florida*

/s/ Britt C. Grant

Samuel S. Olens  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF GEORGIA  
Britt C. Grant  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
40 Capitol Square S.W.  
Atlanta, GA 30334  
Tel: (404) 656-3300  
Fax: (404) 463-9453  
bgrant@law.ga.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Georgia*

/s/ David Crabtree

David Crabtree  
Vice President, General Counsel  
DESERET GENERATION & TRANSMISSION  
CO-OPERATIVE  
10714 South Jordan Gateway  
South Jordan, UT 84095  
Tel: (801) 619-9500  
Crabtree@deseretpower.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Deseret Generation &  
Transmission Co-operative*

/s/ John M. Holloway III

John M. Holloway III  
SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN LLP  
700 Sixth Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 383-0100  
Fax: (202) 383-3593  
jay.holloway@sutherland.com

*Counsel for Petitioners East Kentucky Power  
Cooperative, Inc.; Hoosier Energy Rural Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.; Minnkota Power Cooperative,  
Inc.; and South Mississippi Electric Power  
Association*

/s/ Timothy Junk

Gregory F. Zoeller  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF INDIANA  
Timothy Junk  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Indiana Government Ctr. South  
Fifth Floor  
302 West Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46205  
Tel: (317) 232-6247  
tim.junk@atg.in.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Indiana*

/s/ Jeffrey A. Chanay

Derek Schmidt  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF KANSAS  
Jeffrey A. Chanay  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Bryan C. Clark  
Assistant Solicitor General  
120 S.W. 10th Avenue, 3rd Floor  
Topeka, KS 66612  
Tel: (785) 368-8435  
Fax: (785) 291-3767  
jeff.chanay@ag.ks.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Kansas*

/s/ Patrick Burchette

Patrick Burchette  
HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP  
800 17<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 469-5102  
Patrick.Burchette@hklaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners East Texas Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.; Northeast Texas Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.; Sam Rayburn G&T Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.; and Tex-La Electric  
Cooperative of Texas, Inc.*

/s/ Christopher L. Bell

Christopher L. Bell  
GREENBERG TRAURIG LLP  
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 1700  
Houston, TX 77002  
Tel: (713) 374-3556  
bellc@gtlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Golden Spread Electrical  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Mark Walters

Mark Walters  
Michael J. Nasi  
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.  
100 Congress Avenue, Suite 1100  
Austin, TX 78701  
Tel: (512) 236-2000  
Fax: (512) 236-2002  
mwalters@jw.com  
mnasi@jw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners San Miguel Electric  
Cooperative, Inc. and South Texas Electric  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Joe Newberg

Andy Beshear  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF KENTUCKY  
Mitchel T. Denham  
Assistant Deputy Attorney General  
Joseph A. Newberg, II  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
700 Capital Avenue  
Suite 118  
Frankfort, KY 40601  
Tel: (502) 696-5611  
joe.newberg@ky.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner Commonwealth of  
Kentucky*

/s/ Steven B. "Beaux" Jones

Jeff Landry  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF LOUISIANA  
Steven B. "Beaux" Jones  
*Counsel of Record*  
Duncan S. Kemp, IV  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Environmental Section – Civil Division  
1885 N. Third Street  
Baton Rouge, LA 70804  
Tel: (225) 326-6085  
Fax: (225) 326-6099  
jonesst@ag.state.la.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Louisiana*

/s/ Randolph G. Holt

Randolph G. Holt  
Jeremy L. Fetty  
PARR RICHEY OBREMSKEY FRANDSEN &  
PATTERSON LLP  
Wabash Valley Power Association, Inc.  
722 N. High School Road  
P.O. Box 24700  
Indianapolis, IN 46224  
Tel: (317) 481-2815  
R\_holt@wvpa.com  
jffetty@parrlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Wabash Valley Power  
Association, Inc.*

/s/ Megan H. Berge

Megan H. Berge  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Western Farmers Electric  
Cooperative*

/s/ Steven C. Kohl

Steven C. Kohl  
Gaetan Gerville-Reache  
WARNER NORCROSS & JUDD LLP  
2000 Town Center, Suite 2700  
Southfield, MI 48075-1318  
Tel: (248) 784-5000  
skohl@wnj.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Wolverine Power Supply  
Cooperative, Inc.*

/s/ Donald Trahan

Herman Robinson  
Executive Counsel  
Donald Trahan  
*Counsel of Record*  
Elliott Vega  
LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
Legal Division  
P.O. Box 4302  
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-4302  
Tel: (225) 219-3985  
Fax: (225) 219-4068  
donald.trahan@la.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Louisiana  
Department of Environmental Quality*

/s/ Monica Derbes Gibson

Monica Derbes Gibson  
Lesley Foxhall Pietras  
LISKOW & LEWIS, P.L.C.  
701 Poydras Street, Suite 5000  
New Orleans, LA 70139  
Tel: (504) 556-4010  
Fax: (504) 556-4108  
mdgibson@liskow.com  
lfpietras@liskow.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Louisiana Public Service  
Commission*

/s/ Christina F. Gomez

Christina F. Gomez  
Lawrence E. Volmert  
Garrison W. Kaufman  
Jill H. Van Noord  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
555 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3200  
Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 295-8000  
Fax: (303) 295-8261  
cgomez@hollandhart.com  
lvolmert@hollandhart.com  
gwkaufman@hollandhart.com  
jhvan Noord@hollandhart.com

Patrick R. Day  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
2515 Warren Avenue, Suite 450  
Cheyenne, WY 82001  
Tel: (307) 778-4200  
Fax: (307) 778-8175  
pday@hollandhart.com

Emily C. Schilling  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
222 South Main Street, Suite 2200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101  
Tel: (801) 799-5800  
Fax: (801) 799-5700  
ecschilling@hollandhart.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Basin Electric Power  
Cooperative*

/s/ Aaron D. Lindstrom

Bill Schuette  
ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE PEOPLE  
OF MICHIGAN  
Aaron D. Lindstrom  
Michigan Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 30212  
Lansing, MI 48909  
Tel: (515) 373-1124  
Fax: (517) 373-3042  
lindstroma@michigan.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner People of the State of  
Michigan*

/s/ Harold E. Pizzetta, III

Jim Hood  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF  
MISSISSIPPI  
Harold E. Pizzetta  
Assistant Attorney General  
Civil Litigation Division  
Office of the Attorney General  
Post Office Box 220  
Jackson, MS 39205  
Tel: (601) 359-3816  
Fax: (601) 359-2003  
hpizz@ago.state.ms.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Mississippi*

/s/ Stacey Turner  
Stacey Turner  
SOUTHERN COMPANY SERVICES, INC.  
600 18<sup>th</sup> Street North  
BIN 14N-8195  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
Tel: (205) 257-2823  
staturne@southernco.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Alabama Power Company, Georgia Power Company, Gulf Power Company, and Mississippi Power Company*

/s/ C. Grady Moore, III  
C. Grady Moore, III  
Steven G. McKinney  
BALCH & BINGHAM LLP  
1901 Sixth Avenue North, Suite 1500  
Birmingham, AL 35303-4642  
Tel: (205) 251-8100  
Fax: (205) 488-5704  
gmoore@balch.com  
smckinney@balch.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Alabama Power Company*

/s/ Margaret Claiborne Campbell  
Margaret Claiborne Campbell  
Angela J. Levin  
TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP  
600 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 5200  
Atlanta, GA 30308-2216  
Tel: (404) 885-3000  
margaret.campbell@troutmansanders.com  
angela.levin@troutmansanders.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Georgia Power Company*

/s/ Donna J. Hodges  
Donna J. Hodges  
Senior Counsel  
MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
P.O. Box 2261  
Jackson, MS 39225-2261  
Tel: (601) 961-5369  
Fax: (601) 961-5349  
donna\_hodges@deq.state.ms.us

*Counsel for Petitioner Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality*

/s/ Todd E. Palmer  
Todd E. Palmer  
Valerie L. Green  
MICHAEL, BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP  
601 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20004-2601  
Tel: (202) 747-9560  
Fax: (202) 347-1819  
tepalmer@michaelbest.com  
vlgreen@michaelbest.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Mississippi Public Service Commission*

/s/ Terese T. Wyly

Terese T. Wyly

Ben H. Stone

BALCH & BINGHAM LLP

1310 Twenty Fifth Avenue

Gulfport, MS 39501-1931

Tel: (228) 214-0413

twyly@balch.com

bstone@balch.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Mississippi Power  
Company*

/s/ Jeffrey A. Stone

Jeffrey A. Stone

BEGGS & LANE, RLLP

501 Commendencia Street

Pensacola, FL 32502

Tel: (850) 432-2451

JAS@beggslane.com

James S. Alves

2110 Trescott Drive

Tallahassee, FL 32308

Tel: (850) 566-7607

jim.s.alves@outlook.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Gulf Power Company*

/s/ James R. Layton

Chris Koster

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MISSOURI

James R. Layton

Solicitor General

*Counsel of Record*

P.O. Box 899

207 W. High Street

Jefferson City, MO 65102

Tel: (573) 751-1800

Fax: (573) 751-0774

james.layton@ago.mo.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Missouri*

/s/ Dale Schowengerdt

Timothy C. Fox

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MONTANA

Alan Joscelyn

Chief Deputy Attorney General

Dale Schowengerdt

Solicitor General

*Counsel of Record*

215 North Sanders

Helena, MT 59620-1401

Tel: (406) 444-7008

dales@mt.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Montana*



/s/ James S. Alves

James S. Alves  
2110 Trescott Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
Tel: (850) 566-7607  
jim.s.alves@outlook.com

*Counsel for Petitioner CO<sub>2</sub> Task Force of the  
Florida Electric Power Coordinating Group, Inc.*

/s/ John J. McMackin

John J. McMackin  
WILLIAMS & JENSEN  
701 8th Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 659-8201  
jjmcmackin@wms-jen.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Energy-Intensive  
Manufacturers Working Group on Greenhouse  
Gas Regulation*

/s/ William M. Bumpers

William M. Bumpers  
Megan H. Berge  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

Kelly McQueen  
ENTERGY SERVICES, INC.  
425 W. Capitol Avenue, 27th Floor  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
Tel: (501) 377-5760  
kmcque1@entergy.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Entergy Corporation*

/s/ Justin D. Lavene

Douglas J. Peterson  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEBRASKA  
Dave Bydlaek  
Chief Deputy Attorney General  
Justin D. Lavene  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
2115 State Capitol  
Lincoln, NE 68509  
Tel: (402) 471-2834  
justin.lavene@nebraska.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Nebraska*

/s/ John R. Renella

Robert Lougy  
ACTING ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NEW  
JERSEY  
David C. Apy  
Assistant Attorney General  
John R. Renella  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Division of Law  
R.J. Hughes Justice Complex  
P.O. Box 093  
25 Market Street  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0093  
Tel. (609) 292-6945  
Fax (609) 341-5030  
john.renella@dol.lps.state.nj.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of New Jersey*



/s/ Paul J. Zidlicky

Paul J. Zidlicky  
SIDLEY AUSTIN, LLP  
1501 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 736-8000  
pzidlicky@sidley.com

*Counsel for Petitioners GenOn Mid-Atlantic, LLC; Indian River Power LLC; Louisiana Generating LLC; Midwest Generation, LLC; NRG Chalk Point LLC; NRG Power Midwest LP; NRG Rema LLC; NRG Texas Power LLC; NRG Wholesale Generation LP; and Vienna Power LLC*

/s/ David M. Flannery

David M. Flannery  
Kathy G. Beckett  
Edward L. Kropp  
STEPTOE & JOHNSON, PLLC  
707 Virginia Street East  
Charleston, WV 25326  
Tel: (304) 353-8000  
dave.flannery@steptoe-johnson.com  
kathy.beckett@steptoe-johnson.com  
skipp.kropp@steptoe-johnson.com

Stephen L. Miller  
STEPTOE & JOHNSON, PLLC  
700 N. Hurstbourne Parkway, Suite 115  
Louisville, KY 40222  
Tel: (502) 423-2000  
steve.miller@steptoe-johnson.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Indiana Utility Group*

/s/ Paul M. Seby

Wayne Stenejem  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NORTH  
DAKOTA  
Margaret Olson  
Assistant Attorney General  
North Dakota Attorney General's Office  
600 E. Boulevard Avenue #125  
Bismarck, ND 58505  
Tel: (701) 328-3640  
maiolson@nd.gov

Paul M. Seby  
Special Assistant Attorney General  
State of North Dakota  
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
1200 17th Street, Suite 2400  
Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 572-6500  
Fax: (303) 572-6540  
sebyp@gtlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner State of North Dakota*

/s/ Eric E. Murphy

Michael DeWine  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OHIO  
Eric E. Murphy  
State Solicitor  
*Counsel of Record*  
30 E. Broad Street, 17th Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Tel: (614) 466-8980  
eric.murphy@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Ohio*

/s/ F. William Brownell

F. William Brownell  
Eric J. Murdock  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
bbrownell@hunton.com  
emurdock@hunton.com

Nash E. Long III  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
Bank of America Plaza, Suite 3500  
101 South Tryon Street  
Charlotte, NC 28280  
Tel: (704) 378-4700  
nlong@hunton.com

*Counsel for Petitioner LG&E and  
KU Energy LLC*

/s/ David B. Rivkin, Jr.

E. Scott Pruitt  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF OKLAHOMA  
Patrick R. Wyrick  
Solicitor General of Oklahoma  
313 N.E. 21st Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
Tel: (405) 521-4396  
Fax: (405) 522-0669  
fc.docket@oag.state.ok.us  
scott.pruitt@oag.ok.gov

David B. Rivkin, Jr.  
*Counsel of Record*  
Mark W. DeLaquil  
Andrew M. Grossman  
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP  
Washington Square, Suite 1100  
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 861-1731  
Fax: (202) 861-1783  
drivkin@bakerlaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioners State of Oklahoma and  
Oklahoma Department of Environmental  
Quality*

/s/ P. Stephen Gidiere III

P. Stephen Gidiere III  
Thomas L. Casey III  
Julia B. Barber  
BALCH & BINGHAM LLP  
1901 6th Ave. N., Suite 1500  
Birmingham, AL 35203  
Tel: (205) 251-8100  
sgidiere@balch.com

Stephanie Z. Moore  
Vice President and General Counsel  
LUMINANT GENERATION COMPANY LLC  
1601 Bryan Street, 22nd Floor  
Dallas, TX 75201

Daniel J. Kelly  
Vice President and Associate General  
Counsel  
ENERGY FUTURE HOLDINGS CORP.  
1601 Bryan Street, 43rd Floor  
Dallas, TX 75201

*Counsel for Petitioners Luminant Generation  
Company LLC; Oak Grove Management  
Company LLC; Big Brown Power Company  
LLC; Sandow Power Company LLC; Big  
Brown Lignite Company LLC; Luminant  
Mining Company LLC; and Luminant Big  
Brown Mining Company LLC*

/s/ James Emory Smith, Jr.

Alan Wilson  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH  
CAROLINA  
Robert D. Cook  
Solicitor General  
James Emory Smith, Jr.  
Deputy Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, SC 29211  
Tel: (803) 734-3680  
Fax: (803) 734-3677  
esmith@scag.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of South Carolina*

/s/ Steven R. Blair

Marty J. Jackley  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH  
DAKOTA  
Steven R. Blair  
Assistant Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
1302 E. Highway 14, Suite 1  
Pierre, SD 57501  
Tel: (605) 773-3215  
steven.blair@state.sd.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of South Dakota*

/s/ Ronald J. Tenpas

Ronald J. Tenpas  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 739-3000  
rtenpas@morganlewis.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Minnesota Power (an  
operating division of ALLETE, Inc.)*

/s/ Allison D. Wood

Allison D. Wood  
Tauna M. Szymanski  
Andrew D. Knudsen  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
awood@hunton.com  
tszymanski@hunton.com  
aknudsen@hunton.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Montana-Dakota Utilities  
Co., a Division of MDU Resources Group, Inc.*

/s/ Tyler R. Green

Sean Reyes  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF UTAH  
Tyler R. Green  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Parker Douglas  
Federal Solicitor  
Utah State Capitol Complex  
350 North State Street, Suite 230  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-2320  
pdouglas@utah.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Utah*

/s/ Misha Tseytlin

Brad D. Schimel  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WISCONSIN  
Misha Tseytlin  
Solicitor General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Andrew Cook  
Deputy Attorney General  
Delanie M. Breuer  
Assistant Deputy Attorney General  
Wisconsin Department of Justice  
17 West Main Street  
Madison, WI 53707  
Tel: (608) 267-9323  
tseytlinm@doj.state.wi.us

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Wisconsin*

/s/ William M. Bumpers

William M. Bumpers  
Megan H. Berge  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner NorthWestern  
Corporation d/b/a NorthWestern Energy*

/s/ Joshua R. More

Joshua R. More  
Jane E. Montgomery  
Amy Antonioli  
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP  
233 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 6600  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Tel: (312) 258-5500  
jmore@schiffhardin.com  
jmontgomery@schiffhardin.com  
aantonioli@schiffhardin.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Prairie State Generating  
Company, LLC*

/s/ James Kaste

Peter K. Michael  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WYOMING  
James Kaste  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Counsel of Record*  
Michael J. McGrady  
Erik Petersen  
Senior Assistant Attorneys General  
Elizabeth Morrisseau  
Assistant Attorney General  
2320 Capitol Avenue  
Cheyenne, WY 82002  
Tel: (307) 777-6946  
Fax: (307) 777-3542  
james.kaste@wyo.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner State of Wyoming*

/s/ Sam M. Hayes

Sam M. Hayes  
General Counsel  
*Counsel of Record*  
Craig Bromby  
Deputy General Counsel  
Andrew Norton  
Deputy General Counsel  
NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY  
1601 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-1601  
Tel: (919) 707-8616  
sam.hayes@ncdenr.gov

*Counsel for Petitioner North Carolina  
Department of Environmental Quality*

/s/ Allison D. Wood

Allison D. Wood  
Tauna M. Szymanski  
Andrew D. Knudsen  
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
Tel: (202) 955-1500  
awood@hunton.com  
tszymanski@hunton.com  
aknudsen@hunton.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Tri-State Generation and  
Transmission Association, Inc.*

/s/ William M. Bumpers

William M. Bumpers  
Megan H. Berge  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Westar Energy, Inc.*

/s/ Jeffrey R. Holmstead

Jeffrey R. Holmstead  
Sandra Y. Snyder  
BRACEWELL LLP  
2001 M Street, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 828-5852  
Fax: (202) 857-4812  
jeff.holmstead@bracewellllaw.com

*Counsel for Petitioner American Coalition for  
Clean Coal Electricity*

/s/ Dennis Lane

Dennis Lane  
STINSON LEONARD STREET LLP  
1775 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 785-9100  
Fax: (202) 785-9163  
dennis.lane@stinson.com

Parthenia B. Evans  
STINSON LEONARD STREET LLP  
1201 Walnut Street, Suite 2900  
Kansas City, MO 64106  
Tel: (816) 842-8600  
Fax: (816) 691-3495  
parthy.evans@stinson.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Kansas City Board of  
Public Utilities – Unified Government of  
Wyandotte County/ Kansas City, Kansas*

/s/ Geoffrey K. Barnes  
Geoffrey K. Barnes  
J. Van Carson  
Wendlene M. Lavey  
John D. Lazzaretti  
Robert D. Cheren  
SQUIRE PATTON BOGGS (US) LLP  
4900 Key Tower  
127 Public Square  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
Tel: (216) 479-8646  
geoffrey.barnes@squirepb.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Murray Energy Corporation*

/s/ Andrew C. Emrich  
Andrew C. Emrich  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
6380 South Fiddlers Green Circle  
Suite 500  
Greenwood Village, CO 80111  
Tel: (303) 290-1621  
Fax: (866) 711-8046  
acemrich@hollandhart.com

Emily C. Schilling  
HOLLAND & HART LLP  
222 South Main Street, Suite 2200  
Salt Lake City, UT 84101  
Tel: (801) 799-5753  
Fax: (202) 747-6574  
ecschilling@hollandhart.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Newmont Nevada Energy Investment, LLC and Newmont USA Limited*

/s/ Charles T. Wehland

Charles T. Wehland

*Counsel of Record*

Brian J. Murray

JONES DAY

77 West Wacker Drive, Suite 3500

Chicago, IL 60601-1692

Tel: (312) 782-3939

Fax: (312) 782-8585

ctwehland@jonesday.com

bjmurray@jonesday.com

*Counsel for Petitioners The North American Coal Corporation; The Coteau Properties Company; Coyote Creek Mining Company, LLC; The Falkirk Mining Company; Mississippi Lignite Mining Company; North American Coal Royalty Company; NODAK Energy Services, LLC; Otter Creek Mining Company, LLC; and The Sabine Mining Company*

/s/ Robert G. McLusky

Robert G. McLusky

JACKSON KELLY, PLLC

1600 Laidley Tower

P.O. Box 553

Charleston, WV 25322

Tel: (304) 340-1000

rmclusky@jacksonkelly.com

*Counsel for Petitioner West Virginia Coal Association*



/s/ Eugene M. Trisko  
Eugene M. Trisko  
LAW OFFICES OF EUGENE M. TRISKO  
P.O. Box 596  
Berkeley Springs, WV 25411  
Tel: (304) 258-1977  
Tel: (301) 639-5238 (cell)  
emtrisko7@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner International Brotherhood  
of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders,  
Blacksmiths, Forgers & Helpers*

/s/ Eugene M. Trisko  
Eugene M. Trisko  
LAW OFFICES OF EUGENE M. TRISKO  
P.O. Box 596  
Berkeley Springs, WV 25411  
Tel: (304) 258-1977  
Tel: (301) 639-5238 (cell)  
emtrisko7@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner International Brotherhood  
of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO*

/s/ Grant F. Crandall

Grant F. Crandall  
General Counsel  
UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA  
18354 Quantico Gateway Drive  
Triangle, VA 22172  
Tel: (703) 291-2429  
gcrandall@umwa.org

Arthur Traynor, III  
Staff Counsel  
UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA  
18354 Quantico Gateway Drive  
Triangle, VA 22172  
Tel: (703) 291-2457  
atraynor@umwa.org

Eugene M. Trisko  
LAW OFFICES OF EUGENE M. TRISKO  
P.O. Box 596  
Berkeley Springs, WV 25411  
Tel: (304) 258-1977  
emtrisko7@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner United Mine Workers of  
America*

/s/ Steven P. Lehotsky

Steven P. Lehotsky  
Sheldon B. Gilbert  
U.S. CHAMBER LITIGATION CENTER, INC.  
1615 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20062  
Tel: (202) 463-5337  
slehotsky@uschamber.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Chamber of Commerce of  
the United States of America*

/s/ Quentin Riegel

Linda E. Kelly  
Quentin Riegel  
Leland P. Frost  
MANUFACTURERS' CENTER FOR LEGAL  
ACTION  
733 10th Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Tel: (202) 637-3000  
qriegel@nam.org

*Counsel for Petitioner National Association of  
Manufacturers*

/s/ Richard S. Moskowitz

Richard S. Moskowitz  
AMERICAN FUEL & PETROCHEMICAL  
MANUFACTURERS  
1667 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Tel: (202) 457-0480  
rmoskowitz@afpm.org

*Counsel for Petitioner American Fuel &  
Petrochemical Manufacturers*

/s/ Karen R. Harned

Karen R. Harned  
Executive Director  
Elizabeth A. Gaudio  
Senior Executive Counsel  
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF  
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS  
SMALL BUSINESS LEGAL CENTER  
1201 F Street, N.W., Suite 200  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 314-2061  
karen.harned@nfib.org  
elizabeth.milito@nfib.org

*Counsel for Petitioner National Federation of  
Independent Business*

/s/ Megan H. Berge

Megan H. Berge  
William M. Bumpers  
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.  
1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 639-7700  
megan.berge@bakerbotts.com  
william.bumpers@bakerbotts.com

*Counsel for Petitioner National Association of  
Home Builders*

/s/ Kathryn D. Kirmayer  
Kathryn D. Kirmayer  
General Counsel  
Evelyn R. Nackman  
Associate General Counsel  
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS  
425 3rd Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20024  
Tel: (202) 639-2100  
kkirmayer@aar.org

*Counsel for Petitioner Association of American  
Railroads*

/s/ Chaim Mandelbaum  
Chaim Mandelbaum  
Litigation Manager  
FREE MARKET ENVIRONMENTAL LAW  
CLINIC  
726 N. Nelson Street, Suite 9  
Arlington, VA 22203  
Tel: (703) 577-9973  
chaim12@gmail.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Energy and Environment  
Legal Institute*

/s/ Catherine E. Stetson  
Catherine E. Stetson  
Eugene A. Sokoloff  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004-1109  
Tel: (202) 637-5600  
Fax: (202) 637-5910  
cate.stetson@hoganlovells.com  
eugene.sokoloff@hoganlovells.com

*Counsel for Petitioner Denbury Onshore, LLC*

/s/ Adam R.F. Gustafson

C. Boyden Gray

Adam R.F. Gustafson

*Counsel of Record*

Derek S. Lyons

James R. Conde

BOYDEN GRAY & ASSOCIATES, PLLC

1627 I Street, N.W., Suite 950

Washington, D.C. 20006

Tel: (202) 955-0620

gustafson@boydengrayassociates.com

*Counsel for Petitioners Competitive Enterprise  
Institute; Buckeye Institute for Public Policy  
Solutions; Independence Institute; Rio Grande  
Foundation; Sutherland Institute; Klaus J.  
Christoph; Samuel R. Damewood; Catherine C.  
Dellin; Joseph W. Luquire; Lisa R. Markham;  
Patrick T. Peterson; and Kristi Rosenquist*

Sam Kazman

Hans Bader

COMPETITIVE ENTERPRISE INSTITUTE

1899 L Street, N.W., 12th Floor

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 331-1010

*Counsel for Petitioner Competitive Enterprise  
Institute*

Robert Alt

BUCKEYE INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY  
SOLUTIONS

88 E. Broad Street, Suite 1120

Columbus, OH 43215

Tel: (614) 224-4422

robert@buckeyeinstitute.org

*Counsel for Petitioner Buckeye Institute for  
Public Policy Solutions*

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

Pursuant to Rule 32(a)(7)(C) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and Circuit Rules 32(e)(1) and 32(e)(2)(C), I hereby certify that the foregoing Reply Brief of Petitioners on Core Legal Issues contains 12,450 words, as counted by a word processing system that includes headings, footnotes, quotations, and citations in the count, and therefore is within the word limit set by the Court.

Dated: April 15, 2016

/s/ Elbert Lin

Elbert Lin

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that, on this 15th day of April 2016, a copy of the foregoing Reply Brief of Petitioners on Core Legal Issues was served electronically through the Court's CM/ECF system on all ECF-registered counsel.

/s/ Elbert Lin

Elbert Lin



## **STATUTORY AND REGULATORY ADDENDUM**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Page

#### Statutes:

Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1857c-6(d) (1970)..... REPLY-ADD-001

Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 7401, *et seq.* (2014)

CAA § 169A(b)(2)(A), 42 U.S.C. § 7491(b)(2)(A) ..... REPLY-ADD-003

CAA § 169A(g)(2), 42 U.S.C. § 7491(g)(2) ..... REPLY-ADD-004

CAA § 302(l), 42 U.S.C. § 7602(l) ..... REPLY-ADD-006

#### Regulation:

40 C.F.R. § 51.308(e)(1)..... REPLY-ADD-009

Air Act [this chapter] (as amended by this Act) and will not provide for the attainment of national primary ambient air quality standards in the time required by such Act. If the Administrator so determines, he shall, within 90 days after promulgation of any national ambient air quality standards pursuant to section 109(a) of the Clean Air Act [section 1857c-4(a) of this title], notify the State and specify in what respects changes are needed to meet the additional requirements of such Act, including requirements to implement national secondary ambient air quality standards. If such changes are not adopted by the State after public hearings and within six months after such notification, the Administrator shall promulgate such changes pursuant to section 110(c) of such Act [section 1857c-5(c) of this title].

“(2) The amendments made by section 4(b) [amending sections 1857b and 1857d of this title] shall not be construed as repealing or modifying the powers of the Administrator with respect to any conference convened under section 108(d) of the Clean Air Act [section 1857d of this title] before the date of enactment of this Act [Dec. 31, 1970].

“(b) Regulations or standards issued under this title II of the Clean Air Act [subchapter II of this chapter] prior to the enactment of this Act [Dec 31, 1970] shall continue in effect until revised by the Administrator consistent with the purposes of such Act.”

#### SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS

This section is referred to in sections 1857c, 1857c-2, 1857c-6, 1857c-9, 1857c-10, 1857f-6c, 1857h-5, 6211 of this title.

#### § 1857c-6. Standards of performance for new stationary sources

##### (a) Definitions

For purposes of this section:

(1) The term “standard of performance” means a standard for emissions of air pollutants which reflects the degree of emission limitation achievable through the application of the best system of emission reduction which (taking into account the cost of achieving such reduction) the Administrator determines has been adequately demonstrated.

(2) The term “new source” means any stationary source, the construction or modification of which is commenced after the publication of regulations (or, if earlier, proposed regulations) prescribing a standard of performance under this section which will be applicable to such source.

(3) The term “stationary source” means any building, structure, facility, or installation which emits or may emit any air pollutant.

(4) The term “modification” means any physical change in, or change in the method of operation of, a stationary source which increases the amount of any air pollutant emitted by such source or which results in the emission of any air pollutant not previously emitted.

(5) The term “owner or operator” means any person who owns, leases, operates, controls, or supervises a stationary source.

(6) The term “existing source” means any stationary source other than a new source.

(b) Publication and revision by Administrator of list of categories of stationary sources; inclusion of category in list; proposal of regulations by Administrator establishing standards for new sources within category; promulgation and revision of standards; differentiation within categories of new sources; issuance of information on pollution control techniques; applicability to new sources owned or operated by United States

(1)(A) The Administrator shall, within 90 days after December 31, 1970, publish (and from time to time thereafter shall revise) a list of categories of stationary sources. He shall include a category of sources in such list if he determines it may contribute significantly to air pollution which causes or contributes to the endangerment of public health or welfare.

(B) Within 120 days after the inclusion of a category of stationary sources in a list under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall publish proposed regulations, establishing Federal standards of performance for new sources within such category. The Administrator shall afford interested persons an opportunity for written comment on such proposed regulations. After considering such comments, he shall promulgate, within 90 days after such publications, such standards with such modifications as he deems appropriate. The Administrator may, from time to time, revise such standards following the procedure required by this subsection for promulgation of such standards. Standards of performance or revisions thereof shall become effective upon promulgation.

(2) The Administrator may distinguish among classes, types and sizes within categories of new sources for the purpose of establishing such standards.

(3) The Administrator shall, from time to time, issue information on pollution control techniques for categories of new sources and air pollutants subject to the provisions of this section.

(4) The provisions of this section shall apply to any new source owned or operated by the United States.

(c) Implementation and enforcement by State; procedure; delegation of authority of Administrator to State; enforcement power of Administrator unaffected

(1) Each State may develop and submit to the Administrator a procedure for implementing and enforcing standards of performance for new sources located in such State. If the Administrator finds the State procedure is adequate, he shall delegate to such State any authority he has under this chapter to implement and enforce such standards (except with respect to new sources owned or operated by the United States).

(2) Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the Administrator from enforcing any applicable standard of performance under this section.

(d) Emission standards for any existing source for any air pollutant; submission of State plan to Administrator establishing, implementing and enforcing standards; authority of Administrator to prescribe State plan; authority of Administrator to enforce State plan; procedure

(1) The Administrator shall prescribe regulations which shall establish a procedure similar

to that provided by section 1857c-5 of this title under which each State shall submit to the Administrator a plan which (A) establishes emission standards for any existing source for any air pollutant (i) for which air quality criteria have not been issued or which is not included on a list published under section 1857c-3(a) or 1857c-7(b)(1)(A) of this title but (ii) to which a standard of performance under subsection (b) of this section would apply if such existing source were a new source, and (B) provides for the implementation and enforcement of such emission standards.

(2) The Administrator shall have the same authority—

(A) to prescribe a plan for a State in cases where the State fails to submit a satisfactory plan as he would have under section 1857c-5(c) of this title in the case of failure to submit an implementation plan, and

(B) to enforce the provisions of such plan in cases where the State fails to enforce them as he would have under sections 1857c-8 and 1857c-9 of this title with respect to an implementation plan.

**(e) Prohibited acts**

After the effective date of standards of performance promulgated under this section, it shall be unlawful for any owner or operator of any new source to operate such source in violation of any standard of performance applicable to such source.

(July 14, 1955, ch. 360, title I, § 111, as added Dec. 31, 1970, Pub. L. 91-604, § 4(a), 84 Stat. 1683, and amended Nov. 18, 1971, Pub. L. 92-157, title III, § 302(f), 85 Stat. 464.)

**PRIOR PROVISIONS**

A prior section 111 of Act July 14, 1955, was renumbered section 118 by Pub. L. 91-604, and is set out as section 1857f of this title.

**AMENDMENTS**

1971—Subsec. (b)(1)(B). Pub. L. 92-157 substituted in first sentence "publish proposed" for "propose".

**SECTION REFERRED TO IN OTHER SECTIONS**

This section is referred to in sections 1857c-5, 1857c-7 to 1857c-10, 1857d, 1857d-1, 1857e, 1857f, 1857h-5, 1857h-6 of this title.

**§ 1857c-7. National emission standards for hazardous air pollutants**

**(a) Definitions**

For purposes of this section—

(1) The term "hazardous air pollutant" means an air pollutant to which no ambient air quality standard is applicable and which in the judgment of the Administrator may cause, or contribute to, an increase in mortality or an increase in serious irreversible, or incapacitating reversible, illness.

(2) The term "new source" means a stationary source the construction or modification of which is commenced after the Administrator proposes regulations under this section establishing an emission standard which will be applicable to such source.

(3) The terms "stationary source", "modification", "owner or operator" and "existing source" shall have the same meaning as such

terms have under section 1857c-6(a) of this title.

(b) Publication and revision by Administrator of list of hazardous air pollutants; inclusion of air pollutant in list; proposal of regulations by Administrator establishing standards for pollutant; establishment of standards; standards effective upon promulgation; issuance of information on pollution control techniques

(1)(A) The Administrator shall, within 90 days after December 31, 1970, publish (and shall from time to time thereafter revise) a list which includes each hazardous air pollutant for which he intends to establish an emission standard under this section.

(B) Within 180 days after the inclusion of any air pollutant in such list, the Administrator shall publish proposed regulations establishing emission standards for such pollutant together with a notice of a public hearing within thirty days. Not later than 180 days after such publication, the Administrator shall prescribe an emission standard for such pollutant, unless he finds, on the basis of information presented at such hearings, that such pollutant clearly is not a hazardous air pollutant. The Administrator shall establish any such standard at the level which in his judgment provides an ample margin of safety to protect the public health from such hazardous air pollutant.

(C) Any emission standard established pursuant to this section shall become effective upon promulgation.

(2) The Administrator shall, from time to time, issue information on pollution control techniques for air pollutant subject to the provisions of this section.

(c) Prohibited acts; exemption by President for any stationary source; duration and extension of exemption; report to Congress

(1) After the effective date of any emission standard under this section—

(A) no person may construct any new source or modify any existing source which in the Administrator's judgment, will emit an air pollutant to which such standard applies unless the Administrator finds that such source if properly operated will not cause emissions in violation of such standard, and

(B) no air pollutant to which such standard applies may be emitted from any stationary source in violation of such standard, except that in the case of an existing source—

(i) such standard shall not apply until 90 days after its effective date, and

(ii) the Administrator may grant a waiver permitting such source a period of up to two years after the effective date of a standard to comply with the standard, if he finds that such period is necessary for the installation of controls and that steps will be taken during the period of the waiver to assure that the health of persons will be protected from imminent endangerment.

(2) The President may exempt any stationary source from compliance with paragraph (1) for a period of not more than two years if he finds that the technology to implement such standards is not available and the operation of such source is required for reasons of national security. An exemption under this paragraph may

Par. (3). Pub. L. 101-549, § 403(d), directed the insertion of “, clean fuels,” after “including fuel cleaning,” which was executed by making the insertion after “including fuel cleaning” to reflect the probable intent of Congress, and inserted at end “Emissions from any source utilizing clean fuels, or any other means, to comply with this paragraph shall not be allowed to increase above levels that would have been required under this paragraph as it existed prior to November 15, 1990.”

1977—Par. (2)(C). Pub. L. 95-190 added subpar. (C).

STUDY OF MAJOR EMITTING FACILITIES WITH  
POTENTIAL OF EMITTING 250 TONS PER YEAR

Pub. L. 95-95, title I, § 127(b), Aug. 7, 1977, 91 Stat. 741, directed Administrator, within 1 year after Aug. 7, 1977, to report to Congress on consequences of that portion of definition of “major emitting facility” under this subpart which applies to facilities with potential to emit 250 tons per year or more.

SUBPART II—VISIBILITY PROTECTION  
CODIFICATION

As originally enacted, subpart II of part C of subchapter I of this chapter was added following section 7478 of this title. Pub. L. 95-190, § 14(a)(53), Nov. 16, 1977, 91 Stat. 1402, struck out subpart II and inserted such subpart following section 7479 of this title.

**§ 7491. Visibility protection for Federal class I areas**

**(a) Impairment of visibility; list of areas; study and report**

(1) Congress hereby declares as a national goal the prevention of any future, and the remedying of any existing, impairment of visibility in mandatory class I Federal areas which impairment results from manmade air pollution.

(2) Not later than six months after August 7, 1977, the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with other Federal land managers shall review all mandatory class I Federal areas and identify those where visibility is an important value of the area. From time to time the Secretary of the Interior may revise such identifications. Not later than one year after August 7, 1977, the Administrator shall, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, promulgate a list of mandatory class I Federal areas in which he determines visibility is an important value.

(3) Not later than eighteen months after August 7, 1977, the Administrator shall complete a study and report to Congress on available methods for implementing the national goal set forth in paragraph (1). Such report shall include recommendations for—

(A) methods for identifying, characterizing, determining, quantifying, and measuring visibility impairment in Federal areas referred to in paragraph (1), and

(B) modeling techniques (or other methods) for determining the extent to which manmade air pollution may reasonably be anticipated to cause or contribute to such impairment, and

(C) methods for preventing and remedying such manmade air pollution and resulting visibility impairment.

Such report shall also identify the classes or categories of sources and the types of air pollutants which, alone or in conjunction with other sources or pollutants, may reasonably be antici-

pated to cause or contribute significantly to impairment of visibility.

(4) Not later than twenty-four months after August 7, 1977, and after notice and public hearing, the Administrator shall promulgate regulations to assure (A) reasonable progress toward meeting the national goal specified in paragraph (1), and (B) compliance with the requirements of this section.

**(b) Regulations**

Regulations under subsection (a)(4) of this section shall—

(1) provide guidelines to the States, taking into account the recommendations under subsection (a)(3) of this section on appropriate techniques and methods for implementing this section (as provided in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of such subsection (a)(3)), and

(2) require each applicable implementation plan for a State in which any area listed by the Administrator under subsection (a)(2) of this section is located (or for a State the emissions from which may reasonably be anticipated to cause or contribute to any impairment of visibility in any such area) to contain such emission limits, schedules of compliance and other measures as may be necessary to make reasonable progress toward meeting the national goal specified in subsection (a) of this section, including—

(A) except as otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, a requirement that each major stationary source which is in existence on August 7, 1977, but which has not been in operation for more than fifteen years as of such date, and which, as determined by the State (or the Administrator in the case of a plan promulgated under section 7410(c) of this title) emits any air pollutant which may reasonably be anticipated to cause or contribute to any impairment of visibility in any such area, shall procure, install, and operate, as expeditiously as practicable (and maintain thereafter) the best available retrofit technology, as determined by the State (or the Administrator in the case of a plan promulgated under section 7410(c) of this title) for controlling emissions from such source for the purpose of eliminating or reducing any such impairment, and

(B) a long-term (ten to fifteen years) strategy for making reasonable progress toward meeting the national goal specified in subsection (a) of this section.

In the case of a fossil-fuel fired generating powerplant having a total generating capacity in excess of 750 megawatts, the emission limitations required under this paragraph shall be determined pursuant to guidelines, promulgated by the Administrator under paragraph (1).

**(c) Exemptions**

(1) The Administrator may, by rule, after notice and opportunity for public hearing, exempt any major stationary source from the requirement of subsection (b)(2)(A) of this section, upon his determination that such source does not or will not, by itself or in combination with other sources, emit any air pollutant which may rea-



sonably be anticipated to cause or contribute to a significant impairment of visibility in any mandatory class I Federal area.

(2) Paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not be applicable to any fossil-fuel fired powerplant with total design capacity of 750 megawatts or more, unless the owner or operator of any such plant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such powerplant is located at such distance from all areas listed by the Administrator under subsection (a)(2) of this section that such powerplant does not or will not, by itself or in combination with other sources, emit any air pollutant which may reasonably be anticipated to cause or contribute to significant impairment of visibility in any such area.

(3) An exemption under this subsection shall be effective only upon concurrence by the appropriate Federal land manager or managers with the Administrator's determination under this subsection.

**(d) Consultations with appropriate Federal land managers**

Before holding the public hearing on the proposed revision of an applicable implementation plan to meet the requirements of this section, the State (or the Administrator, in the case of a plan promulgated under section 7410(c) of this title) shall consult in person with the appropriate Federal land manager or managers and shall include a summary of the conclusions and recommendations of the Federal land managers in the notice to the public.

**(e) Buffer zones**

In promulgating regulations under this section, the Administrator shall not require the use of any automatic or uniform buffer zone or zones.

**(f) Nondiscretionary duty**

For purposes of section 7604(a)(2) of this title, the meeting of the national goal specified in subsection (a)(1) of this section by any specific date or dates shall not be considered a "nondiscretionary duty" of the Administrator.

**(g) Definitions**

For the purpose of this section—

(1) in determining reasonable progress there shall be taken into consideration the costs of compliance, the time necessary for compliance, and the energy and nonair quality environmental impacts of compliance, and the remaining useful life of any existing source subject to such requirements;

(2) in determining best available retrofit technology the State (or the Administrator in determining emission limitations which reflect such technology) shall take into consideration the costs of compliance, the energy and nonair quality environmental impacts of compliance, any existing pollution control technology in use at the source, the remaining useful life of the source, and the degree of improvement in visibility which may reasonably be anticipated to result from the use of such technology;

(3) the term "manmade air pollution" means air pollution which results directly or indirectly from human activities;

(4) the term "as expeditiously as practicable" means as expeditiously as practicable but in no event later than five years after the date of approval of a plan revision under this section (or the date of promulgation of such a plan revision in the case of action by the Administrator under section 7410(c) of this title for purposes of this section);

(5) the term "mandatory class I Federal areas" means Federal areas which may not be designated as other than class I under this part;

(6) the terms "visibility impairment" and "impairment of visibility" shall include reduction in visual range and atmospheric discoloration; and

(7) the term "major stationary source" means the following types of stationary sources with the potential to emit 250 tons or more of any pollutant: fossil-fuel fired steam electric plants of more than 250 million British thermal units per hour heat input, coal cleaning plants (thermal dryers), kraft pulp mills, Portland Cement plants, primary zinc smelters, iron and steel mill plants, primary aluminum ore reduction plants, primary copper smelters, municipal incinerators capable of charging more than 250 tons of refuse per day, hydrofluoric, sulfuric, and nitric acid plants, petroleum refineries, lime plants, phosphate rock processing plants, coke oven batteries, sulfur recovery plants, carbon black plants (furnace process), primary lead smelters, fuel conversion plants, sintering plants, secondary metal production facilities, chemical process plants, fossil-fuel boilers of more than 250 million British thermal units per hour heat input, petroleum storage and transfer facilities with a capacity exceeding 300,000 barrels, taconite ore processing facilities, glass fiber processing plants, charcoal production facilities.

(July 14, 1955, ch. 360, title I, §169A, as added Pub. L. 95-95, title I, §128, Aug. 7, 1977, 91 Stat. 742.)

**EFFECTIVE DATE**

Subpart effective Aug. 7, 1977, except as otherwise expressly provided, see section 406(d) of Pub. L. 95-95, set out as an Effective Date of 1977 Amendment note under section 7401 of this title.

**§ 7492. Visibility**

**(a) Studies**

(1) The Administrator, in conjunction with the National Park Service and other appropriate Federal agencies, shall conduct research to identify and evaluate sources and source regions of both visibility impairment and regions that provide predominantly clean air in class I areas. A total of \$8,000,000 per year for 5 years is authorized to be appropriated for the Environmental Protection Agency and the other Federal agencies to conduct this research. The research shall include—

(A) expansion of current visibility related monitoring in class I areas;

(B) assessment of current sources of visibility impairing pollution and clean air corridors;

in the case of a concern which is a publicly traded company at least 51 percent of the stock of the company is owned by, one or more individuals who are members of the following groups:

- “(I) Black Americans.
- “(II) Hispanic Americans.
- “(III) Native Americans.
- “(IV) Asian Americans.
- “(V) Women.
- “(VI) Disabled Americans.

“(ii) The presumption established by clause (i) may be rebutted with respect to a particular business concern if it is reasonably established that the individual or individuals referred to in that clause with respect to that business concern are not experiencing impediments to establishing or developing such concern as a result of the individual’s identification as a member of a group specified in that clause.

“(C) The following institutions are presumed to be disadvantaged business concerns for purposes of subsection (a):

“(i) Historically black colleges and universities, and colleges and universities having a student body in which 40 percent of the students are Hispanic.

“(ii) Minority institutions (as that term is defined by the Secretary of Education pursuant to the General Education Provision Act (20 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.)).

“(iii) Private and voluntary organizations controlled by individuals who are socially and economically disadvantaged.

“(D) A joint venture may be considered to be a disadvantaged business concern under subsection (a), notwithstanding the size of such joint venture, if—

“(i) a party to the joint venture is a disadvantaged business concern; and

“(ii) that party owns at least 51 percent of the joint venture.

A person who is not an economically disadvantaged individual or a disadvantaged business concern, as a party to a joint venture, may not be a party to more than 2 awarded contracts in a fiscal year solely by reason of this subparagraph.

“(E) Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit any member of a racial or ethnic group that is not listed in subparagraph (B)(i) from establishing that they have been impeded in establishing or developing a business concern as a result of racial or ethnic discrimination.

“SEC. 1002. USE OF QUOTAS PROHIBITED.—Nothing in this title shall permit or require the use of quotas or a requirement that has the effect of a quota in determining eligibility under section 1001.”

## § 7602. Definitions

When used in this chapter—

(a) The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(b) The term “air pollution control agency” means any of the following:

(1) A single State agency designated by the Governor of that State as the official State air pollution control agency for purposes of this chapter.

(2) An agency established by two or more States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution.

(3) A city, county, or other local government health authority, or, in the case of any city, county, or other local government in which there is an agency other than the health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the prevention and control of air pollution, such other agency.

(4) An agency of two or more municipalities located in the same State or in different States and having substantial powers or duties pertaining to the prevention and control of air pollution.

(5) An agency of an Indian tribe.

(c) The term “interstate air pollution control agency” means—

(1) an air pollution control agency established by two or more States, or

(2) an air pollution control agency of two or more municipalities located in different States.

(d) The term “State” means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa and includes the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(e) The term “person” includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, State, municipality, political subdivision of a State, and any agency, department, or instrumentality of the United States and any officer, agent, or employee thereof.

(f) The term “municipality” means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law.

(g) The term “air pollutant” means any air pollution agent or combination of such agents, including any physical, chemical, biological, radioactive (including source material, special nuclear material, and byproduct material) substance or matter which is emitted into or otherwise enters the ambient air. Such term includes any precursors to the formation of any air pollutant, to the extent the Administrator has identified such precursor or precursors for the particular purpose for which the term “air pollutant” is used.

(h) All language referring to effects on welfare includes, but is not limited to, effects on soils, water, crops, vegetation, manmade materials, animals, wildlife, weather, visibility, and climate, damage to and deterioration of property, and hazards to transportation, as well as effects on economic values and on personal comfort and well-being, whether caused by transformation, conversion, or combination with other air pollutants.

(i) The term “Federal land manager” means, with respect to any lands in the United States, the Secretary of the department with authority over such lands.

(j) Except as otherwise expressly provided, the terms “major stationary source” and “major emitting facility” mean any stationary facility or source of air pollutants which directly emits, or has the potential to emit, one hundred tons per year or more of any air pollutant (including any major emitting facility or source of fugitive emissions of any such pollutant, as determined by rule by the Administrator).

(k) The terms “emission limitation” and “emission standard” mean a requirement established by the State or the Administrator which limits the quantity, rate, or concentration of emissions of air pollutants on a continuous basis, including any requirement relating to the operation or maintenance of a source to assure continuous emission reduction, and any design,

equipment, work practice or operational standard promulgated under this chapter.<sup>1</sup>

(l) The term “standard of performance” means a requirement of continuous emission reduction, including any requirement relating to the operation or maintenance of a source to assure continuous emission reduction.

(m) The term “means of emission limitation” means a system of continuous emission reduction (including the use of specific technology or fuels with specified pollution characteristics).

(n) The term “primary standard attainment date” means the date specified in the applicable implementation plan for the attainment of a national primary ambient air quality standard for any air pollutant.

(o) The term “delayed compliance order” means an order issued by the State or by the Administrator to an existing stationary source, postponing the date required under an applicable implementation plan for compliance by such source with any requirement of such plan.

(p) The term “schedule and timetable of compliance” means a schedule of required measures including an enforceable sequence of actions or operations leading to compliance with an emission limitation, other limitation, prohibition, or standard.

(q) For purposes of this chapter, the term “applicable implementation plan” means the portion (or portions) of the implementation plan, or most recent revision thereof, which has been approved under section 7410 of this title, or promulgated under section 7410(c) of this title, or promulgated or approved pursuant to regulations promulgated under section 7601(d) of this title and which implements the relevant requirements of this chapter.

(r) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian tribe” means any Indian tribe, band, nation, or other organized group or community, including any Alaska Native village, which is Federally recognized as eligible for the special programs and services provided by the United States to Indians because of their status as Indians.

(s) VOC.—The term “VOC” means volatile organic compound, as defined by the Administrator.

(t) PM-10.—The term “PM-10” means particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal ten micrometers, as measured by such method as the Administrator may determine.

(u) NAAQS AND CTG.—The term “NAAQS” means national ambient air quality standard. The term “CTG” means a Control Technique Guideline published by the Administrator under section 7408 of this title.

(v) NO<sub>x</sub>.—The term “NO<sub>x</sub>” means oxides of nitrogen.

(w) CO.—The term “CO” means carbon monoxide.

(x) SMALL SOURCE.—The term “small source” means a source that emits less than 100 tons of regulated pollutants per year, or any class of persons that the Administrator determines, through regulation, generally lack technical ability or knowledge regarding control of air pollution.

(y) FEDERAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN.—The term “Federal implementation plan” means a plan (or portion thereof) promulgated by the Administrator to fill all or a portion of a gap or otherwise correct all or a portion of an inadequacy in a State implementation plan, and which includes enforceable emission limitations or other control measures, means or techniques (including economic incentives, such as marketable permits or auctions of emissions allowances), and provides for attainment of the relevant national ambient air quality standard.

(z) STATIONARY SOURCE.—The term “stationary source” means generally any source of an air pollutant except those emissions resulting directly from an internal combustion engine for transportation purposes or from a nonroad engine or nonroad vehicle as defined in section 7550 of this title.

(July 14, 1955, ch. 360, title III, §302, formerly §9, as added Pub. L. 88-206, §1, Dec. 17, 1963, 77 Stat. 400, renumbered Pub. L. 89-272, title I, §101(4), Oct. 20, 1965, 79 Stat. 992; amended Pub. L. 90-148, §2, Nov. 21, 1967, 81 Stat. 504; Pub. L. 91-604, §15(a)(1), (c)(1), Dec. 31, 1970, 84 Stat. 1710, 1713; Pub. L. 95-95, title II, §218(c), title III, §301, Aug. 7, 1977, 91 Stat. 761, 769; Pub. L. 95-190, §14(a)(76), Nov. 16, 1977, 91 Stat. 1404; Pub. L. 101-549, title I, §§101(d)(4), 107(a), (b), 108(j), 109(b), title III, §302(e), title VII, §709, Nov. 15, 1990, 104 Stat. 2409, 2464, 2468, 2470, 2574, 2684.)

#### CODIFICATION

Section was formerly classified to section 1857h of this title.

#### PRIOR PROVISIONS

Provisions similar to those in subsecs. (b) and (d) of this section were contained in a section 1857e of this title, act July 14, 1955, ch. 360, §6, 69 Stat. 323, prior to the general amendment of this chapter by Pub. L. 88-206.

#### AMENDMENTS

1990—Subsec. (b)(1) to (3). Pub. L. 101-549, §107(a)(1), (2), struck out “or” at end of par. (3) and substituted periods for semicolons at end of pars. (1) to (3).

Subsec. (b)(5). Pub. L. 101-549, §107(a)(3), added par. (5).

Subsec. (g). Pub. L. 101-549, §108(j)(2), inserted at end “Such term includes any precursors to the formation of any air pollutant, to the extent the Administrator has identified such precursor or precursors for the particular purpose for which the term ‘air pollutant’ is used.”

Subsec. (h). Pub. L. 101-549, §109(b), inserted before period at end “, whether caused by transformation, conversion, or combination with other air pollutants”.

Subsec. (k). Pub. L. 101-549, §303(e), inserted before period at end “, and any design, equipment, work practice or operational standard promulgated under this chapter.”

Subsec. (q). Pub. L. 101-549, §101(d)(4), added subsec. (q).

Subsec. (r). Pub. L. 101-549, §107(b), added subsec. (r). Subsecs. (s) to (y). Pub. L. 101-549, §108(j)(1), added subsecs. (s) to (y).

Subsec. (z). Pub. L. 101-549, §709, added subsec. (z). 1977—Subsec. (d). Pub. L. 95-95, §218(c), inserted “and includes the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands” after “American Samoa”.

Subsec. (e). Pub. L. 95-190 substituted “individual, corporation” for “individual corporation”.

Pub. L. 95-95, §301(b), expanded definition of “person” to include agencies, departments, and instrumentalities of the United States and officers, agents, and employees thereof.

<sup>1</sup> So in original.



Subsec. (g). Pub. L. 95-95, §301(c), expanded definition of “air pollutant” so as, expressly, to include physical, chemical, biological, and radioactive substances or matter emitted into or otherwise entering the ambient air.

Subsecs. (i) to (p). Pub. L. 95-95, §301(a), added subsecs. (i) to (p).

1970—Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 91-604, §15(c)(1), substituted definition of “Administrator” as meaning Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for definition of “Secretary” as meaning Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Subsecs. (g), (h). Pub. L. 91-604, §15(a)(1), added subsec. (g) defining “air pollutant”, redesignated former subsec. (g) as (h) and substituted references to effects on soil, water, crops, vegetation, manmade materials, animals, wildlife, weather, visibility, and climate for references to injury to agricultural crops and livestock, and inserted references to effects on economic values and on personal comfort and well being.

1967—Pub. L. 90-148 reenacted section without change.

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1977 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 95-95 effective Aug. 7, 1977, except as otherwise expressly provided, see section 406(d) of Pub. L. 95-95, set out as a note under section 7401 of this title.

### § 7603. Emergency powers

Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, the Administrator, upon receipt of evidence that a pollution source or combination of sources (including moving sources) is presenting an imminent and substantial endangerment to public health or welfare, or the environment, may bring suit on behalf of the United States in the appropriate United States district court to immediately restrain any person causing or contributing to the alleged pollution to stop the emission of air pollutants causing or contributing to such pollution or to take such other action as may be necessary. If it is not practicable to assure prompt protection of public health or welfare or the environment by commencement of such a civil action, the Administrator may issue such orders as may be necessary to protect public health or welfare or the environment. Prior to taking any action under this section, the Administrator shall consult with appropriate State and local authorities and attempt to confirm the accuracy of the information on which the action proposed to be taken is based. Any order issued by the Administrator under this section shall be effective upon issuance and shall remain in effect for a period of not more than 60 days, unless the Administrator brings an action pursuant to the first sentence of this section before the expiration of that period. Whenever the Administrator brings such an action within the 60-day period, such order shall remain in effect for an additional 14 days or for such longer period as may be authorized by the court in which such action is brought.

(July 14, 1955, ch. 360, title III, §303, as added Pub. L. 91-604, §12(a), Dec. 31, 1970, 84 Stat. 1705; amended Pub. L. 95-95, title III, §302(a), Aug. 7, 1977, 91 Stat. 770; Pub. L. 101-549, title VII, §704, Nov. 15, 1990, 104 Stat. 2681.)

#### CODIFICATION

Section was formerly classified to section 1857h-1 of this title.

#### PRIOR PROVISIONS

A prior section 303 of act July 14, 1955, was renumbered section 310 by Pub. L. 91-604 and is classified to section 7610 of this title.

#### AMENDMENTS

1990—Pub. L. 101-549, §704(2)-(5), struck out subsec. (a) designation before “Notwithstanding any other”, struck out subsec. (b) which related to violation of or failure or refusal to comply with subsec. (a) orders, and substituted new provisions for provisions following first sentence which read as follows: “If it is not practicable to assure prompt protection of the health of persons solely by commencement of such a civil action, the Administrator may issue such orders as may be necessary to protect the health of persons who are, or may be, affected by such pollution source (or sources). Prior to taking any action under this section, the Administrator shall consult with the State and local authorities in order to confirm the correctness of the information on which the action proposed to be taken is based and to ascertain the action which such authorities are, or will be, taking. Such order shall be effective for a period of not more than twenty-four hours unless the Administrator brings an action under the first sentence of this subsection before the expiration of such period. Whenever the Administrator brings such an action within such period, such order shall be effective for a period of forty-eight hours or such longer period as may be authorized by the court pending litigation or thereafter.”

Pub. L. 101-549, §704(1), which directed that “public health or welfare, or the environment” be substituted for “the health of persons and that appropriate State or local authorities have not acted to abate such sources”, was executed by making the substitution for “the health of persons, and that appropriate State or local authorities have not acted to abate such sources” to reflect the probable intent of Congress.

1977—Pub. L. 95-95 designated existing provisions as subsec. (a), inserted provisions that, if it is not practicable to assure prompt protection of the health of persons solely by commencement of a civil action, the Administrator may issue such orders as may be necessary to protect the health of persons who are, or may be, affected by such pollution source (or sources), that, prior to taking any action under this section, the Administrator consult with the State and local authorities in order to confirm the correctness of the information on which the action proposed to be taken is based and to ascertain the action which such authorities are, or will be, taking, that the order be effective for a period of not more than twenty-four hours unless the Administrator brings an action under the first sentence of this subsection before the expiration of such period, and that, whenever the Administrator brings such an action within such period, such order be effective for a period of forty-eight hours or such longer period as may be authorized by the court pending litigation or thereafter, and added subsec. (b).

#### EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1977 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 95-95 effective Aug. 7, 1977, except as otherwise expressly provided, see section 406(d) of Pub. L. 95-95, set out as a note under section 7401 of this title.

#### PENDING ACTIONS AND PROCEEDINGS

Suits, actions, and other proceedings lawfully commenced by or against the Administrator or any other officer or employee of the United States in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties under act July 14, 1955, the Clean Air Act, as in effect immediately prior to the enactment of Pub. L. 95-95 [Aug. 7, 1977], not to abate by reason of the taking effect of Pub. L. 95-95, see section 406(a) of Pub. L.

## Environmental Protection Agency

## § 51.308

Land Manager has provided notice and opportunity for public comment on the integral vista in which case the review must include impacts on any integral vista identified at least 6 months prior to submission of a complete permit application, unless the State determines under § 51.304(d) that the identification was not in accordance with the identification criteria, or

(2) That proposes to locate in an area classified as nonattainment under section 107(d)(1)(A), (B), or (C) of the Clean Air Act that may have an impact on visibility in any mandatory Class I Federal area.

(c) Review of any major stationary source or major modification under paragraph (b) of this section, shall be conducted in accordance with paragraph (a) of this section, and § 51.166(o), (p)(1) through (2), and (q). In conducting such reviews the State must ensure that the source's emissions will be consistent with making reasonable progress toward the national visibility goal referred to in § 51.300(a). The State may take into account the costs of compliance, the time necessary for compliance, the energy and nonair quality environmental impacts of compliance, and the useful life of the source.

(d) The State may require monitoring of visibility in any Federal Class I area near the proposed new stationary source or major modification for such purposes and by such means as the State deems necessary and appropriate.

[45 FR 80089, Dec. 2, 1980, as amended at 64 FR 35765, 35774, July 1, 1999]

### § 51.308 Regional haze program requirements.

(a) *What is the purpose of this section?* This section establishes requirements for implementation plans, plan revisions, and periodic progress reviews to address regional haze.

(b) *When are the first implementation plans due under the regional haze program?* Except as provided in § 51.309(c), each State identified in § 51.300(b)(3) must submit, for the entire State, an implementation plan for regional haze meeting the requirements of paragraphs (d) and (e) of this section no later than December 17, 2007.

(c) [Reserved]

(d) *What are the core requirements for the implementation plan for regional haze?* The State must address regional haze in each mandatory Class I Federal area located within the State and in each mandatory Class I Federal area located outside the State which may be affected by emissions from within the State. To meet the core requirements for regional haze for these areas, the State must submit an implementation plan containing the following plan elements and supporting documentation for all required analyses:

(1) *Reasonable progress goals.* For each mandatory Class I Federal area located within the State, the State must establish goals (expressed in deciviews) that provide for reasonable progress towards achieving natural visibility conditions. The reasonable progress goals must provide for an improvement in visibility for the most impaired days over the period of the implementation plan and ensure no degradation in visibility for the least impaired days over the same period.

(i) In establishing a reasonable progress goal for any mandatory Class I Federal area within the State, the State must:

(A) Consider the costs of compliance, the time necessary for compliance, the energy and non-air quality environmental impacts of compliance, and the remaining useful life of any potentially affected sources, and include a demonstration showing how these factors were taken into consideration in selecting the goal.

(B) Analyze and determine the rate of progress needed to attain natural visibility conditions by the year 2064. To calculate this rate of progress, the State must compare baseline visibility conditions to natural visibility conditions in the mandatory Federal Class I area and determine the uniform rate of visibility improvement (measured in deciviews) that would need to be maintained during each implementation period in order to attain natural visibility conditions by 2064. In establishing the reasonable progress goal, the State must consider the uniform rate of improvement in visibility and

**§ 51.308****40 CFR Ch. I (7–1–15 Edition)**

This monitoring strategy must be coordinated with the monitoring strategy required in § 51.305 for reasonably attributable visibility impairment. Compliance with this requirement may be met through participation in the Interagency Monitoring of Protected Visual Environments network. The implementation plan must also provide for the following:

(i) The establishment of any additional monitoring sites or equipment needed to assess whether reasonable progress goals to address regional haze for all mandatory Class I Federal areas within the State are being achieved.

(ii) Procedures by which monitoring data and other information are used in determining the contribution of emissions from within the State to regional haze visibility impairment at mandatory Class I Federal areas both within and outside the State.

(iii) For a State with no mandatory Class I Federal areas, procedures by which monitoring data and other information are used in determining the contribution of emissions from within the State to regional haze visibility impairment at mandatory Class I Federal areas in other States.

(iv) The implementation plan must provide for the reporting of all visibility monitoring data to the Administrator at least annually for each mandatory Class I Federal area in the State. To the extent possible, the State should report visibility monitoring data electronically.

(v) A statewide inventory of emissions of pollutants that are reasonably anticipated to cause or contribute to visibility impairment in any mandatory Class I Federal area. The inventory must include emissions for a base-line year, emissions for the most recent year for which data are available, and estimates of future projected emissions. The State must also include a commitment to update the inventory periodically.

(vi) Other elements, including reporting, recordkeeping, and other measures, necessary to assess and report on visibility.

(e) *Best Available Retrofit Technology (BART) requirements for regional haze visibility impairment.* The State must submit an implementation plan con-

taining emission limitations representing BART and schedules for compliance with BART for each BART-eligible source that may reasonably be anticipated to cause or contribute to any impairment of visibility in any mandatory Class I Federal area, unless the State demonstrates that an emissions trading program or other alternative will achieve greater reasonable progress toward natural visibility conditions.

(1) To address the requirements for BART, the State must submit an implementation plan containing the following plan elements and include documentation for all required analyses:

(i) A list of all BART-eligible sources within the State.

(ii) A determination of BART for each BART-eligible source in the State that emits any air pollutant which may reasonably be anticipated to cause or contribute to any impairment of visibility in any mandatory Class I Federal area. All such sources are subject to BART.

(A) The determination of BART must be based on an analysis of the best system of continuous emission control technology available and associated emission reductions achievable for each BART-eligible source that is subject to BART within the State. In this analysis, the State must take into consideration the technology available, the costs of compliance, the energy and nonair quality environmental impacts of compliance, any pollution control equipment in use at the source, the remaining useful life of the source, and the degree of improvement in visibility which may reasonably be anticipated to result from the use of such technology.

(B) The determination of BART for fossil-fuel fired power plants having a total generating capacity greater than 750 megawatts must be made pursuant to the guidelines in appendix Y of this part (Guidelines for BART Determinations Under the Regional Haze Rule).

(C) *Exception.* A State is not required to make a determination of BART for SO<sub>2</sub> or for NO<sub>x</sub> if a BART-eligible source has the potential to emit less than 40 tons per year of such pollutant(s), or for PM<sub>10</sub> if a BART-eligible

**Environmental Protection Agency****§ 51.308**

source has the potential to emit less than 15 tons per year of such pollutant.

(iii) If the State determines in establishing BART that technological or economic limitations on the applicability of measurement methodology to a particular source would make the imposition of an emission standard infeasible, it may instead prescribe a design, equipment, work practice, or other operational standard, or combination thereof, to require the application of BART. Such standard, to the degree possible, is to set forth the emission reduction to be achieved by implementation of such design, equipment, work practice or operation, and must provide for compliance by means which achieve equivalent results.

(iv) A requirement that each source subject to BART be required to install and operate BART as expeditiously as practicable, but in no event later than 5 years after approval of the implementation plan revision.

(v) A requirement that each source subject to BART maintain the control equipment required by this subpart and establish procedures to ensure such equipment is properly operated and maintained.

(2) A State may opt to implement or require participation in an emissions trading program or other alternative measure rather than to require sources subject to BART to install, operate, and maintain BART. Such an emissions trading program or other alternative measure must achieve greater reasonable progress than would be achieved through the installation and operation of BART. For all such emissions trading programs or other alternative measures, the State must submit an implementation plan containing the following plan elements and include documentation for all required analyses:

(i) A demonstration that the emissions trading program or other alternative measure will achieve greater reasonable progress than would have resulted from the installation and operation of BART at all sources subject to BART in the State and covered by the alternative program. This demonstration must be based on the following:

(A) A list of all BART-eligible sources within the State.

(B) A list of all BART-eligible sources and all BART source categories covered by the alternative program. The State is not required to include every BART source category or every BART-eligible source within a BART source category in an alternative program, but each BART-eligible source in the State must be subject to the requirements of the alternative program, have a federally enforceable emission limitation determined by the State and approved by EPA as meeting BART in accordance with section 302(c) or paragraph (e)(1) of this section, or otherwise addressed under paragraphs (e)(1) or (e)(4) of this section.

(C) An analysis of the best system of continuous emission control technology available and associated emission reductions achievable for each source within the State subject to BART and covered by the alternative program. This analysis must be conducted by making a determination of BART for each source subject to BART and covered by the alternative program as provided for in paragraph (e)(1) of this section, unless the emissions trading program or other alternative measure has been designed to meet a requirement other than BART (such as the core requirement to have a long-term strategy to achieve the reasonable progress goals established by States). In this case, the State may determine the best system of continuous emission control technology and associated emission reductions for similar types of sources within a source category based on both source-specific and category-wide information, as appropriate.

(D) An analysis of the projected emissions reductions achievable through the trading program or other alternative measure.

(E) A determination under paragraph (e)(3) of this section or otherwise based on the clear weight of evidence that the trading program or other alternative measure achieves greater reasonable progress than would be achieved through the installation and operation of BART at the covered sources.

(ii) [Reserved]