Sample of Positive Media Coverage…


EPA Announcement Roll Out Actions Through 6:00pm…


“What they are saying…” attached.

EPA social media links:

https://www.facebook.com/EPA/posts/10155148982717229

https://twitter.com/EPA/status/842081695310458892

Administrator social media this evening:
EPA to Reexamine 2022–25 Emission Standards

Under the Midterm Evaluation process established under the 2012 greenhouse gas emissions standards, EPA will revisit the standards to determine whether they are still appropriate.

Read the news release
Photos from the announcement

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
To: Jackson, Ryan [jackson.ryan@epa.gov]; Brown, Byron [brown.byron@epa.gov]; Dravis, Samantha [dravis.samantha@epa.gov]
From: Konkus, John
Sent: Wed 3/15/2017 3:21:00 PM
Subject: RE: EPA website needs to be updated - following Federal Register Announcement and Today's event in Michigan

I’ll make sure we have a new CAFÉ website today.

From: Jackson, Ryan
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 11:17 AM
To: Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: EPA website needs to be updated - following Federal Register Announcement and Today's event in Michigan

Frankly we have a lot of clean up to do. Glad we have a new flood of team members. This could be jahan's job with help and guidance. Although his social media responsibilities will be huge. Bigly actually.

Ryan Jackson
Chief of Staff
U.S. EPA
(202) 564-6999

Begin forwarded message:

From: David Schwietert <DSchwietert@autoalliance.org>
Date: March 15, 2017 at 11:09:24 AM EDT
To: "Jackson, Ryan" <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: EPA website needs to be updated - following Federal Register Announcement and Today's event in Michigan

Ryan,

Just wanted to flag that in conjunction with the upcoming Federal Register publication regarding the Mid Term Review and the GHG Final determination being
withdrawn, EPA needs to update/modify its website with a new entry stating that the January 2017 Final Determination is hereby withdrawn pending a new Final Determination to be issued on or before 4/1/18.

See link below:


David Schwietert

Executive Vice President, Federal Government Relations & Public Policy

P: 202-326-5521 | dschwietert@autoalliance.org
After running the first draft by Marianne (comms for DOT) and Kaelan (WH) I reworked the op-ed to give it national reach and adding in some broader job statistics. Please take a look and let me know what you think.

If we can get this approved, I’d like to start pitching it for national publication, rather than only in Detroit.

Thank you!

John
I will transmit this at to USA today at 1030...
You can tell the auto alliance folks that all CAFÉ related info on the EPA site is updated and we have a new CAFÉ landing page found here:


From: Jackson, Ryan
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 11:17 AM
To: Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov>; Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: EPA website needs to be updated - following Federal Register Announcement and Today's event in Michigan

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Ryan Jackson
Chief of Staff
U.S. EPA
(202) 564-6999

Begin forwarded message:

From: David Schwietert <DSchwietert@autoalliance.org>
Date: March 15, 2017 at 11:09:24 AM EDT
To: "Jackson, Ryan" <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: EPA website needs to be updated - following Federal Register Announcement and Today's event in Michigan
Ryan,

Just wanted to flag that in conjunction with the upcoming Federal Register publication regarding the Mid Term Review and the GHG Final determination being withdrawn, EPA needs to update/modify its website with a new entry stating that the January 2017 Final Determination is hereby withdrawn pending a new Final Determination to be issued on or before 4/1/18.

See link below:


David Schwietert

Executive Vice President, Federal Government Relations & Public Policy

P: 202-326-5521 | dschwietert@autoalliance.org

Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers

300 12th Street, SW

Washington, DC 20001
Team: Attached is our comms plan for the CAFÉ announcement this week.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you!

John
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

On Mar 13, 2017, at 5:23 AM, Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov> wrote:

Is this a joint oped with Chao?

Ryan Jackson
Chief of Staff
U.S. EPA
(202) 564-6999

On Mar 12, 2017, at 9:31 PM, Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov> wrote:

After running the first draft by Marianne (comms for DOT) and Kaelan (WH) I reworked the op-ed to give it national reach and adding in some broader job statistics. Please take a look and let me know what you think.

If we can get this approved, I’d like to start pitching it for national publication, rather than only in Detroit.

Thank you!

John

<Draft CAFE Op-Ed.docx>
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Is this a joint oped with Chao?

Ryan Jackson
Chief of Staff
U.S. EPA
(202) 564-6999

On Mar 12, 2017, at 9:31 PM, Konkus, John <konkus.john@epa.gov> wrote:

After running the first draft by Marianne (comms for DOT) and Kaelan (WH) I reworked the op-ed to give it national reach and adding in some broader job statistics. Please take a look and let me know what you think.

If we can get this approved, I’d like to start pitching it for national publication, rather than only in Detroit.

Thank you!

John

<Draft CAFE Op-Ed.docx>
As part of our CAFÉ push next week, I’d like to consider having the Administrator publish an op-ed in the Detroit Free Press. Attached is a draft I’ve written. I need to plug in the rest of the footnotes, but in the meantime, please take a look. I can reach out to the paper tomorrow to try an secure a slot for later in the week.

Thanks!

John
To: Schnare, David [schnare.david@epa.gov]; Brown, Byron [brown.byron@epa.gov]
Cc: Dravis, Samantha [dravis.samantha@epa.gov]
From: Rees, Sarah
Sent: Thur 3/9/2017 10:07:25 PM
Subject: RE: Cafe

Thanks - I was getting conflicting information - this is super helpful.

Cheers,
Sarah

-----Original Message-----
From: Schnare, David
Sent: Thursday, March 09, 2017 4:40 PM
To: Brown, Byron <brown.byron@epa.gov>
Cc: Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Rees, Sarah <rees.sarah@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Cafe

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
d.

-----Original Message-----
From: Brown, Byron
Sent: Thursday, March 9, 2017 4:35 PM
To: Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>
Cc: Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Rees, Sarah <rees.sarah@epa.gov>
Subject: Cafe

David - can you loop in Sarah Rees on timing of cafe notice going to FR? Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone
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-----Original Message-----
From: Brown, Byron
Sent: Thursday, March 9, 2017 4:35 PM
To: Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>
Cc: Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Rees, Sarah <rees.sarah@epa.gov>
Subject: Cafe

David - can you loop in Sarah Rees on timing of cafe notice going to FR? Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone
To: Schnare, David [schnare.david@epa.gov]
Cc: Jackson, Ryan [jackson.ryan@epa.gov]; Brown, Byron [brown.byron@epa.gov]
From: Dravis, Samantha
Sent: Wed 3/8/2017 8:26:07 PM
Subject: Re: CAFE FR Notice ready for signature

Byron is in his office now- BB, can you show this to him? Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 8, 2017, at 3:22 PM, Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov> wrote:

The attached is ready for signature, but for putting in the exact date of the signature directly above the signature block.

We need to get this signed and sent back to DOT for the Secretary’s signature.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

David W. Schnare
Assistant Deputy Administrator
US. EPA

<CACHE-FINAL FINAL-joint-notice-DOT-EPA.docx>
The attached is ready for signature, but for putting in the exact date of the signature directly above the signature block.

We need to get this signed and sent back to DOT for the Secretary’s signature.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

David W. Schnare

Assistant Deputy Administrator

US. EPA
I received word that we would get a copy of the final final Notice tomorrow morning, probably signed by Secretary Chou. All we would need to do is get it signed by our Administrator and then we hold it until the comms folks tell us the public relations plans. We will send it to OFR at that point.

dschnare
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DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

49 CFR Parts 523, 531, 533, 536 and 537

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

40 CFR Part 86 (§ 86.1818-12(c))

[FRB--XXXX--XX--XXX]

Notice of Intention to Reconsider the Final Determination of the Mid-Term Evaluation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards for Model Year 2022-2025 Light Duty Vehicles
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Cc: Dravis, Samantha[dravis.samantha@epa.gov]; Rees, Sarah[rees.sarah@epa.gov]
To: Schnare, David[schnare.david@epa.gov]
From: Brown, Byron
Sent: Thur 3/9/2017 9:35:09 PM
Subject: Cafe

David - can you loop in Sarah Rees on timing of cafe notice going to FR? Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone
Hi Josh,

I’m attaching a couple past public presentations, hopefully meeting the needs of your National Program “101” presentation to the international audience.

The first one is a presentation we also used internationally (for Japanese delegation) a couple years back, and was written to be very high level for an audience who might not have known much about the National program.

The 2nd one is a presentation Bill gave at a Detroit auto/supplier audience conference last week, and is way too technical for your audience, but the last slide includes the figure from ICCT that I mentioned (also pasted below) showing the US standards compared to those of other countries.

The 3rd one is a joint National Program briefing that EPA-NHTSA jointly presented back in early 2013 after the 17-25 standards were finalized, and has more details on some of the credits programs, etc (this might be more than you need).

If you need anything more, I’m leaving in a few minutes and back Monday, but cc’ing Jeff Alson who may be able to help in the meantime.

Best,

Robin
Robin Moran
Senior Policy Advisor
U.S. EPA, Office of Transportation and Air Quality
2000 Traverwood Dr.
Ann Arbor, MI 48105
(734) 214-4781 (phone)
(734) 214-4821 (fax)
Here is some language the Evan Belser put together for No. 2—thanks,

John

The EPA does not impose fines for noncompliance under the CAFE program. Fines are imposed by U.S. Department of Transportation (https://one.nhtsa.gov/cafe_pic/CAFE_PIC_Fines_LIVE.html).

Background:

The EPA has authority to impose fines on light-duty automakers who violate Clean Air Act certification requirements concerning greenhouse gas emission standards, which are harmonized with DOT’s fuel economy standards. The 2014 settlement with the automakers Hyundai and Kia is the only example of a case that included this type of penalty. There, the civil penalty was $100 million. More information about that settlement is available at: https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/hyundai-and-kia-clean-air-act-settlement
Just so we are all on the same page, the press office asked OGC, OECA and OTAQ to weigh in on these Q and A’s on the CAFE/GHG standards. Here is the initial draft for review. It still needs input from OTAQ technical staff, but though I’d share anyway. Nancy has asked that we provide input on Monday.

I am happy to consolidate input on Monday.

Thanks and have a great weekend.

Best,
Erin

From: Millett, John
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:16 AM
To: Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>
Cc: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Kenny, Shannon <Kenny.Shannon@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Ng, Brian <Ng.Brian@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>; Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Q’s that need A’s

So we're all on the same page. Offices that should take first crack at the answers. --

1 --OGC

2 -- OECA
3 -- OAR

4 -- I'm not aware of the information necessary to respond to this.

John Millett
202.510.1822

On Mar 10, 2017, at 10:07 AM, Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov> wrote:

I’m adding Ben and Erin.

From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:00 AM
To: Kenny, Shannon <Kenny.Shannon@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>; Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Ng, Brian <Ng.Brian@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Q's that need A's

As part of our comms prep for cafe rollout next week - we need assistance with answers for these questions-- unfortunately on a fast turnaround - thx ng

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Date: March 10, 2017 at 9:45:56 AM EST
To: "Grantham, Nancy" <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>, "Konkus, John" <konkus.john@epa.gov>
Cc: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>, "Dewey, Amy" <Dewey.Amy@epa.gov>
Subject: Q's that need A's

Here are few questions. Nancy, are you sending this to OP or OAR?
Catherine C. Milbourn
Office of Media Relations
Office of the Administrator
U.S. EPA HQ
202-564-7849 (office)
202-420-8648 (mobile)
Milbourn.cathy@epa.gov

<CAFE Questions.docx>
EPA GHG UPDATE FOR
2017 FUEL ECONOMY DETROIT

Bill Charmley
National Vehicle and Fuel Emissions Laboratory
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

March 16, 2017
Overview

- How the EPA GHG Standards Work
- Industry Progress To Date
- What Might the 2025 Time-Frame Look Like
  - EPA assessment (thus far)
- What Comes Next

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – OAR-OTAQ
Why does EPA have GHG Standards for Light-Duty Vehicles?

**U.S. Supreme Court** in 2007 on the topic of EPA and regulation of GHGs from motor vehicles:

> “But that DOT sets mileage standards in no way licenses EPA to shirk its environmental responsibilities. EPA has been charged with protecting the public “health” and “welfare”, a statutory obligation wholly independent of DOT’s mandate to promote energy efficiency.”

**Clean Air Act** directs EPA –

> “The Administrator shall by regulation prescribe … standards applicable to the emission of any air pollutant from any class or classes of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, which in his judgement cause, or contribute to, air pollution which may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.”
HOW THE EPA STANDARDS WORK
# So What is the 2025 EPA Standard?

## Projections for Model Year 2025 Fleet CO2 Compliance Target

Fuel Prices/Fleet Mix Affect EPA’s PROJECTION of 2025 Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012 Projection</th>
<th>Summer 2016 Projection</th>
<th>Fall 2016 Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fuel Price</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($/gallon)</td>
<td>$3.87</td>
<td>$2.95</td>
<td>$2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Car/truck mix</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67/33%</td>
<td>52/48%</td>
<td>53/47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2025 Fleet CO₂ Compliance Level</strong></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g/mi, 2-cycle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MPG-e</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2-cycle)</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are industry compliance values. For consumers, the 2025 average real-world value is ~ 36 MPG*
Passenger Car Target \((g/\text{mi}) = (3.26 \times \text{footprint}) - 3.2\)

- for vehicle footprints >41 and < 56 square feet

Light-Truck Target \((g/\text{mi}) = (3.58 \times \text{footprint}) + 12.5\)

- for vehicle footprints >41 and < 74 square feet

For each individual company the Car & Truck standards are a function of the \# vehicles produced & each vehicle’s footprint.
Footprint-based $\text{CO}_2$ Target Curves for Trucks – “The Standards”

[separate footprint curve for Cars]

With a shift from cars to SUVs & trucks, the OEM’s standard becomes less stringent.

As Sales Shift, OEMs Standards adapt.
INDUSTRY PROGRESS TO DATE
Vehicle CO_{2} Emissions at Record Low – every major vehicle category improving

- MY2015: 358 g/mi CO\textsubscript{2} (24.8 mpg)
- MY 2016 Projected: 25.6 mpg

Truck SUVs highest % improvement since 2004, up 33%
Automakers Adopting a Wide Array of Technologies at Rapid Rates

- **GDI** use on nearly half of all vehicles (up from 3% in MY2008), with Mazda at 100%, 6 more OEMs above 75%

- ~20% fleet use **7+ speed transmissions**, led by Mercedes, BMW, and Fiat-Chrysler

- >20% fleet use **CVTs**, led by Subaru, Nissan, and Honda

---

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – OAR-OTAQ
Early Years of Program Producing Positive Results

Industry Outperforming Standards

- 2012: 11 g/mi lower than target
- 2013: 12 g/mi lower than target
- 2014: 13 g/mi lower than target
- 2015: 7 g/mi lower than target

7 Years of Sales Increases Thru 2016
First Time in 100 Years

Sales (millions)

- 2009: 10
- 2010: 12
- 2011: 14
- 2012: 16
- 2013: 18
- 2014: 20
- 2015: 22
- 2016: 24

Model Year
What Happens to the Over Compliance?

GHG Program is a **Multi-Year Program**, multiple layers of flexibility for OEMs

- No single year determines compliance.
- Program includes emissions banking and trading
- **Credits last at least 5 model years**, and early credits last longer.
- **Debits can be carried forward for 3 model years.**
- Today, the bank is **280 Million Megagrams CO2**
  - What’s a Megagram?
  - 280M worth about **80 grams CO2/mile** for the entire U.S. fleet
  - Would allow the MY2015 fleet to comply with EPA standards through 2019, if all firms participated fully in credit trading
  - Through MY2015, 12 OEMs involved in credit trading
Advanced Gasoline Vehicles can Take the Industry Much Further … many vehicles already meet future targets

Vehicle Production that Meets or Exceeds MY2020 CO₂

With fleet averaging, in any given model year, only about 50% of vehicles would need to meet/exceed their target, depending on sales volumes.
Case Study: 2017 Honda CRV 1.5 liter AWD

- Best-selling SUV in U.S.
- AWD versions make up 2/3 of sales
- Advanced Gasoline Technology:
  - Turbocharged GDI 1.5 liter I4 engine
  - Continuously variable transmission
  - No electrification
- Could already meet* 2022 target
  - 5 years ahead
- Within 4 mpg of 2025 target

*Illustrative example only. EPA estimated real-world fuel economy targets from CO₂ compliance targets, assuming A/C credits and 5 g/mi off-cycle credits.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – OAR-OTAQ
WHAT MIGHT 2025 LOOK LIKE – EPA TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT (THUS FAR)
EPA’s Assessments are Informed by a Wide Range of Information

➢ Technical research performed by EPA
  o Benchmarking testing of 30 vehicles across wide range of powertrains & segments (with more to come)
  o Published more than 30 peer-reviewed papers and technical reports
  o Vehicle simulation modeling, cost teardown studies, mass reduction feasibility/cost studies, manufacturer “learning by doing” costs, research on consumer issues, economic inputs, others

➢ Extensive reviews of the literature
  o 100’s of reports/papers from the literature published since 2012, including major studies such as the 2015 National Academy of Sciences report

➢ Stakeholder outreach & collaboration
  o Hundreds of meetings with automakers, suppliers, NGOs, consumer groups, labor, states/local governments, others
  o Collaboration with NHTSA, CARB, DOE, Transport & Environment Canada
EPA technical information available to all stakeholders/public

Wide range of peer-reviewed publications and presentations:

- Technical papers, including SAE papers and EPA reports
- Conference presentations
- Modeling workshop
EPA Most Recent Assessment – Standards can be Met Mostly with Advanced Gasoline Technologies

Cost estimate of $875/vehicle

- Advanced engines and transmissions
- Vehicle light-weighting
- Improved aerodynamics
- More efficient accessories
- Low rolling resistance tires
- Stop-start technology
- Mild hybrid (e.g., 48 volt systems)
- Small levels of strong HEV, EV, PHEV

Fuel Savings Offsets Cost increase

- Net lifetime savings of $1,600

One possible pathway EPA modeled

- Advanced gasoline 75%
- Electric Vehicles 3%
- Plug-In Hybrid Vehicles 2%
- Strong Hybrid 2%
- Mild Hybrid 18%

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – OAR-OTAQ
Progress in Engine Efficiency

MY2008 Actual PFI Engine
- Peak thermal efficiency 34%
- Narrow efficiency region

MY2008 PFI Engine
Progress in Engine Efficiency

MY2008 Actual PFI Engine
- Peak thermal efficiency 34%
- Narrow efficiency region

MY2014 Actual GDI Engine
- Peak thermal efficiency 36%
- Broader efficiency region
Progress in Engine Efficiency

MY2008 Actual PFI Engine
- Peak thermal efficiency 34%
- Narrow efficiency region

MY2014 Actual GDI Engine
- Peak thermal efficiency 36%
- Broader efficiency region

MY2016 Actual Turbo downsized Engine
- Peak thermal efficiency 38%
- Very broad efficiency region
- Large overlap with 2-cycle test operation
Progress in Engine Efficiency

MY2008 Actual PFI Engine
- Peak thermal efficiency 34%
- Narrow efficiency region

MY2014 Actual GDI Engine
- Peak thermal efficiency 36%
- Broader efficiency region

MY2016 Actual Turbo downsized Engine
- Peak thermal efficiency 38%
- Very broad efficiency region
- Large overlap with 2-cycle test operation

MY2025 EPA projected turbo downsized engine
- Peak thermal efficiency 38%
- Similar efficiency region as MY2016 actual engine
- Hardware improvements provide some improved low-load efficiency
In 10 model years, powertrain efficiency average can increase from **21.5%** to **26.8%**.
Powertrain Efficiency: Current Levels and Projected Improvement Needed

- MY2017 Honda Fit
- MY2017 Hyundai Tucson
- MY2017 Nissan Juke AWD
- MY2017 Honda Civic
- MY2017 Audi A4
- MY2017 BMW 440i xDrive
- MY2017 Ford F150 (2.7L, 6spcl)
- MY2017 Porsche 911 Carrera 4S

Lower

Higher

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – OAR
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26.8% Fleet Average to Meet MY2025 GHG Standards

Best Powertrain Efficiencies

MY2015 Gasoline Vehicles
- OEM1
- OEM2
- OEM3
- OEM4
- OEM5
- Etc...

MY2017 Gasoline Vehicles
In 2015 an NAS Committee published a comprehensive assessment of the light-duty CAFE & GHG technologies

NAS included a detailed review of the 2012 EPA/NHTSA Assessment:

“The committee found the analysis conducted by NHTSA and EPA in their development of the 2017-2025 standards to be thorough and of high caliber on the whole.”

The NAS also concluded that the 2025 standards could largely be met with advanced gasoline vehicle technology:

“Spark ignition engines are dominant in light-duty vehicles today and are expected to remain dominant, with further reductions in fuel consumption beyond 2025.” [Finding 2.1]
Can GHG standards be good for the U.S. auto industry, and the overall U.S. job market?

- Sept. 2016 – Center for Auto Research issued a sales & employment assessment
- CAR’s report showed potentially large negative impacts on employment and vehicle sales
  - assumes range of high vehicle costs all higher than EPA estimate ($2,000-$6,000)
  - assumes vehicle buy considers only first 3 years of fuel savings in buying decision
- Though EPA has concerns with the methodology used in this report, if we use the CAR approach but with EPA’s cost estimates, the CAR model projects positive sales and employment with $3/gal gasoline prices
- If we assume that consumers consider 5 years of fuel savings (instead of CAR’s assumption of 3-years), the vehicle sales change grows to +51,000 and national employment change grows to +206,000

| EPA assessment of CAR study, using $1,324 (2015$) technology cost to go from 2016 to 2025 standards |
| Sales change | +234,000 more vehicles sold |
| Employment change in auto production | +9,300 more auto jobs |
| Employment change nationally | +84,700 more total U.S. jobs |
WHAT COMES NEXT?
March 15, 2017 - EPA Administrator Pruitt issued a Notice announcing he will reconsider the EPA Final Determination published in January 2017:

“... EPA has concluded that it is appropriate to reconsider its Final Determination in order to allow additional consultation and coordination with NHTSA in support of a national harmonized program.”

“In accord with the schedule set forth in EPA’s regulations, the EPA intends to make a new Final Determination regarding the appropriateness of the MY 2022-2025 GHG standards no later than April 1, 2018.”
Component benchmarking efficiency maps:

- MY2016 Mazda CX-9 2.5 liter GDI-turbo-charged w/ 6-speed AT
- MY2016 Honda Civic 1.5 liter GDI-turbo-charged 10.6:1 w/ CVT

Vehicle level benchmarking:

- MY2016 Acura ILX w/dual-clutch transmission with torque converter
- MY2017 Ford F150 w/10 speed AT
- MY2016 Chevy Malibu w/1.5 liter GDI-turbo-charged w/ 6-speed AT

Demonstration and Modeling:

- Demonstration of cooled EGR on a modified European Mazda 2.0 liter GDI-naturally-aspirated 14:1 CR engine
- GTPower modeling of a MY2012 PSA 1.6 liter GDI-turbo-charged engine with cooled EGR and an advanced turbo
- GTPower modeling of a MY2016 Honda Civic 1.5 liter GDI-turbo-charged 10.6:1 CR engine
- ALPHA model comparison of several CVTs
- ALPHA modeling of all vehicles included in scope component and vehicle benchmarking
Additional EPA Work Underway in Many Areas

- **Technology cost teardowns with FEV**: modern GDI turbo-downsized engine, advanced diesel engine, CVT
- Updates to OMEGA cost-effectiveness optimization model and ALPHA full vehicle simulation model
- Ongoing work to evaluate the **willingness to pay (WTP) for vehicle attributes** (e.g., power, fuel economy, size, etc).
  - Our review of 50+ papers from the last 20 years found very wide variation in these WTP values. Ongoing work evaluates what factors may contribute to this variation.
- **Ongoing evaluation of automotive reviews of MY2015 vehicle fuel efficient technologies**
  - Building upon EPA’s study of MY2014 vehicles, we continue to find that positive evaluations for all technologies (70%) exceed negative evaluations of the technologies (18%)
- **Ongoing work to evaluate the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) rebound effect**
- Collaboration with Transport and Environment/Climate Change Canada on **mass reduction** and **aerodynamics**
- Continued evaluation of the vehicle fleet each year to assess technologies, emissions, and compliance

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency – OAR-OTAQ
Global Passenger Car CO2 Standards

Source: International Council for Clean Transportation. 
Overview
As part of the 2012 rulemaking establishing the model year (MY) 2017-2025 light-duty vehicle GHG standards, EPA made a regulatory commitment to conduct a Midterm Evaluation (MTE) of the standards for MY 2022-2025. As a part of this process EPA is examining a wide range of factors, such as developments in powertrain technology, vehicle electrification, light-weighting and vehicle safety impacts, the penetration of fuel efficient technologies in the marketplace, consumer acceptance of fuel efficient technologies, trends in fuel prices and the vehicle fleet, employment impacts, and many others.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Previous Steps in the Midterm Evaluation
Process

On January 12, 2017, Administrator Gina McCarthy signed her determination to maintain the current GHG emissions standards for model year (MY) 2022-2025 vehicles. Her final determination found that automakers are well positioned to meet the standards at lower costs than previously estimated.

Highlights of Administrator McCarthy’s January 2017, Final Determination

- Automakers have a wide range of technology pathways available to meet the MY2022-2025 standards, at slightly lower per-vehicle costs than previously predicted. The standards are achievable with very low penetration of strong hybrids, electric vehicles and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles, consistent with the findings of a comprehensive 2015 National Academy of Sciences study.

- The standards will save consumers money, significantly reduce GHG emissions and fuel consumption, and provide benefits to the health and welfare of Americans.

- Automakers have outperformed the standards for the first four years of the program (MY2012-2015) and manufacturers are adopting fuel efficient technologies at unprecedented rates, all while vehicle sales have increased for 7 consecutive years.

Administrator McCarthy’s determination was based on an extensive technical record, created over 8 years of research, review of several hundred published reports, hundreds of stakeholder meetings, and multiple opportunities for the public to provide input. This Final Determination follows the November 2016 release of EPA’s Proposed Determination and the July 2016 release of a Draft Technical Assessment Report (TAR), issued jointly by the EPA, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), and the California Air Resources Board (CARB). EPA provided opportunities for public comment for both the Draft TAR and the Proposed Determination.

Cover Letter -- EPA Administrator’s signed Cover Letter to the Final Determination.


Proposed Determination

On November 30, 2016, Administrator McCarthy proposed to determine that the MY 2022-2025 standards remain appropriate and that a rulemaking to change them is not warranted. This proposed determination is based on the robust technical record including the draft TAR, input from the auto industry and other stakeholders, and updated analyses. The public comment period for this proposed determination will end on December 30, 2016.

Highlights of the Proposed Determination
• Auto manufacturers can meet the MY 2022-2025 standards at slightly lower per-vehicle costs than predicted in the TAR, and lower costs than predicted in the 2012 rulemaking that established the standards.

• The current standards will save consumers money and provide benefits to the health and welfare of Americans.

• Automakers have a wide range of technology pathways available to meet the standards. Standards are achievable with very low penetration of strong hybrids, electric vehicles and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles. This finding is consistent with the conclusions the National Academy of Sciences found in a comprehensive 2015 study.

• Automakers have outperformed the standards for the first four years of the program (MY2012-2015) and manufacturers are adopting fuel efficient technologies at unprecedented rates, all while vehicle sales have increased for 6 consecutive years. There are over 100 car, SUV, and pickup versions on the market today that already meet 2020 or later standards.

Cover Letter — EPA Administrator’s signed Cover Letter to the Proposed Determination.


Comment Period — The comment period for the Proposed Determination closed on December 30, 2016. Several organizations requested that EPA extend the public comment period for the Proposed Determination; EPA sent letters explaining our denial of these requests to each of these organizations. The incoming requests for an extension of the comment period are available in the docket noted above. For information regarding the comment period, please see the Federal Register Notice:


For additional documents supporting EPA’s analyses for the Proposed Determination, see the Advanced Light-Duty Powertrain and Hybrid Analysis (ALPHA) Tool and the Optimization Model for reducing Emissions of Greenhouse gases from Automobiles (OMEGA) pages.

Draft Technical Assessment Report (TAR)
EPA, NHTSA, and CARB jointly issued a Draft TAR for public comment in July 2016. The Draft TAR was a technical report, not a decision document, and examined a wide range of issues relevant to the 2022-2025 standards.
Highlights of the Draft Technical Assessment Report:

- **Automakers are innovating in a time of record sales and fuel economy levels.** The results of the Draft TAR show that manufacturers are adopting fuel economy technologies at unprecedented rates. Car makers and suppliers have developed far more innovative technologies to improve fuel economy and reduce GHG emissions than anticipated just a few years ago.

- **Our new analysis shows that the standards can be met largely with more efficient gasoline powered cars – we continue to project that only modest penetration of hybrids and only low levels of electric vehicles are needed to meet the standards.** The Draft TAR shows that manufacturers can meet the current standards for MY 2022-2025 with conventional gasoline vehicles that use internal combustion engines with well-understood technologies. This is consistent with what the National Academies of Science found in a comprehensive 2015 study. Manufacturers can meet the standards at similar or even lower costs than what was anticipated in the 2012 rulemaking with substantial fuel savings payback to consumers.

- **The National Program preserves consumer choice, even as it protects the environment and reduces fuel consumption.** The National Program is designed to ensure that consumers can continue to buy the differing types of vehicles they need, from compact cars, to SUVs, to larger trucks suitable for towing and carrying heavy loads. Owners of every type of new vehicle will enjoy gasoline savings and improved fuel economy with a reduced environmental footprint.


For additional documents supporting EPA’s analyses for the Proposed Determination, see the Advanced Light-Duty Powertrain and Hybrid Analysis (ALPHA) Tool and the Optimization Model for reducing Emissions of Greenhouse gases from Automobiles (OMEGA) pages.


---

**EPA Technical Projects to Inform the Midterm Evaluation**
• EPA’s National Vehicle and Fuel Emissions Laboratory (NVFEL), Ann Arbor, MI

Through the National Center for Advanced Technology (NCAT) located at EPA’s National Vehicle and Fuel Emissions Laboratory (for more information, see: Vehicles and Fuels Emission Testing) in Ann Arbor, Michigan, we are researching future advanced engine and transmission technologies to support modeling, advanced technology testing, and demonstrations (for more information, see: Test Data for Light-duty Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Technology).

• This new study examines the mass reduction potential for a full-size light-duty pickup truck.
  - CAE Baseline and Lightweight Models (ZIP) (1 pg, 71 MB, June 2015)

• Research on consumer issues, including an assessment of vehicle affordability, a study of willingness-to-pay for various vehicle attributes, and content analysis of auto reviews
  - Searching for Hidden Costs: Presentation made at the University of Michigan Energy Institute’s Conference on Transportation, Economics, Energy, and the Environment (TE3)
  - Searching for Hidden Costs: A Technology-Based Approach to the Energy Efficiency Gap in
Light-Duty Vehicles, Presentation made at the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists Annual Conference

- Work on economic issues, including new studies on VMT rebound and manufacturer cost reduction through "learning by doing":
  - Final Report and Peer Review Report for Cost Reduction through Learning in Manufacturing Industries and in the Manufacture of Mobile Sources

- Development of modeling tools:
  - Vehicle simulation modeling (ALPHA - Advanced Light-Duty Powertrain and Hybrid Analysis)
  - Technology feasibility and cost model (OMEGA - Optimization Model for reducing Emissions of Greenhouse gases from Automobiles)
  - Technology packages efficiencies (Lumped Parameter Model)
  - Continued investigation into potential consumer choice modeling:
    - Consumer Vehicle Choice Model Documentation (PDF) (62 pp, 701 K, EPA-420-B-12-052, August 2012)

- In addition to working with CARB and NHTSA, EPA is collaborating with DOE on projects involving vehicle light-weighting and battery cost modeling, and Environment and Climate Change Canada/Transport Canada on projects involving aerodynamics, vehicle light-weighting, all-wheel drive vehicles, and other areas. In addition to these projects supporting the MTE, EPA issues two annual reports related to light-duty GHG emissions:
  - GHG Emission Standards for Light-Duty Vehicles: Manufacturer Performance Report

EPA Publications Informing the Midterm Evaluation

Throughout the MTE process, EPA’s goal is to publish as much of our research as possible in peer-reviewed journals. EPA staff have published the following peer-reviewed papers so far since 2013. EPA staff are attending numerous technical conferences, and keeping abreast of hundreds of papers in the literature on the wide range of factors we are considering for the MTE. The following papers are not available for download due to copyright restrictions; however, we
are providing links to the abstract and ordering information on the journals’ websites.


The following papers are not subject to copyright protection because they are Government works; however, foreign copyrights may apply.


- "Development and Testing of an Automatic Transmission Shift Schedule Algorithm for Vehicle..."


EPA Presentations Regarding the Midterm Evaluation

EPA also has publicly presented information about our work in numerous forums. Click the links below to view selected presentations:

• EPA presentations regarding the MTE
• EPA presentation regarding the ALPHA tool

Contact Us to ask a question, provide feedback, or report a problem.

Regulations for Emissions from Vehicles and Engines Home

• Regulations for Emissions from Vehicles and Engines Home
• Onroad
• Nonroad
• Greenhouse Gas

*Discover.*

*Connect.*

*Ask.*

*Follow.*
Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

From: Orlin, David
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 3:04 PM
To: Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>; Ng, Brian <Ng.Brian@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>; Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>
Cc: Simon, Karl <Simon.Karl@epa.gov>; Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Cook, Leila <cook.leila@epa.gov>; Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: GHG Standards Q and A - due Monday

Hi gang,
Just so we are all on the same page, the press office asked OGC, OECA and OTAQ to weigh in on these Q and A’s on the CAFE/GHG standards. Here is the initial draft for review. It still needs input from OTAQ technical staff, but though I’d share anyway. Nancy has asked that we provide input on Monday.

I am happy to consolidate input on Monday.

Thanks and have a great weekend.

Best,
Erin

From: Millett, John
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:16 AM
To: Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>
Cc: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Kenny, Shannon <Kenny.Shammone@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Ng, Brian <Ng.Brian@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>; Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Q's that need A's

So we're all on the same page. Offices that should take first crack at the answers. --

1 --OGC

2 -- OECA
3 -- OAR

4 -- I'm not aware of the information necessary to respond to this.

John Millett
202.510.1822

On Mar 10, 2017, at 10:07 AM, Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov> wrote:

I'm adding Ben and Erin.

From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:00 AM
To: Kenny, Shannon <Kenny.Shannon@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samanthaaepa.gov>; Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>; Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Ng, Brian <Ng.Brian@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Q's that need A's

As part of our comms prep for cafe rollout next week - we need assistance with answers for these questions-- unfortunately on a fast turnaround - thx ng

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Date: March 10, 2017 at 9:45:56 AM EST
To: "Grantham, Nancy" <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>, "Konkus, John" <konkus.john@epa.gov>
Cc: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>, "Dewey, Amy" <Dewey.Amy@epa.gov>
Subject: Q's that need A's

Here are few questions. Nancy, are you sending this to OP or OAR?
Catherine C. Milbourn
Office of Media Relations
Office of the Administrator
U.S. EPA HQ
202-564-7849 (office)
202-420-8648 (mobile)
Milbourn.cathy@epa.gov

<CAFE Questions.docx>
Hi Erin,

I think the draft response is accurate enough for a verbal response from the press office to an inquiry.

Feel free to send it as it is. If you want more complicated you could use the following.

Thanks,

Byron
Hi Karl,

That is a good point re: 2017 additional costs. OK if I work with Jeff or Robin to make sure I get the correct #’s?
Thanks,
Erin

From: Simon, Karl
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 12:03 PM
To: Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>; Grundler, Christopher <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>; Cook, Leila <cook.leila@epa.gov>; Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Bunker, Byron <bunker.byron@epa.gov>
Cc: Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Q's that need A's

Hi all,

Here are suggested responses for Q's 3 and 4. LMK if there are edits. Copying Byron to
confirm the response to the first Q is 100% accurate.

-Erin

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Christopher Grundler, Director
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202.564.1682 (Washington, DC)
734.214.4207 (Ann Arbor, MI)

From: Cook, Leila
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:59 AM
To: Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>
Cc: Grundler, Christopher <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>; Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>; Simon, Karl <Simon.Karl@epa.gov>; Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Q's that need A's

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 10, 2017, at 10:54 AM, Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov> wrote:

Stay tuned—Millett is figuring out who will be answering what. But take a look.
From: Drinkard, Andrea  
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:07 AM  
To: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Kenny, Shannon <Kenny.Shannon@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Ng, Brian <Ng.Brian@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>  
Cc: Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>  
Subject: RE: Q's that need A's

I’m adding Ben and Erin.

From: Grantham, Nancy  
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:00 AM  
To: Kenny, Shannon <Kenny.Shannon@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>; Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Ng, Brian <Ng.Brian@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>  
Subject: Fwd: Q's that need A's

As part of our comms prep for cafe rollout next week - we need assistance with answers for these questions-- unfortunately on a fast turnaround - thx ng

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>  
Date: March 10, 2017 at 9:45:56 AM EST  
To: "Grantham, Nancy" <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>, "Konkus, John" <konkus.john@epa.gov>  
Cc: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>, "Dewey, Amy" <Dewey.Amy@epa.gov>  
Subject: Q's that need A's

Here are few questions. Nancy, are you sending this to OP or OAR?
Catherine C. Milbourn
Office of Media Relations
Office of the Administrator
U.S. EPA HQ
202-564-7849 (office)
202-420-8648 (mobile)
Milbourn.cathy@epa.gov

<CAFE Questions.docx>
Hi all,

Here are suggested responses for Q’s 3 and 4. LMK if there are edits. Copying Byron to confirm the response to the first Q is 100% accurate.

-Erin
From: Grundler, Christopher  
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 11:22 AM  
To: Cook, Leila <cook.leila@epa.gov>; Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>  
Cc: Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>; Simon, Karl <Simon.Karl@epa.gov>; Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>  
Subject: RE: Q's that need A's
From: Cook, Leila
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:59 AM
To: Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>
Cc: Grundler, Christopher <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>; Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>; Simon, Karl <Simon.Karl@epa.gov>; Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Q's that need A's

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 10, 2017, at 10:54 AM, Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov> wrote:

Stay tuned—Millett is figuring out who will be answering what. But take a look.

From: Drinkard, Andrea
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:07 AM
To: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Kenny, Shannon <Kenny.Shannon@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Ng, Brian <Ng.Brian@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>
Cc: Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Q's that need A's
I’m adding Ben and Erin.

From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:00 AM
To: Kenny, Shannon <Kenny.Shannon@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>; Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Ng, Brian <Ng.Brian@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Q’s that need A’s

As part of our comms prep for cafe rollout next week - we need assistance with answers for these questions-- unfortunately on a fast turnaround - thx ng

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Date: March 10, 2017 at 9:45:56 AM EST
To: "Grantham, Nancy" <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>, "Konkus, John" <konkus.john@epa.gov>
Cc: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>, "Dewey, Amy" <Dewey.Amy@epa.gov>
Subject: Q’s that need A’s

Here are few questions. Nancy, are you sending this to OP or OAR?

Catherine C. Milbourn
Office of Media Relations
Office of the Administrator
U.S. EPA HQ

202-564-7849 (office)

202-420-8648 (mobile)

Milbourn.cathy@epa.gov

<CAFE Questions.docx>
Hi all,

Here are suggested responses for Q’s 3 and 4. LMK if there are edits. Copying Byron to confirm the response to the first Q is 100% accurate.

-Erin

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
From: Grundler, Christopher
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 11:22 AM
To: Cook, Leila <cook.leila@epa.gov>; Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>
Cc: Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>; Simon, Karl <Simon.Karl@epa.gov>
Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Q's that need A's

Christopher Grundler, Director
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202.564.1682 (Washington, DC)
734.214.4207 (Ann Arbor, MI)

From: Cook, Leila
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:59 AM
To: Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>
Cc: Grundler, Christopher <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>; Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>; Simon, Karl <Simon.Karl@epa.gov>; Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Q's that need A's
On Mar 10, 2017, at 10:54 AM, Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov> wrote:

Stay tuned—Millett is figuring out who will be answering what. But take a look.

I’m adding Ben and Erin.

As part of our comms prep for cafe rollout next week - we need assistance with answers for these questions-- unfortunately on a fast turnaround - thx ng
From: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Date: March 10, 2017 at 9:45:56 AM EST
To: "Grantham, Nancy" <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>, "Konkus, John"
<konzus.john@epa.gov>
Cc: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>, "Dewey, Amy"
<Dewey.Amy@epa.gov>
Subject: Q's that need A's

Here are few questions. Nancy, are you sending this to OP or OAR?

Catherine C. Milbourn
Office of Media Relations
Office of the Administrator
U.S. EPA HQ
202-564-7849 (office)
202-420-8648 (mobile)
Milbourn.cathy@epa.gov

<CAFE Questions.docx>
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Christopher Grundler, Director
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202.564.1682 (Washington, DC)
734.214.4207 (Ann Arbor, MI)

From: Cook, Leila
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:59 AM
To: Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>
Cc: Grundler, Christopher <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>; Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>; Simon, Karl <Simon.Karl@epa.gov>; Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Q's that need A's

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 10, 2017, at 10:54 AM, Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov> wrote:

Stay tuned—Millett is figuring out who will be answering what. But take a look.
From: Drinkard, Andrea
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:07 AM
To: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Kenny, Shannon <Kenny.Shannon@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Ng, Brian <Ng.Brian@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>
Cc: Hengst, Benjamin <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Q's that need A's

I'm adding Bcn and Erin.

From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 10, 2017 10:00 AM
To: Kenny, Shannon <Kenny.Shannon@epa.gov>; Dravis, Samantha <dravis.samantha@epa.gov>; Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>; Drinkard, Andrea <Drinkard.Andrea@epa.gov>; Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Ng, Brian <Ng.Brian@epa.gov>; Senn, John <Senn.John@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Q's that need A's

As part of our comms prep for cafe rollout next week - we need assistance with answers for these questions-- unfortunately on a fast turnaround - thx ng

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Date: March 10, 2017 at 9:45:56 AM EST
To: "Grantham, Nancy" <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>, "Konkus, John" <konkus.john@epa.gov>
Cc: "Milbourn, Cathy" <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>, "Dewey, Amy" <Dewey.Amy@epa.gov>
Subject: Q's that need A's

Here are few questions. Nancy, are you sending this to OP or OAR?
Catherine C. Milbourn
Office of Media Relations
Office of the Administrator
U.S. EPA HQ
202-564-7849 (office)
202-420-8648 (mobile)
Milbourn.cathy@epa.gov

<CAFE Questions.docx>
To: Charmley, William [charmley.william@epa.gov]
Cc: Hengst, Benjamin [Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov]; Bunker, Byron [bunker.byron@epa.gov]; Cook, Leila [cook.leila@epa.gov]; Simon, Karl [Simon.Karl@epa.gov]; Haugen, David [haugen.david@epa.gov]
From: Grundler, Christopher
Sent: Thur 3/9/2017 8:04:25 PM
Subject: FW: kristien knapp is on her way to DOT to have Secretary Chao sign the CAFE FR ..fyi
Nancy Grantham  
Office of Public Affairs  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
202-564-6879 (desk)  
202-253-7056 (mobile)
Hearing that signature could be today or tomorrow

Environmental Protection Agency chief Scott Pruiit said Thursday he expects an announcement rolling back fuel economy rules "very soon."

Automakers have expressed concern about the rules set during the Obama administration, which would have pushed auto fuel economy standards to 54.5 mpg by 2025. Some companies have said the Corporate Average Fuel Economy, or CAFE, standard would boost regulatory compliance costs.

Pruiit, who has pledged to roll back what he deems burdensome regulations, told CNBC that American automakers wanted to evaluate those standards. He said he believes the rule-making process was rushed.

"There's going to be an announcement on that very soon, and I think what's concerning to me and I think concerning to the president is how that process occurred," Pruiit said on "Squawk Box."

"I think that what has been broken in that process is, one, not a recognition of the great progress that's been made with those standards, but two, those in Detroit, those that are manufacturing autos in this country, expressed to the EPA that they wanted to evaluate the impact of the previous standards. And that was largely disregarded."
Backers of the Obama administration rules, which the EPA issued only a week before President Donald Trump took office, say automakers have overblown the potential costs of compliance. They also argue that consumers may be willing to pay for better fuel economy.

Trump has held several meetings with key executives since taking office, some of which have included the CEOs of Ford and General Motors.

— NBC News contributed to this report

Robin Moran
Senior Policy Advisor
U.S. EPA, Office of Transportation and Air Quality
2000 Traverwood Dr.
Ann Arbor, MI 48105
(734) 214-4781 (phone)
(734) 214-4821 (fax)
OTAQ Daily News Brief

**Welcome everyone to OTAQ’s daily news listserv. The OTAQ Daily News Brief compiles
articles from around the world focused on our office’s work; this includes everything from light duty/heavy duty vehicles, electric vehicles, air quality studies, aircrafts, boats and ships, to alternative fuels, and of course, climate change. If you’d like to be removed or would like to add another person to the listserv please contact David Richards at richards.david@epa.gov. Feedback welcomed. Thanks and enjoy!

Bloomberg

Cars Seen Missing U.S. Mileage Targets for First Time Since 2004

Cars and light trucks from the 2016 model year will be the first to fall short of U.S. fuel economy targets in more than a decade, according to a new projection released by regulators that will feed a debate over efficiency standards between automakers and environmental groups. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration forecasts that the 2016 models will average 32.1 miles per gallon, below the target of 32.8. The agency forecasts another shortfall in model year 2017 of 31.8 miles per gallon compared to a projected target of 33. The U.S. fleet has exceeded industrywide fuel economy targets every year since 2004, the oldest data available on NHTSA’s website for its Corporate Average Fuel Economy program. "If this is accurate, it contradicts what prior reports have said about the industry’s ability to meet these standards and suggests that it might be more difficult to do," said Stephanie Brinley, a senior analyst at IHS Markit Ltd.’s automotive group. The two-page report, dated Feb. 14, was recently posted by NHTSA and is based on preliminary data collected from automakers that the agency cautions hasn’t been verified.

Oil Drops Below $50 for First Time Since December on Supply Glut

Oil dropped below $50 for the first time since December after concerns that OPEC’s output cuts aren’t tempering a surplus in the U.S. triggered the biggest slump in more than a year. Futures dropped as much as 3 percent in New York after losing 5.7 percent the previous three sessions. Stockpiles rose 8.2 million to the highest level in weekly government data since 1982. Harold Hamm, the U.S. shale oil billionaire, warned on Wednesday that the industry could “kill” the crude market if it embarks on another spending binge. Oil had fluctuated above $50 a barrel since the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries and other nations started trimming supply for six months starting Jan. 1 to reduce a global glut. While U.S. shale production has rebounded, larger-than-expected cuts elsewhere and signs of growing demand suggest stockpiles will decline, according to Goldman Sachs Group Inc. “The bottom line here is you have wide compliance within OPEC with the production cuts and on the other hand you have increased production out of the U.S..” Hans Goetti, chief strategist for the Middle East and Asia at Banque Internationale a Luxembourg, said in a Bloomberg television interview. “The shale oil industry in the U.S. has made great strides to cut costs.”
Reuters

Watchdog presses U.S. lawmakers to probe Icahn's role with Trump

Chris Prentice

(Reuters) - A government watchdog group, Public Citizen, said on Wednesday it has asked lawmakers to investigate whether Carl Icahn violated lobbying disclosure laws, a complaint the billionaire investor denied and called a "witch hunt." The group said Icahn may have been acting as a lobbyist when he advised President Donald Trump to overhaul the U.S. biofuels program. Icahn, an unpaid adviser to Trump on regulation, submitted a proposal to Trump last month to change the U.S. Renewable Fuel Standard by shifting the burden of blending biofuels into gasoline away from oil refining companies, and further down the supply chain to marketers. Public Citizen said that, because Icahn owns a controlling stake in a refinery that could benefit from the proposed change, he may have been required by a 1995 lobbying disclosure law to disclose his discussions with Trump on the subject as lobbying. The group said it has made its request for a probe in a letter sent to Congress on Wednesday morning. "All of this has occurred with no record of any (Lobbying Disclosure Act) filings by or on behalf of Mr. Icahn," Public Citizen said in a copy of the letter provided to Reuters. Icahn did not respond to Reuters requests for comment but described the complaint in an opinion piece on The Hill website as a "gross misstatement of the facts" and said he had vetted his activities with lawyers.

U.S. shale plots production growth despite OPEC's warning

U.S. shale oil producers are plotting ambitious production growth outside the red-hot Permian Basin in Texas, widening a resurgence that could confound OPEC's strategy to tighten global supplies. As shale firms rebound from a two-year price war with OPEC, many are planning to expand production in North Dakota, Oklahoma and other shale regions. The Permian - America's largest oilfield - has already seen output jump in the past six months. Hess Corp, Chesapeake Energy Corp, Continental Resources Inc and other firms detailed their growth plans at an energy conference in Houston this week. The projects they outlined would result in a steady supply of American crude exports through the next decade. Rising U.S. energy clout has frustrated efforts by the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries to control global oil prices through a production curb announced last fall - its first in eight years. The rise in U.S. output was enough to boost domestic crude stockpiles last week by 8.2 million barrels, more than quadruple estimates from analysts polled by Reuters.

The Hill

Watchdog: Trump ally Carl Icahn violating lobbying rules
A watchdog group is formally accusing billionaire investor Carl Icahn, an ally and special adviser to President Trump, of improperly lobbying while not officially registered to do so. Public Citizen’s Wednesday complaint to Senate and House officials cites Icahn’s role in advocating for a change to the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) ethanol mandate, which would benefit a fuel refining company that he owns. Trump named Icahn in December as a special adviser on regulatory policy, an unpaid position. Icahn owns Icahn Enterprises, which is the majority shareholder of CVR Energy, a fuel refiner that has to pay for ethanol blending credits. Icahn has pushed for a change in EPA policy to make fuel wholesalers responsible for complying with the ethanol rules. The Trump administration is considering an executive order to implement that change, which Icahn has said would save his company hundreds of millions of dollars.

“The factual record shows that Mr. Icahn played a leading role shaping the Trump campaign’s position on the point of obligation for the [renewable fuel standard], and served to ‘vet’ candidates to run the EPA, the agency in charge of administering the RFS,” Public Citizen, a left-leaning consumer advocacy organization, wrote in its complaint.

Dems push Trump to keep Obama-era car emissions standards

Senate Democrats are pushing the Trump administration to preserve the strict car emissions standards set under former President Obama. The 12 Democrats, led by Sen. Ed Markey (Mass.), sent a letter to Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) head Scott Pruitt on Tuesday, days after the New York Times and other outlets reported that Pruitt will act as soon as this week to start weakening the greenhouse gas emissions standards. “These automobile emissions standards are economically feasible and technologically achievable for the auto industry,” the senators wrote, citing the EPA’s decision at the end of the Obama administration to maintain the rules for the 2022 to 2025 model years, despite auto industry pleas. “They will enhance our national security by reducing our consumption of foreign oil. They will benefit consumers, saving them billions of dollars at the pump and reduce our carbon pollution. It is critical that they remain in place.”

Markey, who helped write the 2007 law the led to the standards, said that the rules helped the domestic auto industry recover from the recession, while reducing dependence on foreign oil.

Wired

Want to Gut Emission Rules? Prepare for War With California

IN ITS ONGOING jihad against federal regulations, the Trump administration has indicated some interest in targeting the ones that attempt to fight climate change. First in its sights: a funky law that gives the state of California the right to make its own rules on automotive emissions. But because of the way laws and business work, the California exemption is one of the most powerful environmental tools in the world. So California’s not going down without a fight.
quick history lesson: When legislators wrote the 1963 Clean Air Act, they acknowledged that California already had pollution-fighting rules, and that its environmental situation was especially dire. So they gave the state the right to write its own, stricter standards. “It’s hard to overstate how important the ability for California to set its standards has been to public health and clean air over the past 40 years,” says Don Anair, deputy director for the clean vehicles program at the Union of Concerned Scientists. “Time and again, California’s been willing and able to move forward.” From unleaded gasoline to catalytic converters to counting carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions in vehicle standards, the Golden State has played a key role. That’s because, as Therese Langer, transportation program director at the American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy, puts it, “California doesn’t just mean California.” Even though California is the only state that can write its own rules, under Section 177 of the Clean Air Act, any state looking for more than the federal package of regulations can opt to follow California’s auto standards.

**Heavy Duty Trucking**

**For-Hire Freight Movements Remain Steady**

While the amount of freight moved by the nation’s for-hire transportation sector was unchanged in January from December, according to a new Transportation Department report, it did manage a slight increase from the same time a year ago. Freight Transportation Services Index (TSI) remained at 123.2, but that’s up 0.8% from January 2016, and just 1.6% below the all-time high level of 125.2 hit in July 2016. The December index was revised to 123.2 from 124.7 in last month’s release as a result of fewer actual air freight ton-miles than forecast. The Freight TSI measures the month-to-month changes in for-hire freight shipments by mode of transportation in tons and ton-miles, which are combined into one index. The index measures the output for-hire trucking, rail, inland waterways, pipelines and air freight. In January, there were increases in air freight, water, and rail carloads, while trucking, pipeline, and rail intermodal declined. The January steadiness in Freight TSI took place against a background of mixed signals in other economic indicators, according to the report, including growth in employment, personal income and manufacturing while housing starts fell by 2.6%.

**International**

**Trucking News**

**Canadian equipment prices to rise with emission rules**

OTTAWA, ON – The federal government has published its plans for new Greenhouse Gas limits that will apply to 2018-29 Model Year equipment, effectively mirroring changes introduced by
the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The required upgrades will cost Canada’s trucking industry an extra $4.1 billion, but save $10.3 billion in fuel, according to the Department of the Environment. When considering the overall lifespan of the affected vehicles, net benefits are expected to reach $8.8 billion between 2018 and 2050. The upgrades are projected to add 8% to the cost of a typical 2027 Model Year tractor, or $11,322. Vocational vehicles in the same model year will cost an extra 4%, or $4,369. Trailers – introduced in emissions standards for the first time beginning with the 2018 Model Year – will see an average 4% price bump on 2027 models. That will be up $1,237. Heavy-duty pickup trucks and vans, meanwhile, will see price tags increase an average of 3% or $1,324 per vehicle. For tractors the changes are expected to involve technologies like improvements in engine efficiency, aerodynamics, weights, idle-reducing tools, predictive cruise control, speed limiters, low-friction lubricants, electric and high-efficiency accessories, and efficient drivelines, axles and transmissions. Changes that involve tires alone could include the introduction of models with lower rolling resistances, tire pressure monitoring systems, and automatic tire inflation systems. Trailers are expected to see some of the same tire-related changes, as well as aerodynamic enhancements including side skirts, underbody and rear fairings, and gap reducers. Lightweight components are expected to be needed, too.

David Richards
ORISE Research Participant
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
US Environmental Protection Agency

ph. 202.564.4964
To: Charmley, William [charmley.william@epa.gov]
Cc: Manning, Bryan [manning.bryan@epa.gov]; Audette, Lucie [audette.lucie@epa.gov]
From: Samulski, Michael
Subject: Re: OTAQ Daily News Brief - article on ICAO

It would be the US ambassador to ICAO. This is a Senate confirmed position

The last we heard it was Michael Lawson who was a lawyer working for airports

We will check to see if he is still in this position and was at the Council meeting

Mike

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 8, 2017, at 10:18 AM, Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov> wrote:

Matt and Bryan –

Do we know who represented the United States at the ICAO Council meeting that just happened? Was it someone from FAA?

Thanks

Bill
Aviation International News

ICAO Council Adopts New Aircraft CO2 Emissions Standard

The council of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) adopted a new carbon dioxide emissions standard for aircraft, the first such design certification standard among world industry sectors, the organization announced on March 6. Approval by the 36-nation council codifies recommendations made by a committee of experts in February 2016. The standard applies to new aircraft type designs as of 2020 and to designs already in production as of 2023. Aircraft that are already in production must meet the standard by 2028 or be sufficiently modified, ICAO said. It is contained in a new Volume III to Annex 16 of the Chicago Convention that created the United Nations aviation body. Boeing in a statement said that it is “fully committed to meeting the new standard and will put our resources to work to ensure that our products meet the standard as well as customer requirements.” The U.S. manufacturer noted that current-production 787 and 737 Max airliners were designed to meet or exceed emissions requirements. The 777X, which Boeing expects to begin delivering in 2020, will be the world’s largest and most fuel-efficient twin-engine jet, it declared.

From: Richards, David
Sent: Wednesday, March 08, 2017 9:48 AM
To: Acevedo, Frank <acevedo.francisco@epa.gov>; Adams, Elizabeth <Adams.Elizabeth@epa.gov>; Alson, Jeff <alson.jeff@epa.gov>; Argyropoulos, Paul <Argyropoulos.Paul@epa.gov>; Audette, Lucie <audette.lucie@epa.gov>; Barba, Daniel <Barba.Daniel@epa.gov>; Beardslee, Renee <Beardslee.Renee@epa.gov>; Beardsley, Megan <Beardsley.Megan@epa.gov>; Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>; Bizer-Cox, Daniel <Bizer-Cox.Daniel@epa.gov>; Blubaugh, Jim <Blubaugh.Jim@epa.gov>; Bradish, Tracey <bradish.tracey@epa.gov>; Brusstar, Matt <brusstar.matt@epa.gov>; Bunker, Byron <bunker.byron@epa.gov>; Burch, Julia <Burch.Julia@epa.gov>; Bynum, Cheryl <bynum.cheryl@epa.gov>; Caldwell, Amy <caldwell.amy@epa.gov>; Charmley,
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Detroit News

**Senators call on EPA not to roll back mpg standards**

Washington — Eleven Democratic senators on Tuesday called on the Environmental Protection Agency not to roll back federal fuel-economy standards for cars and trucks, arguing the move would harm consumers and lead to costly litigation. The EPA and U.S. Department of Transportation under President Donald Trump are expected as early as this week to reopen the review of greenhouse gas emission standards that require automakers to produce car and truck fleets averaging more than 50 miles per gallon by 2025. Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards ramp up incrementally from the 35-plus miles per gallon required for 2017 models already in showrooms. The fuel-economy standards were supposed to be reviewed in 2018, but after a brief comment period that ended Dec. 30, the EPA pushed through portions of the regulations just days before Trump took office. The Auto Alliance, a trade group which represents automakers including the Detroit Three, has said this “unnecessarily politicized” the midterm review of the emission standards by moving to finalize the regulations ahead of schedule. The senators, led by Ed Markey of Massachusetts, wrote to EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, saying the auto emissions standards are both economically feasible and technologically achievable for the industry, and that they enhance national security by reducing the nation’s reliance on foreign oil.

Aviation International News

**ICAO Council Adopts New Aircraft CO2 Emissions Standard**

The council of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) adopted a new carbon dioxide emissions standard for aircraft, the first such design certification standard among world industry sectors, the organization announced on March 6. Approval by the 36-nation council codifies recommendations made by a committee of experts in February 2016. The standard applies to new aircraft type designs as of 2020 and to designs already in production as of 2023. Aircraft that are already in production must meet the standard by 2028 or be sufficiently modified, ICAO said. It is contained in a new Volume III to Annex 16 of the Chicago Convention that created the United Nations aviation body. Boeing in a statement said that it is “fully committed to meeting the new standard and will put our resources to work to ensure that our products meet the standard as well as customer requirements.” The U.S. manufacturer noted that current-production 787 and 737 Max
airliners were designed to meet or exceed emissions requirements. The 777X, which Boeing expects to begin delivering in 2020, will be the world's largest and most fuel-efficient twin-engine jet, it declared.

**Reuters**

*Autos bosses focus on technology rather than PSA-Opel*

The auto industry is facing seismic changes with the rise of electric vehicles, automated driving and car sharing set to eclipse even big mergers such as PSA's purchase of Opel, executives at the Geneva auto show said. Peugeot maker PSA Group (PEUP.PA) said on Monday it had agreed to buy loss-making Opel from General Motors (GM.N), creating Europe's second-biggest carmaker behind Volkswagen (VOWG_p.DE) and sparking speculation of more consolidation. However, some auto executives gathering in Geneva said the deal was unlikely to alter the landscape on its own, with changing consumer habits and new rivals in Silicon Valley and China all likely to have a much bigger impact on carmakers. "My feeling is that the industry as a whole and brand positioning will change in the next 10 or 15 years, and that comes in addition to traditional consolidation," said Herbert Diess, head of Volkswagen's (VW) passenger car division. "We are really in a transitionary phase for the industry. There are new competitors on the horizon like Tesla or Chinese ventures," Diess told reporters, adding that he did not expect a wave of Opel-style mergers.

**Exxon to invest $20 billion on U.S. Gulf Coast refining projects**

Exxon Mobil Corp (XOM.N), the world's largest publicly traded oil producer, said on Monday it would invest $20 billion through 2022 to expand its chemical and oil refining plants on the U.S. Gulf Coast. The investments at 11 sites should create 35,000 temporary construction jobs and 12,000 permanent jobs, Chief Executive Darren Woods said in a speech at CERAWeek, the world's largest gathering of energy executives. Some of the expansions began in 2013, but the scope of the project is now growing and the timeline extended, Exxon said. Woods ran Exxon's refining division before becoming CEO two months ago, and the new spending benefits a sector with which he has significant experience and comfort. Investments in the high-margin projects should help ease concerns from Wall Street that Exxon's growth potential - especially in oil and gas exploration and production - is sliding. "Exxon Mobil is building a manufacturing powerhouse along the U.S. Gulf Coast," Woods said. "These businesses are leveraging the shale revolution to manufacture cleaner fuels and more energy-efficient plastics."

**White House weighs U.S. biofuels program change, no position yet -official**
The Trump administration is reviewing the possibility of a key change to U.S. biofuels policy requested by oil refiners and Carl Icahn, the billionaire investor and special advisor on regulations to President Donald Trump, a White House official said on Monday. The administration has no position "either way on this issue at this time," the White House official confirmed to Reuters. The statements come after news last week that Icahn had reached out to the White House regarding the change. The debate centers on the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS), a 2005 policy that requires increasing volumes of biofuels to be added to gasoline and diesel each year. Oil refiners including Valero Energy Corp and CVR Energy Inc currently have to show environmental regulators they are meeting those annual mandates, and have urged the government to push this compliance further downstream to fuel blenders and integrated oil companies. Opponents of the change say it will complicate ensuring compliance and that it could threaten the future of the RFS policy that sets the annual requirements for use of biofuels with gasoline and diesel. Confusion over Trump's plans for RFS sparked wild swings in energy and agricultural markets last week. Carl Icahn, who owns a majority stake in CVR, said he had reached out to the White House about the issue.

U.S. to probe some Ford imports of hybrid electric vehicles, parts

The U.S. International Trade Commission said on Tuesday it has launched a patent-infringement investigation into imports of certain hybrid electric vehicles and parts by Ford Motor Co. The probe was sought by Paice LLC and Abell Foundation Inc, both privately owned companies in Baltimore, which allege that the imports infringe their patents, the ITC said in a statement. The two companies are seeking a limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders, it said.

Biofuels Magazine

Renewable Fuels Nebraska opposes ‘any change’ to RFS point of obligation

Renewable Fuels Nebraska, a trade body for the US ethanol industry, has issued a statement stating that it is “strongly opposed to any change in the point of obligation”. The statement follows last week’s news of rumours from the Trump administration that it would remove oil refiner’s obligation to blend ethanol with petro under the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) programme. In response to unconfirmed reports concerning the possibility of a change to the point of obligation under the RFS, RFN executive director Mark Palmer said: “Since its inception in 2005, the RFS has been a pillar of our domestic energy policy. Recently, there have been calls for a change in the RFS by moving the point of obligation. “RFN remains strongly opposed to any change in the Point of Obligation if it would undermine the integrity of that important program. RFN is committed to the RFS because it is good public policy, good for consumers, and good for Nebraska. “The challenge facing
the Nebraska ethanol industry today is access to the consumer. RFN supports measures that would eliminate barriers to the increased sale of E15 and open new markets for domestic renewable fuels.”

Iowa Governor maintains that Trump will support ethanol producers

Iowa Governor Terry Branstad has said that he has been assured President Donald Trump’s administration will support producers of ethanol and biodiesel fuels, according to media reports. According to the Des Moines Reporter, Branstad was aware of reports to change the point of obligation in relation to the Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS). "I know the rumors and I can tell you who was involved, and I can tell you they are not true," Branstad told reporters, according to a report in the Des Moines Reporter. He added that he has talked with his son, Eric Branstad, who works in the Trump administration, and that his son told him that “this is not going to happen.” The news follows an announcement last week by trade body Fuels America cutting its ties with counterpart Renewable Fuels Association (RFA) after it discovered that a Trump official had told the RFA that Trump would sign an executive order shifting the burden for blending ethanol and biodiesel into the nation’s fuel supply from oil refiners to fuel retailers. The Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) would be maintained, but responsibility for compliance would be shifted from refiners to fuel blenders, the RFA was told. The move, critics said, would hurt Iowa farmers and consumers by hindering the widespread use of ethanol and biodiesel. The White House subsequently distanced itself from the reports. Branstad said he shared concerns about a possible shift of responsibility for blending biofuels to retailers. The agreement allegedly involved the Renewable Fuels Association and Trump adviser Carl Icahn, a billionaire investor in CVR Refining, a Texas energy company.

Chicago Tribune

Bowing to auto industry pressure, Trump to reconsider emissions standards, says source

The Trump administration plans to open the door to a possible reconsideration of greenhouse gas emission standards for cars and light trucks that has been sought by automakers, according to a person familiar with the plans. The Environmental Protection Agency in the final days of the Obama administration decided to lock in the emissions standards through 2025 that had been negotiated with the industry in 2011. That decision will be withdrawn for reconsideration as early as next week, said the person, who would only discuss the plans on the condition of anonymity because they have not been made public. An EPA spokeswoman declined to comment. It will be one of a series of actions taken by the Trump administration recently to reconsider or reverse Obama-era regulations opposed by industry.
Forbes

Seeking Survival, Coal Industry Wants To Be Part Of The Low-Carbon Economy

During President Trump’s address to the nation, he explained that his administration would remove regulations -- including those tied to the coal industry -- to create an economic expansion. But even the coal sector realizes that its future may be more closely linked to investments in low-carbon technologies. Now the coal operators are pushing for public incentives to motivate new capital to flow into ultra-efficient plants and those that are able to capture carbon releases. The result, they say, will produce power plants as clean as today's natural gas units -- a roughly 45% efficiency rate, which is greater than the current 33% figure and which means fewer emissions on the backend. That's a position generally endorsed by former Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz, who served under President Obama. “The coal industry must build, own and operate these new plants. ...,” Moniz said last fall before the Energy Innovation Forum. “Getting the tax credits ... would be a very, very big deal. Having the tax credits in place and the trajectory for carbon reductions, in my view, is what the investment community needs.”

LA Times

California won't meet its climate change goals without a lot more housing density in its cities

To meet the bold new climate change goals put in place last year, California will work to put millions of electric cars on the road, revolutionize its dairy industry and generate half of all power from solar panels and other renewable sources. But those efforts will come up short, warn state regulators, without dramatic changes to how Californians live and travel. The state has pledged to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030. To do so, Southern Californians will have to drive nearly 12% less by that date than they did five years ago, cutting their miles on the road every day from 22.8 to 20.2, according a Los Angeles Times estimate based on data from state and regional climate and planning officials. These driving reductions mean that Californians will have to walk, bike and use mass transit much more frequently than they do now. By 2030, residents will have to travel by foot four times more frequently than they did in 2012, alongside a nine-fold increase in bicycling over the same time, and a substantial boost in bus and rail ridership, climate officials say.

Green Car Reports

New York state electric-car rebate program to launch this month
New York state has finally issued details on its effort to step up its efforts to promote electric cars. The Empire State is one of eight so-called "ZEV states" that have adopted California emissions standards. But New York does not mandate automakers to sell zero-emission vehicles within its borders, and currently does not offer purchase incentives to consumers. That will change within this month, as legislators plan to launch an electric-car rebate program, according to the Associated Press. The program, which officials hope to launch by April 1, will offer a $2,000 rebate for the purchase of a new battery-electric car or plug-in hybrid. Rebates are also nominally available for hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles, although no such cars are sold in New York state at this time.

Associated Press

Cuomo: NY to Install More Electric Vehicle Charging Stations

ALBANY, N.Y. (AP) — New York state is embarking on a campaign to install 450 new charging stations for electric vehicles. Gov. Andrew Cuomo announced the effort on Monday. The new charging stations will be located in Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Albany, the Hudson Valley, Westchester County, New York City and Long Island. Cars, trucks and other transportation vehicles are the largest contributor to climate change in the state. The Democratic governor says the addition of new charging stations will encourage the use of electric vehicles and help the state reduce its overall carbon emissions. The effort also includes public outreach campaigns including public test drives of electric vehicles and incentives for businesses that buy electric vehicles or install charging stations.

International

Bloomberg

London's Toxic Smog Triggers Business Action Against Illegal Air

London’s toxic air is bad for business. That’s the conclusion of commercial groups making their own plans to fight pollution for fear the government’s failure to tackle emissions levels that break legal limits is driving customers and workers away. At least 15 of the city’s 42 so-called business improvement districts, which were established a decade ago to fight urban grime and crime, are implementing programs to protect the environment. After a raft of studies linking dangerous levels of pollution to ill health and impaired fetal brain development, business groups are looking at the cost to companies. From the swanky shops along Regent Street to transport hubs in King’s Cross and London Bridge, they’re installing monitors, paying for green spaces and limiting truck deliveries to rein in smog. With Prime Minister Theresa May’s government focused on withdrawing Britain from the European
Union, local authorities including London Mayor Sadiq Khan have been left on their own to work on air quality. Those issues are draining 20 billion pounds ($24 billion) a year from the economy, according to a study by the Royal College of Physicians.

**Platts**

**EU biomass rules 'fail to account' for GHG emissions**

London, 23 February (Argus) — New EU rules fail to account for emissions for biomass combustion properly and risk creating perverse incentives to burn the fuel, according to a report from UK-based policy institute Chatham House. Under European Commission proposals biomass emissions will continue to be zero-rated at the point of combustion after 2021 and therefore are not included either in UK carbon budgets or the EU emissions trading scheme (ETS). The commission has sought to justify this by accounting for biomass emissions within the land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) sector, assuming that as long as enough trees are planted to replace those that are used to make the fuel feedstock, biomass combustion can be accounted for as being carbon neutral. But there are a number of problems with this approach, according to the Chatham House report entitled: "Woody Biomass for Power and Heat: Impacts on the Global Climate." The biggest is the lack of proper accounting rules and forest management practices in the regions producing the most biomass. The US, Canada, and Russia, all significant exporters of woody biomass, do not adequately account for emissions in the LULUCF sector as they are not parties to the Kyoto Protocol, raising the prospect that not enough trees are being planted to replaced felled ones, or that they are being planted over too long a time period.

**Forbes**

**Electric Cars For The Masses Go Missing In Geneva, But They Are Coming**

GENEVA, Switzerland — Visitors to the annual car show here might wonder where all the new electric cars are hiding, but they can save their energy; there aren’t any new ones, at least not any affordable ones. There are a few examples of expensive electric playthings, and concept cars which drive themselves, but that’s another revolution waiting in the wings for the technology to catch up. At the last big European car show in Paris last October, the new Opel Ampera e (European version of the Chevy Bolt) and longer range Renault Zoe were leading the new wave of battery-only new cars for the masses. Late last year investment banker Morgan Stanley revised its estimate for electric car sales up to between 10 and 15% of the global market by 2025, to what it said were more than three times the current average of expectations. The current global level is less than 2%, but sales still refuse to embrace the brave new world expected by experts.
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Detroit News

Senators call on EPA not to roll back mpg standards

Washington — Eleven Democratic senators on Tuesday called on the Environmental Protection Agency not to roll back federal fuel-economy standards for cars and trucks, arguing the move would harm consumers and lead to costly litigation. The EPA and U.S. Department of Transportation under President Donald Trump are expected as early as this week to reopen the review of greenhouse gas emission standards that require automakers to produce car and truck fleets averaging more than 50 miles per gallon by 2025. Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards ramp up incrementally from the 35-plus miles per gallon required for 2017 models already in showrooms. The fuel-economy standards were supposed to be reviewed in 2018, but after a brief comment period that ended Dec. 30, the EPA pushed through portions of the regulations just days before Trump took office. The Auto Alliance, a trade group which represents automakers including the Detroit Three, has said this “unnecessarily politicized” the midterm review of the emission standards by moving to finalize the regulations ahead of schedule. The senators, led by Ed Markey of Massachusetts, wrote to EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, saying the auto emissions standards are both economically feasible and technologically achievable for the industry, and that they enhance national security by reducing the nation’s reliance on foreign oil.

Aviation International News

ICAO Council Adopts New Aircraft CO2 Emissions Standard

The council of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) adopted a new carbon dioxide emissions standard for aircraft, the first such design certification standard among world industry sectors, the organization announced on March 6. Approval by the 36-nation council codifies recommendations made by a committee of experts in February 2016. The standard applies to new aircraft type designs as of 2020 and to designs already in production as of 2023. Aircraft that are already in production must meet the standard by 2028 or be sufficiently modified, ICAO said. It is contained in a new Volume III to Annex 16 of the Chicago Convention that created the United Nations aviation body. Boeing in a statement said that it is “fully committed to meeting the new standard and will put our resources to work to ensure that our products meet the standard as well as customer requirements.” The U.S. manufacturer noted that current-production 787 and 737 Max airliners were designed to meet or exceed emissions requirements. The 777X, which Boeing expects to begin delivering in 2020, will be the world’s
largest and most fuel-efficient twin-engine jet, it declared.

**Reuters**

*Autos bosses focus on technology rather than PSA-Opel*

The auto industry is facing seismic changes with the rise of electric vehicles, automated driving and car sharing set to eclipse even big mergers such as PSA’s purchase of Opel, executives at the Geneva auto show said. Peugeot maker PSA Group (PEUP.PA) said on Monday it had agreed to buy loss-making Opel from General Motors (GM.N), creating Europe's second-biggest carmaker behind Volkswagen (VOWG_p.DE) and sparking speculation of more consolidation. However, some auto executives gathering in Geneva said the deal was unlikely to alter the landscape on its own, with changing consumer habits and new rivals in Silicon Valley and China all likely to have a much bigger impact on carmakers. "My feeling is that the industry as a whole and brand positioning will change in the next 10 or 15 years, and that comes in addition to traditional consolidation," said Herbert Diess, head of Volkswagen's (VW) passenger car division. "We are really in a transitional phase for the industry. There are new competitors on the horizon like Tesla or Chinese ventures," Diess told reporters, adding that he did not expect a wave of Opel-style mergers.

**Exxon to invest $20 billion on U.S. Gulf Coast refining projects**

Exxon Mobil Corp (XOM.N), the world's largest publicly traded oil producer, said on Monday it would invest $20 billion through 2022 to expand its chemical and oil refining plants on the U.S. Gulf Coast. The investments at 11 sites should create 35,000 temporary construction jobs and 12,000 permanent jobs, Chief Executive Darren Woods said in a speech at CERAWeek, the world's largest gathering of energy executives. Some of the expansions began in 2013, but the scope of the project is now growing and the timeline extended, Exxon said. Woods ran Exxon's refining division before becoming CEO two months ago, and the new spending benefits a sector with which he has significant experience and comfort. Investments in the high-margin projects should help ease concerns from Wall Street that Exxon's growth potential - especially in oil and gas exploration and production - is sliding. "Exxon Mobil is building a manufacturing powerhouse along the U.S. Gulf Coast," Woods said. "These businesses are leveraging the shale revolution to manufacture cleaner fuels and more energy-efficient plastics."

**White House weighs U.S. biofuels program change, no position yet -official**

The Trump administration is reviewing the possibility of a key change to U.S. biofuels policy requested by oil refiners and Carl Icahn, the billionaire investor and special advisor on regulations to President Donald Trump, a White House official said on Monday. The
administration has no position "either way on this issue at this time," the White House official confirmed to Reuters. The statements come after news last week that Icahn had reached out to the White House regarding the change. The debate centers on the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS), a 2005 policy that requires increasing volumes of biofuels to be added to gasoline and diesel each year. Oil refiners including Valero Energy Corp and CVR Energy Inc currently have to show environmental regulators they are meeting those annual mandates, and have urged the government to push this compliance further downstream to fuel blenders and integrated oil companies. Opponents of the change say it will complicate ensuring compliance and that it could threaten the future of the RFS policy that sets the annual requirements for use of biofuels with gasoline and diesel. Confusion over Trump's plans for RFS sparked wild swings in energy and agricultural markets last week. Carl Icahn, who owns a majority stake in CVR, said he had reached out to the White House about the issue.

U.S. to probe some Ford imports of hybrid electric vehicles, parts

The U.S. International Trade Commission said on Tuesday it has launched a patent-infringement investigation into imports of certain hybrid electric vehicles and parts by Ford Motor Co. The probe was sought by Paice I.I.C and Abell Foundation Inc, both privately owned companies in Baltimore, which allege that the imports infringe their patents, the ITC said in a statement. The two companies are seeking a limited exclusion order and cease and desist orders, it said.

Biofuels Magazine

Renewable Fuels Nebraska opposes 'any change' to RFS point of obligation

Renewable Fuels Nebraska, a trade body for the US ethanol industry, has issued a statement stating that it is "strongly opposed to any change in the point of obligation". The statement follows last week's news of rumours from the Trump administration that it would remove oil refiner's obligation to blend ethanol with petro under the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) programme. In response to unconfirmed reports concerning the possibility of a change to the point of obligation under the RFS, RFN executive director Mark Palmer said: "Since its inception in 2005, the RFS has been a pillar of our domestic energy policy. Recently, there have been calls for a change in the RFS by moving the point of obligation. "RFN remains strongly opposed to any change in the Point of Obligation if it would undermine the integrity of that important program. RFN is committed to the RFS because it is good public policy, good for consumers, and good for Nebraska. “The challenge facing the Nebraska ethanol industry today is access to the consumer. RFN supports measures that would eliminate barriers to the increased sale of E15 and open new markets for domestic renewable fuels.”

Iowa Governor maintains that Trump will support ethanol producers
Iowa Governor Terry Branstad has said that he has been assured President Donald Trump’s administration will support producers of ethanol and biodiesel fuels, according to media reports. According to the Des Moines Register, Branstad was aware of reports to change the point of obligation in relation to the Renewable Fuels Standard (RFS). “I know the rumors and I can tell you who was involved, and I can tell you they are not true,” Branstad told reporters, according to a report in the Des Moines Register. He added that he has talked with his son, Eric Branstad, who works in the Trump administration, and that his son told him that “his is not going to happen.” The news follows an announcement last week by trade body Fuels America cutting its ties with counterpart Renewable Fuels Association (RFA) after it discovered that a Trump official had told the RFA that Trump would sign an executive order shifting the burden for blending ethanol and biodiesel into the nation’s fuel supply from oil refiners to fuel retailers. The Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) would be maintained, but responsibility for compliance would be shifted from refiners to fuel blenders, the RFA was told. The move, critics said, would hurt Iowa farmers and consumers by hindering the widespread use of ethanol and biodiesel. The White House subsequently distanced itself from the reports. Branstad said he shared concerns about a possible shift of responsibility for blending biofuels to retailers. The agreement allegedly involved the Renewable Fuels Association and Trump adviser Carl Icahn, a billionaire investor in CVR Refining, a Texas energy company.

**Chicago Tribune**

**Bowing to auto industry pressure, Trump to reconsider emissions standards, says source**

The Trump administration plans to open the door to a possible reconsideration of greenhouse gas emission standards for cars and light trucks that has been sought by automakers, according to a person familiar with the plans. The Environmental Protection Agency in the final days of the Obama administration decided to lock in the emissions standards through 2025 that had been negotiated with the industry in 2011. That decision will be withdrawn for reconsideration as early as next week, said the person, who would only discuss the plans on the condition of anonymity because they have not been made public. An EPA spokeswoman declined to comment. It will be one of a series of actions taken by the Trump administration recently to reconsider or reverse Obama-era regulations opposed by industry.

**Forbes**

**Seeking Survival, Coal Industry Wants To Be Part Of The Low-Carbon Economy**

During President Trump’s address to the nation, he explained that his administration would remove regulations -- including those tied to the coal industry -- to create an economic expansion. But even the coal sector realizes that its future may be more closely linked to investments in low-carbon technologies. Now the coal operators are pushing for public
incentives to motivate new capital to flow into ultra-efficient plants and those that are able to capture carbon releases. The result, they say, will produce power plants as clean as today's natural gas units -- a roughly 45% efficiency rate, which is greater than the current 33% figure and which means fewer emissions on the backend. That's a position generally endorsed by former Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz, who served under President Obama. “The coal industry must build, own and operate these new plants. …,” Moniz said last fall before the Energy Innovation Forum. “Getting the tax credits … would be a very, very big deal. Having the tax credits in place and the trajectory for carbon reductions, in my view, is what the investment community needs.”

**LA Times**

*California won't meet its climate change goals without a lot more housing density in its cities*

To meet the bold new climate change goals put in place last year, California will work to put millions of electric cars on the road, revolutionize its dairy industry and generate half of all power from solar panels and other renewable sources. But those efforts will come up short, warn state regulators, without dramatic changes to how Californians live and travel. The state has pledged to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030. To do so, Southern Californians will have to drive nearly 12% less by that date than they did five years ago, cutting their miles on the road every day from 22.8 to 20.2, according a Los Angeles Times estimate based on data from state and regional climate and planning officials. These driving reductions mean that Californians will have to walk, bike and use mass transit much more frequently than they do now. By 2030, residents will have to travel by foot four times more frequently than they did in 2012, alongside a nine-fold increase in bicycling over the same time, and a substantial boost in bus and rail ridership, climate officials say.

**Green Car Reports**

*New York state electric-car rebate program to launch this month*

New York state has finally issued details on its effort to step up its efforts to promote electric cars. The Empire State is one of eight so-called "ZEV states" that have adopted California emissions standards. But New York does not mandate automakers to sell zero-emission vehicles within its borders, and currently does not offer purchase incentives to consumers. That will change within this month, as legislators plan to launch an electric-car rebate program, according to the Associated Press. The program, which officials hope to launch by April 1, will offer a $2,000 rebate for the purchase of a new battery-electric car or plug-in hybrid. Rebates are also nominally available for hydrogen fuel-cell vehicles, although no such cars are sold in New York state at this time.
Associated Press

Cuomo: NY to Install More Electric Vehicle Charging Stations

ALBANY, N.Y. (AP) — New York state is embarking on a campaign to install 450 new charging stations for electric vehicles. Gov. Andrew Cuomo announced the effort on Monday. The new charging stations will be located in Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, Albany, the Hudson Valley, Westchester County, New York City and Long Island. Cars, trucks and other transportation vehicles are the largest contributor to climate change in the state. The Democratic governor says the addition of new charging stations will encourage the use of electric vehicles and help the state reduce its overall carbon emissions. The effort also includes public outreach campaigns including public test drives of electric vehicles and incentives for businesses that buy electric vehicles or install charging stations.

International

Bloomberg

London’s Toxic Smog Triggers Business Action Against Illegal Air

London’s toxic air is bad for business. That’s the conclusion of commercial groups making their own plans to fight pollution for fear the government’s failure to tackle emissions levels that break legal limits is driving customers and workers away. At least 15 of the city’s 42 so-called business improvement districts, which were established a decade ago to fight urban grime and crime, are implementing programs to protect the environment. After a raft of studies linking dangerous levels of pollution to ill health and impaired fetal brain development, business groups are looking at the cost to companies. From the swanky shops along Regent Street to transport hubs in King’s Cross and London Bridge, they’re installing monitors, paying for green spaces and limiting truck deliveries to rein in smog. With Prime Minister Theresa May’s government focused on withdrawing Britain from the European Union, local authorities including London Mayor Sadiq Khan have been left on their own to work on air quality. Those issues are draining 20 billion pounds ($24 billion) a year from the economy, according to a study by the Royal College of Physicians.

Platts

EU biomass rules ‘fail to account’ for GHG emissions

London, 23 February (Argus) — New EU rules fail to account for emissions for biomass
combustion properly and risk creating perverse incentives to burn the fuel, according to a report from UK-based policy institute Chatham House. Under European Commission proposals biomass emissions will continue to be zero-rated at the point of combustion after 2021 and therefore are not included either in UK carbon budgets or the EU emissions trading scheme (ETS). The commission has sought to justify this by accounting for biomass emissions within the land use, land-use change and forestry (LULUCF) sector, assuming that as long as enough trees are planted to replace those that are used to make the fuel feedstock, biomass combustion can be accounted for as being carbon neutral. But there are a number of problems with this approach, according to the Chatham House report entitled: "Woody Biomass for Power and Heat: Impacts on the Global Climate." The biggest is the lack of proper accounting rules and forest management practices in the regions producing the most biomass. The US, Canada, and Russia, all significant exporters of woody biomass, do not adequately account for emissions in the LULUCF sector as they are not parties to the Kyoto Protocol, raising the prospect that not enough trees are being planted to replaced felled ones, or that they are being planted over too long a time period.

**Forbes**

**Electric Cars For The Masses Go Missing In Geneva, But They Are Coming**

GENEVA, Switzerland – Visitors to the annual car show here might wonder where all the new electric cars are hiding, but they can save their energy; there aren’t any new ones, at least not any affordable ones. There are a few examples of expensive electric playthings, and concept cars which drive themselves, but that’s another revolution waiting in the wings for the technology to catch up. At the last big European car show in Paris last October, the new Opel Ampera-e (European version of the Chevy Bolt) and longer range Renault Zoe were leading the new wave of battery-only new cars for the masses. Late last year investment banker Morgan Stanley revised its estimate for electric car sales up to between 10 and 15% of the global market by 2025, to what it said were more than three times the current average of expectations. The current global level is less than 2%, but sales still refuse to embrace the brave new world expected by experts.

David Richards
ORISE Research Participant
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
US Environmental Protection Agency

ph. 202.564.4964
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 3, 2017, at 4:04 PM, Grundler, Christopher <grundler.christopher@epa.gov> wrote:

Christopher Grundler, Director
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202/564-1682 (Washington DC)
734/214-4207 (Ann Arbor MI)

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Dunham, Sarah" <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>
Date: March 3, 2017 at 3:57:02 PM EST
To: "Schnare, David" <schnare.david@epa.gov>, "Minoli, Kevin" <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>
Cc: "Schmidt, Lorie" <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>, "Orlin, David" <Orlin.David@epa.gov>, "Schwab, Justin" <schwab.justin@epa.gov>, "Jackson, Ryan" <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
From: Schnare, David  
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 7:22 AM  
To: Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>  
Cc: Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>; Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>; Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>  
Subject: RE: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Sarah:

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

dschnare

From: Dunham, Sarah  
Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2017 8:34 PM  
To: Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>  
Cc: Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>; Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>; Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>; Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>  
Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Kevin, David, Ryan-

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
Ex. 5 - Attorney Client
Appendix:

**EPA's regulation governing the Mid-Term Evaluation:**

40 CFR 86.1818-12(h)

(h) *Mid-term evaluation of standards.* No later than April 1, 2018, the Administrator shall determine whether the standards established in paragraph (c) of this section for the 2022 through 2025 model years are appropriate under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act, in light of the record then before the Administrator. An opportunity for public comment shall be provided before making such determination. If the Administrator determines they are not appropriate, the Administrator shall initiate a rulemaking to revise the standards, to be either more or less stringent as appropriate.

(1) In making the determination required by this paragraph (h), the Administrator shall consider the information available on the factors relevant to setting greenhouse gas emission standards under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act for model years 2022 through 2025, including but not limited to:

(i) The availability and effectiveness of technology, and the appropriate lead time
for introduction of technology;

(ii) The cost on the producers or purchasers of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines;

(iii) The feasibility and practicability of the standards;

(iv) The impact of the standards on reduction of emissions, oil conservation, energy security, and fuel savings by consumers;

(v) The impact of the standards on the automobile industry;

(vi) The impacts of the standards on automobile safety;

(vii) The impact of the greenhouse gas emission standards on the Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards and a national harmonized program; and

(viii) The impact of the standards on other relevant factors.

(2) The Administrator shall make the determination required by this paragraph (h) based upon a record that includes the following:

(i) A draft Technical Assessment Report addressing issues relevant to the standard for the 2022 through 2025 model years;

(ii) Public comment on the draft Technical Assessment Report;

(iii) Public comment on whether the standards established for the 2022 through 2025 model years are appropriate under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act; and

(iv) Such other materials the Administrator deems appropriate.

(3) No later than November 15, 2017, the Administrator shall issue a draft Technical Assessment Report addressing issues relevant to the standards for the 2022 through 2025 model years.

(4) The Administrator will set forth in detail the bases for the determination required by this paragraph (h), including the Administrator's assessment of each of the factors listed in paragraph (h)(1) of this section.
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From: "Schnare, David" <schnare.david@epa.gov>
Date: March 2, 2017 at 7:12:19 AM EST
To: "Minoli, Kevin" <Minoli.Kevin@cpa.gov>, "Schmidt, Loric" <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Kevin:

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

dschnare

From: Schnare, David
Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2017 5:29 AM
To: Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO
Cc: Smith, Loren (OST) <Loren-Smith@dot.gov>; Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>; Smith, Ja'Ron K. EOP/WHO
                                 McCown, Brigham (OST)
                                 <brigham.mccown@dot.gov>; Fiorentino, Marty (OST)
                                 <marty.fiorentino@dot.gov>; Fulton, Finch (OST)
                                 <Finch.Fulton@dot.gov>; Pugliese, Anthony (OST)
                                 <anthony.Pugliese@dot.gov>; Moran, John S. EOP/WHO
Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

dschnare

Sent from my iPhone


Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy wrote:

Can the group do a call at 9:30 tomorrow?

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2017, at 11:55 PM, Smith, Loren (OST)

<Loren.Smith@dot.gov> wrote:
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Loren Smith
USDOT
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

From: Smith, Loren (OST)
[mailto:Loren.Smith@dot.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 1, 2017 7:35 PM
To: Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>
Cc: Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO
   Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>
   Smith, Ja'Ron K. EOP/WHO
   McCown, Brigham (OST) <brigham.mccown@dot.gov>
   Fiorentino, Marty (OST) <marty.fiorentino@dot.gov>
   Fulton, Finch (OST) <Finch.Fulton@dot.gov>
   Pugliese, Anthony (OST) <anthony.Pugliese@dot.gov>
Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2017, at 7:14 PM, Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2017, at 7:11 PM, Catanzaro, Michael J.
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

From: Smith, Loren (OST)  
[mailto:Loren.Smith@dot.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2017 6:02 PM  
To: Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>; jackson.ryan@epa.gov; Smith, Ja'Ron K.  
Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO  
L._Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy  
McCown, Brigham (OST) <brigham.mccown@dot.gov>; Fiorentino, Marty (OST) <marty.fiorentino@dot.gov>; Fulton, Finch (OST) <Finch.Fulton@dot.gov>  
Subject: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice  
Importance: High  

We look forward to your comments.

+++  
Loren Smith  
U.S. Department of Transportation  

ED_001220_00000464-00012
West Building – W85-115

loren.smith@dot.gov

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

<MTE reg.docx>
Thanks all

Nancy Grantham
Office of Public Affairs
US Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-6879 (desk)
202-253-7056 (mobile)
Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

David Orlin
U.S. EPA, Office of General Counsel
(202) 564-1222

From: Hengst, Benjamin
Hi Kevin. Yes, Bill Charmley will be working with David on this. We will get back to folks.

Ben

Can I suggest that the OAR folks please work with David so we can send OPA a set both offices are comfortable with? Thanks! Kevin

Kevin S. Minoli

Acting General Counsel

Office of General Counsel

US Environmental Protection Agency

Main Office Line: 202-564-8040

From: Millett, John
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

From: Minoli, Kevin
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 11:59 AM
To: Grantham, Nancy
Cc: Dunham, Sarah; Schmidt, Lorie; Srinivasan, Gautam; Orlin, David
Subject: RE: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

Kevin S. Minoli
Acting General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
US Environmental Protection Agency
Main Office Line: 202-564-8040

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 11:38 AM
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Kevin – will send you the source document next.

Thanks ng

Nancy Grantham
Office of Public Affairs
US Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-6879 (desk)
202-253-7056 (mobile)
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
Ex. 5 - Attorney Client
Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

David Orlin
U.S. EPA, Office of General Counsel
(202) 564-1222

From: Hengst, Benjamin
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 12:29 PM
To: Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>; Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Birgfeld, Erin <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>
Cc: Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>; Srinivasan, Gautam <Srinivasan.Gautam@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>
Grundler, Christopher <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>; Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

Hi Kevin. Yes, Bill Charmley will be working with David on this. We will get back to folks.

Ben

From: Minoli, Kevin
Sent: Friday, March 3, 2017 12:22:05 PM
To: Millett, John; Grantham, Nancy; Hengst, Benjamin; Birgfeld, Erin
Cc: Dunham, Sarah; Schmidt, Lorie; Srinivasan, Gautam; Orlin, David; Grundler, Christopher
Subject: RE: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points
Can I suggest that the OAR folks please work with David so we can send OPA a set both offices are comfortable with? Thanks! Kevin

Kevin S. Minoli
Acting General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
US Environmental Protection Agency
Main Office Line: 202-564-8040

From: Millett, John
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 12:05 PM
To: Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>
Cc: Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>
Srinivasan, Gautam <Srinivasan.Gautam@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

From: Minoli, Kevin
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 11:59 AM
To: Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>
Cc: Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>; Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>
Srinivasan, Gautam <Srinivasan.Gautam@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client
Kevin S. Minoli
Acting General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
US Environmental Protection Agency
Main Office Line: 202-564-8040

From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 11:38 AM
To: Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>; Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

Kevin – will send you the source document next.

Thanks ng

Nancy Grantham
Office of Public Affairs
US Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-6879 (desk)
From: Konkus, John
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 10:57 AM
To: Hull, George <Hull.George@epa.gov>; Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>; Amy Dewey<Ex. 6-Personal Privacy>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>
Subject: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
To: Charmley, William [charmley.william@epa.gov]
From: Orlin, David
Sent: Fri 3/3/2017 5:51:56 PM
Subject: MTE talking points.docx

MTE talking points.docx

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client
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Chris

Christopher Grundler, Director
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202.564.1682 (Washington, DC)
734.214.4207 (Ann Arbor, MI)

From: Dunham, Sarah
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 11:22 AM
To: Grundler, Christopher <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

We should talk about this

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Millett, John" <Millett.John@epa.gov>
Date: March 3, 2017 at 11:12:25 AM EST
To: "Dunham, Sarah" <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>, "Hengst, Benjamin" <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>, "Birgfeld, Erin" <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>, "Lewis, Josh" <Lewis.Josh@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

This is what they’re currently working with –

From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 10:50 AM
To: Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>; Richardson, RobinH <Richardson.RobinH@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

Nancy Grantham
Office of Public Affairs
US Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-6879 (desk)
202-253-7056 (mobile)
From: Konkus, John
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 10:49 AM
To: Hull, George <Hull.George@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Amy Dewey <Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy>; Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Subject: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
Attached are the few comments I would make on this draft FR notice.

Thanks,

David Orlin
U.S. EPA, Office of General Counsel
(202) 564-1222
From: Dunham, Sarah  
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 4:22 PM  
To: Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>; Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>; Srinivasan, Gautam <Srinivasan.Gautam@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>  
Subject: RE: Mobile Sources

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Thanks

From: Minoli, Kevin  
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 3:00 PM  
To: Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>; Srinivasan, Gautam <Srinivasan.Gautam@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>  
Cc: Dunham, Sarah <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>  
Subject: Mobile Sources

All- Attached is a revised FR notice re the MTE. Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

We’ve been asked to provide our comments on their edits by COB tomorrow. Can we do that? Thanks, Kevin

Kevin S. Minoli

Acting General Counsel

Office of General Counsel

US Environmental Protection Agency

Main Office Line: 202-564-8040
To: Hengst, Benjamin[Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov]; Cook, Leila[cook.leila@epa.gov]; Charmley, William[charmley.william@epa.gov]; Simon, Karl[Simon.Karl@epa.gov]
From: Grundler, Christopher
Subject: For 11:30 discussion FW: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

Christopher Grundler, Director
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202.564.1682 (Washington, DC)
734.214.4207 (Ann Arbor, MI)

From: Dunham, Sarah
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 11:22 AM
To: Grundler, Christopher <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

We should talk about this

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Millett, John" <Millett.John@epa.gov>
Date: March 3, 2017 at 11:12:25 AM EST
To: "Dunham, Sarah" <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>, "Hengst, Benjamin" <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>, "Birgfeld, Erin" <Birgfeld.Erin@epa.gov>, "Lewis, Josh" <Lewis.Josh@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points
This is what they’re currently working with –

From: Grantham, Nancy
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 10:50 AM
To: Millett, John <Millett.John@epa.gov>; Richardson, RobinH <Richardson.RobinH@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

Nancy Grantham
Office of Public Affairs
US Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-6879 (desk)
202-253-7056 (mobile)

From: Konkus, John
Sent: Friday, March 03, 2017 10:49 AM
To: Hull, George <Hull.George@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Amy Dewey [Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]; Milbourn, Cathy <Milbourn.Cathy@epa.gov>
Subject: DRAFT CAFE Top Line Talking Points

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
Attached are the few comments I would make on this draft FR notice.

Thanks,

David Orlin
U.S. EPA, Office of General Counsel
(202) 564-1222

From: Dunham, Sarah
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 4:22 PM
To: Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>; Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>; Srinivasan, Gautam <Srinivasan.Gautam@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Mobile Sources

Thanks

From: Minoli, Kevin
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 3:00 PM
To: Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>; Srinivasan, Gautam
All- Attached is a revised FR notice re the MTE. We’ve been asked to provide our comments on their edits by COB tomorrow. Can we do that? Thanks, Kevin
Hi Chris,

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

David Orlin
U.S. EPA, Office of General Counsel
(202) 564-1222

From: Grundler, Christopher
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 9:37 PM
To: Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Charmley, William <charmley.william@epa.gov>; Hengst, Benjamin
<Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>; Cook, Leila <cook.leila@epa.gov>; Simon, Karl
<Simon.Karl@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice
David:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Christopher Grundler, Director
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202/564-1682 (Washington DC)
734/214-4207 (Ann Arbor MI)

On Mar 2, 2017, at 6:48 PM, Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

David Orlin
U.S. EPA, Office of General Counsel
(202) 564-1222
From: Orlin, David
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 6:41 PM
To: Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>; Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Kevin –

Here is a new and improved version.
Ex. 5 - Attorney Client
Appendix:

**EPA's regulation governing the Mid-Term Evaluation:**

40 CFR 86.1818-12(h)

(h) *Mid-term evaluation of standards.* No later than April 1, 2018, the Administrator shall determine whether the standards established in paragraph (c) of this section for the 2022 through 2025 model years are appropriate under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act, in light of the record then before the Administrator. An opportunity for public comment shall be provided before making such determination. If the Administrator determines they are not appropriate, the Administrator shall initiate a rulemaking to revise the standards, to be either more or less stringent as appropriate.

(1) In making the determination required by this paragraph (h), the Administrator shall consider the information available on the factors relevant to setting greenhouse gas emission standards under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act for model years 2022 through 2025, including but not limited to:

(i) The availability and effectiveness of technology, and the appropriate lead time for introduction of technology;

(ii) The cost on the producers or purchasers of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines;

(iii) The feasibility and practicability of the standards;

(iv) The impact of the standards on reduction of emissions, oil conservation, energy security, and fuel savings by consumers;
(v) The impact of the standards on the automobile industry;

(vi) The impacts of the standards on automobile safety;

(vii) The impact of the greenhouse gas emission standards on the Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards and a national harmonized program; and

(viii) The impact of the standards on other relevant factors.

(2) The Administrator shall make the determination required by this paragraph (h) based upon a record that includes the following:

(i) A draft Technical Assessment Report addressing issues relevant to the standard for the 2022 through 2025 model years;

(ii) Public comment on the draft Technical Assessment Report;

(iii) Public comment on whether the standards established for the 2022 through 2025 model years are appropriate under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act; and

(iv) Such other materials the Administrator deems appropriate.

(3) No later than November 15, 2017, the Administrator shall issue a draft Technical Assessment Report addressing issues relevant to the standards for the 2022 through 2025 model years.

(4) The Administrator will set forth in detail the bases for the determination required by this paragraph (h), including the Administrator's assessment of each of the factors listed in paragraph (h)(1) of this section.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

David Orlin
U.S. EPA, Office of General Counsel
(202) 564-1222

From: Minoli, Kevin
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 4:41 PM
To: Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice
Checking in on these. Thanks.

Kevin S. Minoli  
Acting General Counsel  
Office of General Counsel  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
Main Office Line: 202-564-8040

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Minoli, Kevin" <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>  
Date: March 2, 2017 at 4:29:13 PM EST  
To: "Schnare, David" <schnare.david@epa.gov>  
Subject: RE: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Kevin S. Minoli  
Acting General Counsel  
Office of General Counsel  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
Main Office Line: 202-564-8040

From: Schnare, David  
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 4:24 PM  
To: Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>  
Subject: RE: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client
d.

From: Minoli, Kevin  
Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2017 10:24 AM  
To: Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>; Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>  
Cc: Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>; Srinivasan, Gautam <Srinivasan.Gautam@epa.gov>  
Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

---

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Kevin S. Minoli  
Acting General Counsel  
Office of General Counsel  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
Main Office Line: 202-564-8040

On Mar 2, 2017, at 9:54 AM, Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov> wrote:

Kevin,

I put our answers below. I’ve also attached a copy of the reg text on the MTE, in case it’s helpful. Let us know if you need anything else.

David Orlin  
U.S. EPA, Office of General Counsel  
(202) 564-1222

---

From: Minoli, Kevin  
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2017 7:57 AM
To: Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>; Srinivasan, Gautam <Srinivasan.Gautam@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client
Thanks, Kevin

Kevin S. Minoli  
Acting General Counsel  
Office of General Counsel  
US Environmental Protection Agency  
Main Office Line: 202-564-8040

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Schnare, David" <schnare.david@epa.gov>
Date: March 2, 2017 at 7:12:19 AM EST
To: "Minoli, Kevin" <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>, "Schmidt, Lorie" <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Kevin:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

dschnare

From: Schnare, David
Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2017 5:29 AM
To: Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO
Cc: Smith, Loren (OST) <Loren.Smith@dot.gov>; Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>; Smith, Ja'Ron K. EOP/WHO <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>; Smith, Brigham (OST) <brigham.mccown@dot.gov>; Fiorentino, Marty (OST) <marty.fiorentino@dot.gov>; Fulton, Finch (OST) <Finch.Fulton@dot.gov>; Pugliese, Anthony (OST) <Anthony.Pugliese@dot.gov>; Moran, John S. EOP/WHO

Ex. 6 - Deliberative Process

Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

dschnare

Sent from my iPhone
On Mar 2, 2017, at 12:27 AM, Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy wrote:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Can the group do a call at 9:30 tomorrow?

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2017, at 11:55 PM, Smith, Loren (OST) <Loren.Smith@dot.gov> wrote:

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Loren Smith
USDOT

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

On Mar 1, 2017, at 11:04 PM, Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO wrote:

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

From: Smith, Loren (OST) [mailto:Loren.Smith@dot.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 1, 2017 7:35 PM  
To: Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>  
Cc: Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO 
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy  
Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>; Smith, Ja'Ron K. EOP/WHO  
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy  
McCown, Brigham (OST)  
<mccown.brigham@dot.gov>; Fiorentino, Marty (OST)  
<marty.fiorentino@dot.gov>; Fulton, Finch (OST)  
<Fulton.Finch@dot.gov>; Pugliese, Anthony (OST)  
<Anthony.Pugliese@dot.gov>  
Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2017, at 7:14 PM, Schnare, David  
<schnare.david@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2017, at 7:11 PM, Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO  
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy  
wrote:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

From: Smith, Loren (OST) [mailto:Loren.Smith@dot.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2017 6:02 PM  
To: Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>;  
jackson.ryan@epa.gov; Smith, Ja'Ron K. EOP/WHO  
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy  
Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO; McCown, Brigham (OST)  
<mccown.brigham@dot.gov>; Fiorentino, Marty (OST)  
marty.fiorentino@dot.gov; Fulton, Finch (OST)  
<Finch.Fulton@dot.gov>; Pugliese, Anthony (OST)  
<Anthony.Pugliese@dot.gov>
Subject: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice
Importance: High

Gentlemen, as discussed yesterday. Attached please find DOT/NHTSA’s initial discussion draft for moving forward on CAFÉ/GHG standards for light-duty vehicles.

We look forward to your comments.

+++ 

Loren Smith
U.S. Department of Transportation
West Building – W85-115
loren.smith@dot.gov

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

<MTE reg.docx>
Christopher Grundler, Director
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202/564-1682 (Washington DC)
734/214-4207 (Ann Arbor MI)

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Dunham, Sarah" <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>
Date: March 3, 2017 at 7:36:55 AM EST
To: "Grundler, Christopher" <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

See response

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Schnare, David" <schnare.david@epa.gov>
Date: March 3, 2017 at 7:21:51 AM EST
To: "Dunham, Sarah" <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>, "Minoli, Kevin" <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>
Cc: "Schmidt, Lorie" <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>, "Orlin, David"<Orlin.David@epa.gov>, "Schwab, Justin"<schwab.justin@epa.gov>, "Jackson, Ryan"<jackson.ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Sarah:

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
From: Dunham, Sarah
Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2017 8:34 PM
To: Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>
Cc: Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>; Schmidt, Lorie <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>; Orlin, David <Orlin.David@epa.gov>; Schwab, Justin <schwab.justin@epa.gov>; Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Kevin, David, Ryan-

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sarah

On Mar 2, 2017, at 6:59 PM, Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Thanks, Kevin

Kevin S. Minoli

Acting General Counsel
Ex. 5 - Attorney Client
Ex. 5 - Attorney Client
Appendix:

EPA’s regulation governing the Mid-Term Evaluation:

40 CFR 86.1818-12(h)

(h) Mid-term evaluation of standards. No later than April 1, 2018, the Administrator shall determine whether the standards established in paragraph (c) of this section for the 2022 through 2025 model years are appropriate under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act, in light of the record then before the Administrator. An opportunity for public comment shall be provided before making such determination. If the Administrator determines they are not appropriate, the Administrator shall initiate a rulemaking to revise the standards, to be either more or less stringent as appropriate.

(1) In making the determination required by this paragraph (h), the Administrator shall consider the information available on the factors relevant to setting greenhouse gas emission standards under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act for model years 2022 through 2025, including but not limited to:

(i) The availability and effectiveness of technology, and the appropriate lead time for introduction of technology;

(ii) The cost on the producers or purchasers of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines;

(iii) The feasibility and practicability of the standards;

(iv) The impact of the standards on reduction of emissions, oil conservation, energy security, and fuel savings by consumers;

(v) The impact of the standards on the automobile industry;

(vi) The impacts of the standards on automobile safety;

(vii) The impact of the greenhouse gas emission standards on the Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards and a national harmonized program; and

(viii) The impact of the standards on other relevant factors.
(2) The Administrator shall make the determination required by this paragraph (h) based upon a record that includes the following:

(i) A draft Technical Assessment Report addressing issues relevant to the standard for the 2022 through 2025 model years;

(ii) Public comment on the draft Technical Assessment Report;

(iii) Public comment on whether the standards established for the 2022 through 2025 model years are appropriate under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act; and

(iv) Such other materials the Administrator deems appropriate.

(3) No later than November 15, 2017, the Administrator shall issue a draft Technical Assessment Report addressing issues relevant to the standards for the 2022 through 2025 model years.

(4) The Administrator will set forth in detail the bases for the determination required by this paragraph (h), including the Administrator's assessment of each of the factors listed in paragraph (h)(1) of this section.

---

**Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process**
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

David Orlin
U.S. EPA, Office of General Counsel
(202) 564-1222

From: "Schnare, David" <schnare.david@epa.gov>
Date: March 2, 2017 at 7:12:19 AM EST
To: "Minoli, Kevin" <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>, "Schmidt, Lorie" <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Kevin:
From: Schnare, David  
Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2017 5:29 AM  
To: Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO  
Cc: Smith, Loren (OST) <Loren.Smith@dot.gov>; Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>; Smith, Ja'Ron K. EOP/WHO  
McCown, Brigham (OST) <brigham.mccown@dot.gov>; Fiorentino, Marty (OST) <marty.fiorentino@dot.gov>; Fulton, Finch (OST) <Finch.Fulton@dot.gov>; Pugliese, Anthony (OST) <anthony.Pugliese@dot.gov>; Moran, John S. EOP/WHO  

Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice
Can the group do a call at 9:30 tomorrow?

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2017, at 11:55 PM, Smith, Loren (OST) <Loren.Smith@dot.gov> wrote:
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Loren Smith
USDOT
202-430-2952 (cell)

On Mar 1, 2017, at 11:04 PM, Catanzaro, Michael J. wrote:

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
From: Smith, Loren (OST)
To: Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>
Cc: Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy; Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>; Smith, JaRon K. EOP/WHO
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy; McCown, Brigham (OST) <brigham.mccown@epa.gov>; Fiorentino, Marty (OST) <marty.fiorentino@epa.gov>; Fulton, Finch (OST) <Finch.Fulton@epa.gov>; Pugliese, Anthony (OST) <anthony.Pugliese@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2017, at 7:14 PM, Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2017, at 7:11 PM, Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO wrote:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

From: Smith, Loren (OST)
Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2017 6:02 PM
To: Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>;  
jackson.ryana@epa.gov; Smith, Ja'Ron K.  
EOP/WHO     Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy  
Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO 
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy  
McCown, Brigham (OST) <brigham.mccown@dot.gov>; 
Fiorentino, Marty (OST)  
<marty.fiorentino@dot.gov>; Fulton, Finch (OST)  
<Finch.Fultouradot.gov>  
Subject: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice  
Importance: High

Gentlemen, as discussed yesterday. Attached please find DOT/NHTSA's initial discussion draft for moving forward on CAFÉ/GHG standards for light-duty vehicles.

We look forward to your comments.

+++  
Loren Smith  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
West Building – W85-115  
loren.smith@dot.gov  
202-430-2952

<MTE reg.docx>
Christopher Grundler, Director
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202/564-1682 (Washington DC)
734/214-4207 (Ann Arbor MI)

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Dunham, Sarah" <Dunham.Sarah@epa.gov>
Date: March 2, 2017 at 8:36:42 PM EST
To: "Grundler, Christopher" <Grundler.Christopher@epagov>
Subject: Fwd: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

FYI

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Dunham, Sarah" <Dunham.Sarah@epagov>
Date: March 2, 2017 at 8:33:53 PM EST
To: "Minoli, Kevin" <Minoli.Kevin@epagov>
Cc: "Schnare, David" <Schnare.David@epagov>, "Schmidt, Lorie" <Schmidt.Lorie@epagov>, "Orlin, David" <Orlin.David@epagov>, "Schwab, Justin" <Schwab.Justin@epagov>, "Jackson, Ryan" <Jackson.Ryan@epagov>
Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Kevin, David, Ryan-

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sarah
On Mar 2, 2017, at 6:59 PM, Minoli, Kevin <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Thanks, Kevin

Kevin S. Minoli
Acting General Counsel
Office of General Counsel
US Environmental Protection Agency
Main Office Line: 202-564-8040
Ex. 5 - Attorney Client
Appendix:

**EPA's regulation governing the Mid-Term Evaluation:**

40 CFR 86.1818-12(h)

(h) *Mid-term evaluation of standards.* No later than April 1, 2018, the Administrator shall determine whether the standards established in paragraph (c) of this section for the 2022 through 2025 model years are appropriate under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act, in light of the record then before the Administrator. An opportunity for public comment shall be provided before making such determination. If the Administrator determines they are not appropriate, the Administrator shall initiate a rulemaking to revise the standards, to be either more or less stringent as appropriate.

(1) In making the determination required by this paragraph (h), the Administrator shall consider the information available on the factors relevant to setting greenhouse gas emission standards under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act for model years 2022 through 2025, including but not limited to:

(i) The availability and effectiveness of technology, and the appropriate lead time
for introduction of technology;

(ii) The cost on the producers or purchasers of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines;

(iii) The feasibility and practicability of the standards;

(iv) The impact of the standards on reduction of emissions, oil conservation, energy security, and fuel savings by consumers;

(v) The impact of the standards on the automobile industry;

(vi) The impacts of the standards on automobile safety;

(vii) The impact of the greenhouse gas emission standards on the Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards and a national harmonized program; and

(viii) The impact of the standards on other relevant factors.

(2) The Administrator shall make the determination required by this paragraph (h) based upon a record that includes the following:

(i) A draft Technical Assessment Report addressing issues relevant to the standard for the 2022 through 2025 model years;

(ii) Public comment on the draft Technical Assessment Report;

(iii) Public comment on whether the standards established for the 2022 through 2025 model years are appropriate under section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act; and

(iv) Such other materials the Administrator deems appropriate.

(3) No later than November 15, 2017, the Administrator shall issue a draft Technical Assessment Report addressing issues relevant to the standards for the 2022 through 2025 model years.

(4) The Administrator will set forth in detail the bases for the determination required by this paragraph (h), including the Administrator's assessment of each of the factors listed in paragraph (h)(1) of this section.

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
From: "Schnare, David" <schnare.david@epa.gov>
Date: March 2, 2017 at 7:12:19 AM EST
To: "Minoli, Kevin" <Minoli.Kevin@epa.gov>, "Schmidt, Loric" <Schmidt.Lorie@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Kevin:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

dschnare

From: Schnare, David
Sent: Thursday, March 2, 2017 5:29 AM
To: Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO
Cc: Smith, Loren (OST) <Loren.Smith@dot.gov>; Jackson, Ryan <jackson.ryan@epa.gov>; Smith, Ja'Ron K. EOP/WHO <Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy>; McCown, Brigham (OST) <brigham.mccown@dot.gov>; Fiorentino, Marty (OST) <marty.fiorentino@dot.gov>; Fulton, Finch (OST) <Finch.Fulton@dot.gov>; Pugliese, Anthony (OST) <anthony.pugliese@dot.gov>; Moran, John S. EOP/WHO

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

dschnare

Sent from my iPhone


Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

> wrote:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Can the group do a call at 9:30 tomorrow?

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2017, at 11:55 PM, Smith, Loren (OST)

<Loren.Smith@dot.gov> wrote:

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Loren Smith
USDOT
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

On Mar 1, 2017, at 11:04 PM, Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO wrote:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

From: Smith, Loren (OST)
[mailto:Loren.Smith@dot.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, March 1, 2017 7:35 PM
To: Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>
Cc: Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy
Jackson, Ryan
Jackson.ryan@epa.gov
McCown, Brigham
McCown Brigham (OST) <brigham.mccown@dot.gov>
Fiorentino, Marty
Fiorentino Marty (OST) <marty.fiorentino@dot.gov>
Fulton, Finch
Fulton Finch (OST) <Finch.Fulton@dot.gov>
Pugliese, Anthony
Pugliese Anthony (OST) <anthony.Pugliese@dot.gov>
Subject: Re: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice

Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2017, at 7:14 PM, Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov> wrote:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 1, 2017, at 7:11 PM, Catanzaro, Michael J.
From: Smith, Loren (OST)  
[mailto:Loren.Smith@dot.gov]  
Sent: Tuesday, February 28, 2017 6:02 PM  
To: Schnare, David <schnare.david@epa.gov>; jackson.ryan@epa.gov; Smith, Ja'Ron K.  
EOP/WHO <Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy>; Catanzaro, Michael J. EOP/WHO  
Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy; McCown, Brigham (OST) <brigham.mccown@dot.gov>; Fiorentino, Marty (OST) <marty.fiorentino@dot.gov>; Fulton, Finch (OST) <Finch.Fultong@dot.gov>  
Subject: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice  
Importance: High  

Gentlemen, as discussed yesterday. Attached please find DOT/NHTSA’s initial discussion draft for moving forward on CAFÉ/GHG standards for light-duty vehicles.

We look forward to your comments.

+++  
Loren Smith  
U.S. Department of Transportation
West Building – W85-115

loren.smith@dot.gov

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

<MTE reg.docx>
Ex. 5 - Deliberative Process

Christopher Grundler, Director
Office of Transportation and Air Quality
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202/564-1682 (Washington DC)
734/214-4207 (Ann Arbor MI)

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Orlin, David" <Orlin.David@epa.gov>
Date: March 2, 2017 at 6:48:10 PM EST
To: "Grundler, Christopher" <grundler.christopher@epa.gov>, "Charmley, William" <charmley.william@epa.gov>, "Hengst, Benjamin" <Hengst.Benjamin@epa.gov>, "Cook, Leila" <cook.leila@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: CAFE discussion draft: joint DOT-EPA notice
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