



**Congressional  
Research Service**

Informing the legislative debate since 1914

---

# Clean Air Act Issues in the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress: In Brief

(name redacted)

Specialist in Environmental Policy

June 7, 2017

Congressional Research Service

7-....

[www.crs.gov](http://www.crs.gov)

R44744

## Summary

In the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress, and in the executive and judicial branches, review of regulations issued under the Obama Administration, with the possibility of their modification or repeal, has been the main focus of interest on Clean Air Act issues so far in 2017. Of particular interest are the Clean Power Plan (CPP) and related Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) rules to regulate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from power plants, promulgated on August 3, 2015. Other GHG emission standards affecting cars and light trucks, and the oil and gas sector have also received attention.

Reducing GHG emissions to address climate change was a major goal of President Obama, but, for a variety of reasons, many in Congress have been opposed to it. In the absence of congressional action, President Obama directed EPA to promulgate GHG emission standards using existing Clean Air Act authority. This authority has been upheld on three occasions by the Supreme Court, but it remains controversial in Congress and among Cabinet appointees of the Trump Administration. With key figures in Congress and the new Administration having expressed opposition to GHG regulations, major changes in the GHG regulatory structure are possible.

The CPP has been a frequent topic in articles discussing the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress's priorities; in the near term, however, the courts and EPA seem the more likely venues for action. Implementation of the CPP was stayed by the Supreme Court in February 2016, pending the completion of judicial review. Challenges to the rule had been filed with the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals by more than 100 parties, including 27 states. These challenges have been consolidated into a single case, *West Virginia v. EPA*. The D.C. Circuit heard oral argument in the case in September 2016; as of this writing, the court has not issued a decision. There is general agreement that whatever decision the court hands down would be appealed to the Supreme Court, adding more time before completion of the judicial process.

EPA, under new leadership, now appears the more likely venue to modify the CPP. On March 28, 2017, President Trump signed Executive Order 13783, to require the review of regulations and policies that burden the development or use of domestically produced energy. The E.O. directed EPA to review the Clean Power Plan (and several other regulations) for consistency with policies that the E.O. enumerates, and as soon as practicable, to “suspend, revise, or rescind the guidance, or publish for notice and comment proposed rules suspending, revising, or rescinding those rules.” Like judicial review, this route could be time-consuming. Modifying the rule would likely require the agency to follow the administrative steps involved in proposing and promulgating a new rule. Following promulgation, the new rule would itself be subject to judicial review. A large group of stakeholders, including some states, will likely oppose major changes to the CPP.

The EPA and judicial processes could be short-circuited by Congress, through legislation overturning or modifying the CPP. The threat of a filibuster, requiring 60 votes to proceed, might prevent Senate action, however.

By contrast, six other Clean Air Act rules might have been more easily overturned by Congress under the Congressional Review Act (CRA). The CRA established a special set of procedures, including fast-track procedures in the Senate available during a limited period of time, under which Congress may consider legislation to overturn regulations following their promulgation and submission to Congress. Rules received by Congress on or after June 13, 2016, including GHG emission standards for medium- and heavy-duty trucks, an update to EPA's Cross-State Air Pollution Rule, and methane standards for landfills, were among the rules potentially eligible for

CRA review. The fast-track Senate procedures for overturning these rules expired on May 11, 2017, without the Senate taking action.

In addition to GHG rules and rules subject to the CRA, another EPA rule that could see renewed interest in the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress is the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone, which EPA promulgated in October 2015. As of mid-May, four bills had been introduced to delay implementation of the ozone rule. On June 6, 2017, EPA Administrator Pruitt announced a one-year delay in designating nonattainment areas under the revised NAAQS.

## Contents

Introduction .....	1
EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Regulations .....	1
Standards for Motor Vehicles .....	2
Standards for Power Plants (Clean Power Plan) .....	4
Standards for the Oil and Gas Industry .....	6
Air Quality Standards .....	8
Background .....	8
2015 Revision of the Ozone NAAQS .....	8
Other Issues .....	11

## Figures

Figure 1. Counties Designated Nonattainment for One or More NAAQS .....	9
---	---

## Contacts

Author Contact Information .....	12
----------------------------------	----

## Introduction

Congressional actions on air quality issues have been dominated for the past six years by efforts—particularly in the House—to change the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA’s) authority to promulgate or implement new emission control requirements.

Often under court order, the Obama Administration’s EPA used authorities Congress gave EPA in the Clean Air Act amendments of 1970, 1977, and 1990 to address long-standing issues posed by emissions from various sources. EPA’s regulations on greenhouse gas emissions from electric power plants and from oil and gas industry sources have been of particular interest, as have the agency’s efforts to revise ambient air quality standards for ozone. The 115<sup>th</sup> Congress, and a new Administration that includes frequent critics of EPA regulations, have begun to review a number of these regulations, with the possibility of their modification or repeal.<sup>1</sup>

## EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Regulations

A continuing focus of congressional interest under the Clean Air Act (CAA) has been EPA regulatory actions to limit greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions using existing CAA authority. EPA actions have focused on six gases or groups of gases that multiple scientific studies have linked to climate change. Of the six gases, carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), produced by combustion of fossil fuels, is by far the most prevalent, accounting for about 80% of annual emissions of the combined group when measured as CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents.<sup>2</sup>

Members from both sides of the aisle have expressed concerns about EPA proceeding with GHG regulations that could have major economic impacts. Some have argued that the case for GHG controls has not been proven. Others maintain that EPA should delay taking such action until Congress more explicitly authorizes it.

Of the GHG emission standards promulgated by EPA, four sets of standards, which have had the broadest impacts, are discussed below: those for power plants, the oil and gas industry, trucks, and light-duty vehicles (the latter two topics are combined under the heading “Standards for Motor Vehicles”). EPA finalized GHG standards for power plants in August 2015; set GHG emission standards for oil and gas industry sources in June 2016; finalized a second round of GHG standards for trucks in August 2016; and completed a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the already promulgated 2022-2025 GHG standards for light-duty vehicles (cars and light trucks) in January 2017. Most of these rules are under review at EPA and could be the subject of congressional interest in the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress.

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to bills targeting specific Clean Air Act rules, the House has also considered broader legislation designed to address regulation in general—bills such as the Regulatory Accountability Act (H.R. 5 in the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress), which would combine six bills to require that agencies developing regulations consider the economic impacts of proposed regulations and choose the lowest cost regulatory option permissible within the law, among other provisions, or the REINS Act (H.R. 26 in the current Congress), which would require congressional approval before regulations classified as major rules could take effect. If enacted, such legislation would affect new rules under the Clean Air Act as well as other statutes. Broad regulatory reform, such as these bills, is high on the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress’s agenda. H.R. 26 passed the House on January 5, 2017, and H.R. 5 passed the House on January 11, 2017. Given the broad nature of the bills’ purposes, however—addressing regulations from any agency or department, not just EPA—these bills are not discussed here. For information on the REINS Act, see CRS Legal Sidebar WSLG443, *REINS Act and the Legislative Veto*, by (name redacted).

<sup>2</sup> The six are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), and perfluorocarbons (PFCs). For a discussion of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalence, see CRS Report R43860, *Methane: An Introduction to Emission Sources and Reduction Strategies*.

## Standards for Motor Vehicles

Auto manufacturers and other stakeholders have generally supported EPA's GHG standards for new motor vehicles, but controversy has surfaced in recent months. In May 2009, President Obama reached agreement with major U.S. and foreign auto manufacturers, the state of California (which has separate authority to set motor vehicle emission standards, if EPA grants a waiver), and other stakeholders regarding the substance of GHG emission and related fuel economy standards.<sup>3</sup> A second round of standards for cars and light trucks, promulgated in October 2012,<sup>4</sup> was also preceded by an agreement with the auto industry and key stakeholders. Under the agreements, EPA, the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT, which has authority to set fuel economy standards), and California would establish "One National Program" for GHG emissions and fuel economy. The auto industry supported national standards, in part, to avoid having to meet standards on a state-by-state basis; thus, it has not generally supported efforts to block EPA's motor vehicle GHG standards.

The second round of GHG standards for cars and light trucks is being phased in over model years (MY) 2017-2025. As part of the rulemaking, EPA made a commitment to conduct a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) for the MY2022-2025 standards by April 2018. The agency deemed an MTE appropriate given the long time frame at issue, with the final standards taking effect as long as 12 years after promulgation. Through the MTE, EPA was to determine whether the standards for MY2022-2025 were still appropriate given the latest available data and information, with the option of strengthening, weakening, or retaining the standards as promulgated.

On November 30, 2016, EPA released a proposed determination under the MTE stating that the MY2022-2025 standards remained appropriate and that a rulemaking to change them was not warranted. EPA based its findings on a Technical Support Document, a previously released Draft Technical Assessment Report (which was issued jointly by EPA, DOT, and the California Air Resources Board (CARB)), and input from the auto industry and other stakeholders. The proposed determination opened a public comment period that ran through December 30, 2016. On January 12, 2017, the EPA Administrator made a final determination to retain the MY2022-2025 standards as originally promulgated.

This action significantly accelerated the original timeline for the MTE (which called for a final determination by April 2018), and EPA announced it separately from any DOT (fuel economy) or California (GHG standard) process. (California subsequently reaffirmed its commitment to the 2022-2025 standards, on March 24, 2017.) Critics reacted to the accelerated timetable swiftly, vowing to work with the new Administration to revisit EPA's determination—citing a "rush to judgment" that they argued contradicted the objectives of the One National Program. Among the potential revisions suggested by critics have been better harmonization of the existing EPA/DOT/CARB standards, easing the MY2022-2025 standards, or eliminating them entirely.

The Administration re-opened the MTE in mid-March, but it is unclear to what extent EPA will modify or eliminate the standards, or if so, how quickly. The standards were promulgated in 2012

---

<sup>3</sup> GHG emissions and fuel economy are directly related, because 94% of GHG emissions from light duty vehicles are the result of fuel combustion. The less fuel a vehicle uses, the lower will be its GHG emissions.

The President's announcement and related documents, including a Notice of Upcoming Joint Rulemaking to Establish Vehicle GHG Emissions and CAFE Standards, which appeared in the May 22, 2009, *Federal Register*, and both the draft and final emission standards can be found at <https://www.epa.gov/regulations-emissions-vehicles-and-engines/final-rule-model-year-2012-2016-light-duty-vehicle>.

<sup>4</sup> For the rule and additional information, see <https://www.epa.gov/regulations-emissions-vehicles-and-engines/final-rule-model-year-2017-and-later-light-duty-vehicle>.

and were not modified by the Obama Administration MTE, so the deadlines for judicial review and for the fast-track review authority in the Congressional Review Act have lapsed. The rule could be changed through a new rulemaking, a process that normally would take a year or more and would itself be subject to judicial and congressional review upon completion. A rulemaking would probably need to be justified by new data or a reasonable justification to avoid being considered arbitrary and capricious if challenged in court.<sup>5</sup> Some changes, on the other hand, such as better coordination of the standards with those of DOT and California, might be implemented without a change to the promulgated EPA standards. With the options for review uncertain, the role of Congress may be one of oversight, at least for now. (For additional information, see CRS Insight IN10619, *EPA's Mid-Term Evaluation of Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards*.)

EPA and DOT have also promulgated joint GHG emission and fuel economy standards for medium- and heavy-duty trucks,<sup>6</sup> which have generally been supported by the trucking industry and truck and engine manufacturers. In his 2014 State of the Union message and a subsequent directive to EPA and DOT, President Obama directed the agencies to develop a second round of these standards, to be proposed in 2015 and finalized a year later. The rule was finalized on August 16, 2016.<sup>7</sup> The new standards cover MY2018-2027 for certain trailers and model years MY2021-2027 for semi-trucks, large pickup trucks, vans, and all types and sizes of buses and work trucks. According to EPA,

The Phase 2 standards are expected to lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by approximately 1.1 billion metric tons, save vehicle owners fuel costs of about \$170 billion, and reduce oil consumption by up to 2 billion barrels over the lifetime of the vehicles sold under the program.<sup>8</sup>

In the Regulatory Impact Analysis accompanying the rule's promulgation, EPA projected the total cost of the Phase 2 standards at \$29-\$31 billion over the lifetime of MY2018-2029 trucks. The standards will increase the cost of a long haul tractor-trailer by as much as \$13,500 in MY2027, according to the agency; but the buyer would recoup the investment in fuel-efficient technology in less than two years through fuel savings. In EPA's analysis, fuel consumption of 2027 model tractor-trailers will decline by 34% as a result of the rule.<sup>9</sup>

In general, the truck standards have been well-received. The American Trucking Associations, for example, described themselves as "cautiously optimistic" that the rule would achieve its targets: "We are pleased that our concerns such as adequate lead-time for technology development, national harmonization of standards, and flexibility for manufacturers have been heard and

---

<sup>5</sup> For additional information regarding repealing a regulation, see CRS Legal Sidebar WSLG888, *How to Repeal a Rule*, by (name redacted)

<sup>6</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Transportation, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions Standards and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Engines and Vehicles; Final Rules," 76 *Federal Register* 57106, September 15, 2011.

<sup>7</sup> The rule appeared in the *Federal Register* on October 25, 2016: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Transportation, "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Engines and Vehicles—Phase 2; Final Rule," 81 *Federal Register* 73478, 73482, October 25, 2016. Fact sheets and links to the final rule and the Regulatory Impact Analysis are at <https://www.epa.gov/regulations-emissions-vehicles-and-engines/final-rule-greenhouse-gas-emissions-and-fuel-efficiency>.

<sup>8</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Transportation and Air Quality, "EPA and NHTSA Adopt Standards to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Improve Fuel Efficiency of Medium- and Heavy-Duty Vehicles for Model Year 2018 and Beyond; Regulatory Announcement," August 2016, at <https://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/P100P7NL.PDF?Dockey=P100P7NL.PDF>.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

included in the final rule.”<sup>10</sup> The Truck and Engine Manufacturers Association, while describing itself as “in the process of reviewing” the final rule, highlighted its work providing input to assure that EPA and DOT established a single national program, and concluded: “A vitally important outcome is that EPA and DOT have collaborated to issue a single final rule that includes a harmonized approach to greenhouse gas reductions and fuel efficiency improvements.”<sup>11</sup>

As of the filing deadline (December 27, 2016—60 days after the rule’s promulgation in the *Federal Register*), only two organizations had filed petitions for judicial review: the Truck Trailer Manufacturers Association and the Racing Enthusiasts and Suppliers Coalition. Nevertheless, in April 2017, EPA took steps to review the rule. The agency asked the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals to hold the legal challenge (*Truck Trailer Manufacturers Association v. EPA*) in abeyance while it conducts a review of the standards. The court granted EPA’s request on May 8. The rule itself was not stayed, and remains in effect while the agency conducts its review.

## Standards for Power Plants (Clean Power Plan)

Power plants are the largest anthropogenic source of U.S. GHG emissions, accounting for about 30% of the U.S. total. EPA finalized emission standards for new, existing, and modified fossil-fueled power plants in August 2015.<sup>12</sup> The standards would primarily affect coal-fired units, which emit twice the amount of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) that would be emitted by an equivalent natural gas combined cycle (NGCC) electric generating unit.<sup>13</sup> The final rules have been hugely controversial: EPA received more than 4 million public comments as it considered the proposed standards for existing units, by far the most comments in the agency’s 46-year history.

The Clean Power Plan (CPP), which is the rule for existing units, would set state-specific goals for CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and emission rates from existing fossil-fueled power plants. EPA established different goals for each state based on three “building blocks”: improved efficiency at coal-fired power plants; substitution of NGCC generation for coal-fired power; and zero-emission power generation from increased renewable energy, such as wind or solar. Two sets of goals were established by the rule: an interim set, which would apply to the average emissions rate in a state in the 2022-2029 time period; and a final state-specific average emission rate for the years 2030 and beyond. States can reach these goals through a wide array of options, including heavier reliance on renewable or nuclear power; reductions in power demand through efficiency programs; substituting natural gas-fired for coal-fired units; the use of tradeable allowances; and combining efforts with other states. In general, states that currently rely on coal-fired power to a great extent would be allowed higher emission rates, but would have to reduce average emissions by a greater percentage than other states.<sup>14</sup> The first step in implementation was to be the submission of implementation plans by the states in September 2016.

---

<sup>10</sup> American Trucking Associations, “ATA Hopes Final Truck Efficiency Rule Will Achieve Emissions Goals,” Press Release, August 16, 2016, at <http://www.trucking.org/article/ATA-Hopes-Final-Truck-Efficiency-Rule-Will-Achieve-Emissions-Goals>.

<sup>11</sup> Truck and Engine Manufacturers Association, “Truck and Engine Manufacturers Evaluating New Phase 2 Greenhouse Gas Regulations that EPA/DOT Announced Today,” Press Release, August 16, 2016, at <http://www.truckandenginemanufacturers.org/file.asp?A=Y&F=2016+08+16+Final++GHG+Phase+II+Press+Release.pdf&N=2016+08+16+Final++GHG+Phase+II+Press+Release.pdf&C=documents>.

<sup>12</sup> Links to these rules, as well as extensive background materials, can be found on EPA’s website at <http://www2.epa.gov/cleanpowerplan>.

<sup>13</sup> See CRS Report R44090, *Life-Cycle Greenhouse Gas Assessment of Coal and Natural Gas in the Power Sector*.

<sup>14</sup> For a more detailed description of the CPP requirements, see CRS Report R44145, *EPA’s Clean Power Plan*: (continued...)



A separate rule for new power plants, the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS), would affect fewer plants, but it too is controversial, because of the technology it assumed could be used to reduce emissions at new coal-fired units. The NSPS would rely in part on carbon capture and sequestration (CCS) technology to reduce emissions by about 20% compared to the emissions of a state of the art coal-fired plant without CCS. Critics complained that CCS is a costly and unproven technology, and because of this, the NSPS would effectively prohibit the construction of new coal-fired plants. They noted that no operating commercial U.S. power plant was capturing and storing CO<sub>2</sub> as of the date the rule was promulgated. (The first commercial CCS facility in the United States, the Petra Nova project at the WA Parish Generating Station in Texas, came on line in 2016.)

EPA has contended that the components of CCS (separation of CO<sub>2</sub> from emissions, pipelines to transport the CO<sub>2</sub> to storage sites, and equipment to pump the CO<sub>2</sub> underground) have been successfully operated for decades, even if no power plant had combined all of them in an operating unit. At the same time, EPA maintained that the NSPS rule “will result in negligible ... costs,” because, given the low cost and abundance of natural gas, new fossil-fueled capacity will rely on natural gas (NGCC) technology for the immediate future.<sup>15</sup> NGCC units, which emit only half the CO<sub>2</sub> of uncontrolled coal-fired plants, can attain the NSPS without needing to capture any of their carbon emissions.

Following publication of the NSPS and the Clean Power Plan in the October 23, 2015, *Federal Register*, the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress considered and passed joint resolutions of disapproval of both rules in December 2015 (S.J.Res. 23 and S.J.Res. 24) under the Congressional Review Act (CRA). The CRA resolutions would have revoked the rules and prevented EPA from issuing substantially similar rules unless authorized by a subsequently enacted law. President Obama vetoed both of the joint resolutions.

The CRA resolutions were the latest in a long line of attempts by Members, primarily in the House, to limit EPA’s authority to implement GHG emission requirements for power plants (referred to as electric generating units, or EGUs, in EPA parlance). For example, in June 2015, the House passed H.R. 2042, which would have delayed the compliance date of GHG emission standards for existing EGUs (including the date by which states must submit implementation plans) until after the completion of judicial review of any aspect of the rule, and would have allowed a state to opt out of compliance if the governor determined that the rule would have significant adverse effects on rate-payers or on the reliability of the state’s electricity system.

Legislation was also considered in the 113<sup>th</sup> and 112<sup>th</sup> Congresses. In the 113<sup>th</sup>, the House passed H.R. 3826, which would have prohibited EPA from promulgating or implementing GHG emission standards for fossil-fueled power plants until at least six power plants representative of the operating characteristics of electric generation units at different locations across the United States had demonstrated compliance with proposed emission limits for a continuous period of 12 months on a commercial basis. Projects demonstrating the feasibility of carbon capture and storage that received government financial assistance could not have been used in setting such standards, and the standards would not have taken effect unless Congress enacted new legislation

---

(...continued)

*Highlights of the Final Rule*, and CRS Report R44341, *EPA’s Clean Power Plan for Existing Power Plants: Frequently Asked Questions*.

<sup>15</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Regulatory Impact Analysis for the Final Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units*, August 2015, pp. ES-4 and ES-5, at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2015-08/documents/cps-ria.pdf>.

setting an effective date. The House incorporated the language of H.R. 3826 in H.R. 2, which also passed the House. The House also passed three bills in the 112<sup>th</sup> Congress. The Senate did not take up any of the House bills, however.

Another frequently discussed option to prevent EPA action on GHG emissions would be an appropriations rider prohibiting EPA from finalizing or implementing the EGU standards. On July 14, 2016, the House passed H.R. 5538, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017. Section 431 of the bill would have prevented the use of funds appropriated under the bill to implement or enforce both the NSPS and the Clean Power Plan. The House rider was not included in the continuing resolutions (P.L. 114-223 and P.L. 114-254) that funded EPA through April 2017 or in the Consolidated Appropriations Act that funded EPA through the remainder of the fiscal year (P.L. 115-31).

Action on the CPP was a frequent topic in articles discussing the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress's priorities, at the beginning of 2017; for now, however, the courts and EPA seem the more likely venues for action. Implementation of the CPP was stayed by the Supreme Court in February 2016, pending the completion of judicial review. Challenges to the rule were filed with the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals by more than 100 parties, including 27 states. These challenges have been consolidated into a single case, *West Virginia v. EPA*. The D.C. Circuit heard oral argument in the case in September 2016; as of this writing, the court has not issued a decision. There is general agreement that whatever decision the court hands down would be appealed to the Supreme Court, potentially adding another year or more before completion of the judicial process. (For a discussion of the legal issues, see CRS Report R44480, *Clean Power Plan: Legal Background and Pending Litigation in West Virginia v. EPA*.) The NSPS have also been challenged (*North Dakota v. EPA*). The D.C. Circuit had scheduled oral argument in the *North Dakota* case for April 17, 2017, but EPA requested (and the court granted) a pause in the litigation to give it time to conduct a review.

EPA, under new leadership, now appears the more likely venue to modify the CPP and the NSPS. On March 28, 2017, President Trump signed Executive Order 13783, to require the review of regulations and policies that burden the development or use of domestically produced energy. The E.O. directed EPA to review the Clean Power Plan, the NSPS, and other regulations for consistency with policies that the E.O. enumerates, and as soon as practicable, to “suspend, revise, or rescind the guidance, or publish for notice and comment proposed rules suspending, revising, or rescinding those rules.” Like judicial review, this route could be time-consuming. Modifying the rule would likely require the agency to follow the administrative steps involved in proposing and promulgating a new rule. Following promulgation, new rules would themselves be subject to judicial review. A large group of stakeholders, including some states, will likely oppose major changes to the CPP.

The EPA and judicial processes could be short-circuited by Congress, through legislation overturning or modifying the CPP or NSPS. The threat of a filibuster, requiring 60 votes to proceed, might prevent Senate action, however.

## **Standards for the Oil and Gas Industry**

On June 3, 2016, EPA promulgated a suite of New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) under Section 111 of the Clean Air Act to set controls for the first time on methane emissions from sources in the crude oil and natural gas production sector and the natural gas transmission and

storage sector.<sup>16</sup> The rule builds on the agency's 2012 NSPS for volatile organic compound (VOC) emissions<sup>17</sup> and would extend controls for methane and VOC emissions beyond the existing requirements to include new or modified hydraulically fractured oil wells, pneumatic pumps, compressor stations, and leak detection and repair at well sites, gathering and boosting stations, and processing plants. The Administration stated that the rule was a key component under President Obama's "Climate Action Plan," and that plan's *Strategy to Reduce Methane Emissions*,<sup>18</sup> needed to set the Administration on track to achieve its goal to cut methane emissions from the oil and gas sector by 40%-45% from 2012 levels by 2025, and to reduce all domestic greenhouse gas emissions by 26%-28% from 2005 levels by 2025.

Methane—the key constituent of natural gas—is a potent greenhouse gas with a global warming potential (GWP) more than 25 times greater than that of carbon dioxide. According to EPA's *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks*, methane is the second most prevalent greenhouse gas emitted in the United States from human activities, and nearly 30% of those emissions come from oil production and the production, transmission, and distribution of natural gas.<sup>19</sup>

EPA projected that the standards for new, reconstructed, and modified sources will reduce methane emissions by 510,000 tons in 2025, the equivalent of reducing 11 million metric tons of carbon dioxide.<sup>20</sup> In conjunction with the proposal, EPA conducted a Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) that looked at the illustrative benefits and costs of the proposed NSPS: in 2025, EPA estimated the rule will have costs of \$530 million and climate benefits of \$690 million (in constant 2012 dollars). The rule will also reduce emissions of VOCs and hazardous air pollutants (HAPs). EPA was not able to quantify the benefits of the VOC/HAP reductions.

The methane rule is among the rules subject to review under E.O. 13783. Section 7 of the E.O. directed EPA to review the rule for consistency with policies that the E.O. enumerates, and, if appropriate, as soon as practicable, to "suspend, revise, or rescind the guidance, or publish for notice and comment proposed rules suspending, revising, or rescinding those rules." EPA has begun a review of the rule and issued an administrative stay of portions of it. The stay and reconsideration are being challenged in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit by several environmental groups.

---

<sup>16</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources; Final Rule," 81 *Federal Register* 35824, June 3, 2016.

<sup>17</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: New Source Performance Standards and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants Reviews; Final Rule," 77 *Federal Register* 49489, August 16, 2012.

<sup>18</sup> For more information, see Executive Office of the President (EOP), *The President's Climate Action Plan*, June 2013; EOP, *Climate Action Plan: Strategy to Reduce Methane Emissions*, March 2014; EOP, "Fact Sheet: Administration Takes Steps Forward on Climate Action Plan by Announcing Actions to Cut Methane Emissions," January 14, 2015; and CRS Report R43860, *Methane: An Introduction to Emission Sources and Reduction Strategies*.

<sup>19</sup> GWP as calculated over 100 years. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, *Inventory of U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Sinks: 1990-2013*, Washington, DC, EPA 430-R-15-004, April 15, 2015.

<sup>20</sup> In 2014, the United States had 6.87 billion metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>-equivalent emissions.

# Air Quality Standards

## Background

Air quality has improved substantially since the passage of the Clean Air Act in 1970. Annual emissions of the six air pollutants for which EPA has set national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS)—ozone, particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, and lead—have declined by more than 70%, despite major increases in population, motor vehicle miles traveled, and economic activity.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, the goal of clean air continues to elude many areas, in part because scientific understanding of the health effects of air pollution has caused EPA to tighten standards for most of these pollutants. Congress anticipated that the understanding of air pollution’s effects on public health and welfare would change with time, and it required, in Section 109(d) of the act, that EPA review the NAAQS at five-year intervals and revise them, as appropriate.

The most widespread air quality problems involve ozone and fine particles. A 2013 study by researchers at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology concluded that emissions of particulate matter and ozone caused 210,000 premature deaths in the United States in 2005.<sup>22</sup> Many other studies have found links between air pollution, illness, and premature mortality, as well. EPA summarizes these studies in what are called Integrated Science Assessments and Risk Analyses when it reviews a NAAQS, and, with input from the states, it identifies areas where concentrations of pollution exceed the NAAQS following its promulgation. As of February 2017, 115 million people lived in areas classified as “nonattainment” for the ozone NAAQS; 23 million lived in areas that were nonattainment for the fine particle (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) NAAQS.<sup>23</sup>

**Figure 1** identifies areas that had not attained one or more of the NAAQS as of February 2017.

## 2015 Revision of the Ozone NAAQS

Since 2008, review of the NAAQS for ozone has sparked recurrent controversy. A review completed in 2008 made the standards more stringent, but for the first time ever, the Administrator chose a health-based standard outside the range recommended by the independent scientific review committee established by the Clean Air Act to review the agency’s work performed in the NAAQS-setting process. EPA suspended implementation of the 2008 standard in September 2009 in order to consider further strengthening it, and proposed a more stringent standard in January 2010.<sup>24</sup>

On September 2, 2011, however, with a final rule in the last steps of interagency review at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), the White House announced that President Obama had requested that the EPA Administrator withdraw the all-but-final (more stringent) ozone standards from further consideration at that time. The President’s statement noted that “work is

---


<sup>21</sup> For additional data on air pollution trends, see EPA’s air trends website, at <https://gispub.epa.gov/air/trendsreport/2016/>.

<sup>22</sup> Fabio Caiazzo, et al., “Air Pollution and Early Deaths in the United States. Part I: Quantifying the Impact of Major Sectors in 2005,” *Atmospheric Environment*, November 2013, pp. 198-208.

<sup>23</sup> Data are from the U.S. EPA “Green Book,” at <https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/popexp.html>.

<sup>24</sup> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, “National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone; Proposed Rule,” 75 *Federal Register* 2938, January 19, 2010.

**Figure 1. Counties Designated Nonattainment for One or More NAAQS**



**Source:** U.S. EPA Green Book, <https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/mapnpoll.html>. Map shows areas designated nonattainment as of February 13, 2017. Partial counties, those with part of the county designated nonattainment and part attainment, are shown as full counties on the map. In addition to the areas shown, two counties in Guam are designated nonattainment for the SO<sub>2</sub> NAAQS.

already underway to update a 2006 review of the science that will result in the reconsideration of the ozone standard in 2013,” and stated that he did not “support asking state and local governments to begin implementing a new standard that will soon be reconsidered.”<sup>25</sup>

EPA then proceeded with the required five-year review of the 2008 standard, as the President indicated it would. The agency missed the statutory deadline for completion of the review in March 2013, and a federal district court subsequently ordered the agency to propose any revisions resulting from this review by December 1, 2014, and to release a final decision by October 1, 2015. The final standards were released on October 1, 2015, and appeared in the *Federal Register*, October 26, 2015.<sup>26</sup>

The 2015 revision sets more stringent standards, lowering both the primary (health-based) and secondary (welfare-based) standards<sup>27</sup> from 75 parts per billion (ppb)—the level set in 2008—to 70 ppb. Using the latest available data, EPA identified 213 counties in 32 states outside California that had monitors showing nonattainment with the new standard in 2012-2014.<sup>28</sup> These are not the data EPA will use to designate nonattainment areas under the standard (EPA will use the most current monitoring data at the time, most likely data for 2014-2016 or later), but they served as the basis of EPA’s analysis of the rule’s potential effects. The agency’s modeling shows all but 14 of these counties reaching attainment with a 70 ppb standard by 2025 as a result of already promulgated standards for power plants, motor vehicles, gasoline, and other emission sources.<sup>29</sup>

Thus, the agency’s 2015 estimates of the cost of attaining a revised ozone NAAQS were substantially lower than many earlier estimates, including the agency’s own estimate when it proposed a 70 ppb NAAQS in 2010. EPA estimated the cost of meeting a 70 ppb standard in all states except California at \$1.4 billion annually in 2025. Because most areas in California would have until the 2030s to reach attainment,<sup>30</sup> EPA provided separate cost estimates for California (\$0.8 billion in 2038). These cost estimates are substantially less than widely circulated estimates from the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) and other industry sources.<sup>31</sup>

Members of Congress have shown particular interest in whether the expected benefits of the new ozone NAAQS will justify their costs. Both nationwide and in California, the agency expects the benefits of attainment to exceed the costs, but there is controversy over the methods used to estimate both. The agency prepares cost and benefit estimates at the time it proposes or promulgates a NAAQS—for information purposes and to comply with Executive Order 12866, under which the OMB requires cost-benefit analysis of economically significant rules.

---

<sup>25</sup> The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, “Statement by the President on the Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards,” September 2, 2011. For discussion of the 2010-2011 reconsideration, see CRS Report R42895, *Clean Air Issues in the 113th Congress: An Overview*.

<sup>26</sup> 80 *Federal Register* 65292. For links to the rule, as well as EPA’s fact sheets and technical documents, see <https://www.epa.gov/ozone-pollution/2015-national-ambient-air-quality-standards-naaqs-ozone>.

<sup>27</sup> “Welfare” is defined by the statute to include effects on soils, water, crops, vegetation, man-made materials, weather, visibility, and climate, among other variables.

<sup>28</sup> See U.S. EPA, “County-Level Design Values for the 2015 Ozone Standards Based on Monitored Air Quality Data from 2012-2014,” at <https://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-03/documents/20151001datatable20122014.pdf>.

An additional 28 counties in California also have monitors showing nonattainment. EPA’s analysis considered California separately, since most of the state’s nonattainment areas will have until the late 2030s to reach attainment of the revised standard.

<sup>29</sup> See map at [https://ozoneairqualitystandards.epa.gov/OAR\\_OAQPS/OzoneSliderApp/index.html#](https://ozoneairqualitystandards.epa.gov/OAR_OAQPS/OzoneSliderApp/index.html#).

<sup>30</sup> Under the statute, areas with more severe ozone pollution are given additional time to reach attainment of the standard, and must impose additional emission controls.

<sup>31</sup> For a discussion, see CRS Report R43092, *EPA’s 2015 Ozone Air Quality Standards*.

As the Clean Air Act is currently written, however, the agency is prohibited from weighing costs against benefits in setting the standards. The Clean Air Act's Section 109 has been interpreted to prohibit consideration of costs in the setting of NAAQS since the provision was added to the act in 1970. In 2001, this interpretation was affirmed in a unanimous Supreme Court decision, *Whitman v. American Trucking Associations*.<sup>32</sup> Section 109 simply states that the EPA Administrator is to set the primary standard at a level requisite to protect public health, allowing an adequate margin of safety. The Court pointed to numerous other CAA sections where Congress had explicitly allowed consideration of economic factors, concluding that if Congress had intended to allow such factors in the setting of a primary NAAQS, it would have been more forthright—particularly given the centrality of the NAAQS concept to the CAA's regulatory scheme. The court concluded that Section 109(b)(1) “unambiguously bars cost considerations from the NAAQS-setting process.”<sup>33</sup>

This is not to say that cost considerations play no role in Clean Air Act decisions, including in *implementation* of a NAAQS. Cost-effectiveness is considered extensively by EPA and the states in selecting emission control options to meet the standards. But in deciding what level of ambient pollution poses a health threat, the statute bars consideration of costs.

Congress has taken a keen interest in the results of the recent ozone review. Fifteen bills were introduced in the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress to modify EPA's authority or prohibit or delay the agency's proposed strengthening of the ozone NAAQS. Two of them, H.R. 4775 and H.R. 5538, passed the House, but neither bill was enacted. In the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress, H.R. 806 and S. 263 would, among other provisions, delay designation of nonattainment areas under the 2015 ozone standard until 2025 and submission of State Implementation Plans until 2026, require future NAAQS reviews every 10 years instead of every five, and allow consideration of technological feasibility in the setting of some primary (health-based) standards. H.R. 806 is identical to one of the bills that passed the House in the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress, H.R. 4775. On June 6, 2017, EPA Administrator Pruitt announced a one-year delay in designating nonattainment areas under the revised NAAQS. (For additional information on revision of the ozone NAAQS, see CRS Report R43092, *EPA's 2015 Ozone Air Quality Standards*.)

## Other Issues

At the outset of the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress, with a Republican President and Republican majorities in both the House and Senate, much was made of the opportunity presented to override EPA regulatory actions from the final days of the Obama Administration through use of the Congressional Review Act (CRA). The CRA provides expedited procedures that can be used during a limited period of time after promulgation of an agency rule to bring resolutions disapproving regulations to the Senate floor, where they cannot be amended or filibustered. In doing so, the CRA can remove commonly used obstacles to Senate action.

A December 15, 2016, CRS analysis concluded that joint resolutions disapproving regulations promulgated and received in Congress on or after June 13, 2016, were eligible to use these fast-track Senate procedures during the first 60 legislative days of the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress.<sup>34</sup> CRS also

---

<sup>32</sup> 531 U.S. 457 (2001).

<sup>33</sup> For further discussion of the American Trucking case, see CRS Report RS20860, *The Supreme Court Upholds EPA Standard-Setting Under the Clean Air Act: Whitman v. American Trucking Ass'ns*, by (name redacted) and (name redacted).

<sup>34</sup> CRS Insight IN10437, *Agency Final Rules Submitted on or After June 13, 2016, May Be Subject to Disapproval by the 115th Congress*.

prepared a list of major rules that were promulgated on or after June 13: the list included six Clean Air Act rules promulgated by EPA: the Renewable Fuel Standard (RFS) Program Standards for 2017 and Biomass-Based Diesel Volume for 2018; Formaldehyde Emission Standards for Composite Wood Products; the Cross-State Air Pollution (CSAPR) Update Rule; the Phase 2 Medium- and Heavy-Duty Truck GHG Emission Rule; New Source Performance Standards for Methane Emissions from Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) Landfills; and Emission Guidelines for Existing MSW Landfills.<sup>35</sup> The CRA's fast track authority expired on May 11, 2017, without any of these rules being disapproved.

These and other rules—those promulgated and received in Congress before June 13, 2016—could still be addressed by Congress through targeted legislation or through the appropriations process. In the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress, for example, the House passed two bills that would have overturned or delayed specific EPA air regulations: H.R. 4557, the BRICK Act, which would have delayed implementation of hazardous air pollutant emission standards affecting brick and ceramic manufacturers until all legal challenges to the rules are settled; and H.R. 3797, the SENSE Act, which would have eased emission limits under the Cross-State Air Pollution Rule and the Mercury and Air Toxics Standards for electric generating units powered by coal refuse. In addition, H.R. 5538, the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies appropriation bill for FY2017, as passed by the House, contained riders prohibiting EPA from using FY2017 funds to implement various authorities under the Clean Air Act. None of these bills were enacted, however.

These and other bills would have addressed criticism by industry groups and others that EPA had overreached its authority. In the Trump Administration, EPA could act to reconsider some of these regulations. Doing so would generally involve the use of notice-and-comment rulemaking, a lengthy process. Environmental and public health groups, on the other hand, generally believe that the agency has not overreached in setting Clean Air Act standards. These groups often maintain that the agency's standards are not stringent enough, do not meet statutory requirements, or disregard the findings of the agency's science advisors. The result is that EPA Clean Air Act standards generally are challenged in court both by industry and by environmental groups, with various states supporting each side. The resulting court decisions often set EPA's agenda as much as Congress or the Administration.

The courts will continue to play an important role, and the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress and EPA itself may act to make important revisions to Clean Air Act regulations. In short, the CAA's regulatory structure faces an unusual degree of uncertainty in 2017, with possible changes emanating from the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.<sup>36</sup>

## Author Contact Information

(name redacted)  
Specialist in Environmental Policy  
redacted@crs.loc.gov , 7-....

<sup>35</sup> See (name redacted) et al., "Major" Obama Administration Rules Potentially Eligible to be Overturned under the Congressional Review Act in the 115<sup>th</sup> Congress," CRS General Distribution Memorandum, January 31, 2017.

<sup>36</sup> For additional discussion of EPA's regulatory actions under all the environmental statutes, see CRS Report R41561, *EPA Regulations: Too Much, Too Little, or On Track?*



# EveryCRSReport.com

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) is a federal legislative branch agency, housed inside the Library of Congress, charged with providing the United States Congress non-partisan advice on issues that may come before Congress.

EveryCRSReport.com republishes CRS reports that are available to all Congressional staff. The reports are not classified, and Members of Congress routinely make individual reports available to the public.

Prior to our republication, we redacted names, phone numbers and email addresses of analysts who produced the reports. We also added this page to the report. We have not intentionally made any other changes to any report published on EveryCRSReport.com.

CRS reports, as a work of the United States government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.

Information in a CRS report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to members of Congress in connection with CRS' institutional role.

EveryCRSReport.com is not a government website and is not affiliated with CRS. We do not claim copyright on any CRS report we have republished.