

**Background and History of EPA Regulation of
Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions
Under the Clean Air Act &
National Association of Clean Air Agencies'
Comments on
EPA GHG Regulatory and Policy Proposals**

July 19, 2011

Summary

This document provides a background and history of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA's) regulation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions under the Clean Air Act (CAA or Act) and the National Association of Clean Air Agencies' (NACAA's) comments on EPA GHG regulations or policies.

In short, the Supreme Court in 2007 ruled that GHGs fit within the definition of "air pollutant" under the Clean Air Act,¹ thus setting in motion a regulatory process leading to EPA's regulation of GHG emissions under the CAA. EPA conferred with state and local clean air agencies regarding their concerns about the workload brought about by GHG permitting regulations and responded by delaying the timing of GHG permitting applicability and narrowing the scope of coverage.

History Leading Up to Regulation – 1999-2007

The path to EPA regulation of GHG emissions begins in 1999, when the International Center for Technology Assessment (ICTA) and 18 other organizations filed a petition for rulemaking with EPA, requesting that EPA regulate GHG emissions from new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines under section 202 of the CAA.² The petitioners argued that GHG emissions met the definition of "air pollutant" under the CAA, that GHG emissions contributed to pollution that is reasonably anticipated to endanger public health and welfare and that it was technically feasible to reduce GHG emissions from light-duty vehicles. Thus, the groups argued, EPA must regulate these emissions. In their petition, the groups cited a 1998 legal opinion from EPA's general counsel that carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions clearly met the definition of "air pollutant" in section 302(g) of the Act.³

On January 23, 2001, EPA published a notice seeking comment on the petition.⁴ On September 8, 2003, EPA published a notice denying the petition for rulemaking.⁵ EPA said it did not believe the CAA authorized regulation to deal with global climate change and, even if GHG regulation under the CAA was possible, EPA gave a number of policy reasons why it did not think regulation of GHG emissions under the CAA was appropriate.

On October 18, 2003, ICTA, 13 other environmental organizations, 12 states, three cities and one U.S. territory filed a petition for review of EPA's decision with the U.S. Court of Appeals

¹ Almost all subsequent EPA GHG regulation has flowed from the consequences of that court decision (*Massachusetts v. EPA*, 127 S. Ct. 1438 (2007)). The exception is the Greenhouse Gas Mandatory Reporting Rule, which was required by Congressional legislation (the Fiscal Year 2008 Consolidated Appropriations Act (H.R. 2764)). This document does not discuss this rule since it was authorized by independent legislation.

² Petition is available at <http://www.icta.org/doc/ghgpet2.pdf>. Specifically, the petition sought regulation of emissions of carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide and hydrofluorocarbons.

³ Id. at 10.

⁴ 66 *Federal Register* 7486.

⁵ 68 *Federal Register* 52922.

for the D.C. Circuit.⁶ On July 15, 2005, the court issued a split decision.⁷ The court denied the petition by a vote of 2 to 1, but the judges split in their reasoning. Judge Randolph upheld EPA's denial of the petition based on policy considerations. Judge Sentelle joined Judge Randolph in his opinion, but wrote separately. Sentelle's view was that the court lacked jurisdiction to hear the case because the petitioners failed to meet the requirements for standing because they did not allege a particularized injury to themselves, since global warming affects all humans. The third judge in the case, David Tatel, issued a strong dissent, finding that EPA had authority to regulate, that petitioners did have standing and that EPA relied on impermissible policy reasons that are not in CAA section 202(a)(1) in rejecting the petition. The groups filed an appeal with the U.S. Supreme Court.

In the meantime, California submitted on December 21, 2005, a request to EPA that the agency waive CAA section 209(a)'s prohibition against states adopting emissions standards for new motor vehicles (i.e., that EPA grant a section 209 waiver). California had established GHG emissions standards for new light-duty vehicles and vehicle engines for model years (MYs) 2009-2016, standards which also had been adopted by 13 other states and the District of Columbia. For the states to enforce these standards, EPA needed to grant a section 209 waiver. EPA responded to California on February 21, 2007, that it was awaiting the Supreme Court decision before responding to the section 209 waiver request.

On April 2, 2007, the Supreme Court released its decision.⁸ By a vote of 5-4, the Court found that the appellants had standing, that EPA had authority to regulate GHG emissions from new motor vehicles under the Clean Air Act and that the reasons EPA gave for not regulating these emissions were "divorced from the statutory text."⁹ The majority opinion was authored by Justice Stevens and joined by Justices Breyer, Ginsburg, Kennedy and Souter. The court strongly criticized EPA's decision and reasoning in refusing to regulate GHG emissions from new motor vehicles. First, it examined EPA's argument that GHGs were not "air pollutants" as defined in the Act. The court said the statute contained a "sweeping definition" of air pollutant that "embraces all airborne compounds of whatever stripe," and CO₂ and other GHGs "without a doubt" fit the statutory definition of "air pollutant" in the Act.¹⁰ Furthermore, the court rejected EPA's contention that regulation of CO₂ emissions from motor vehicles would require the agency to tighten fuel efficiency standards, which are set by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT). That "DOT sets mileage standards in no way licenses EPA to shirk its environmental responsibilities" – the obligations of the two agencies may overlap, "but there is no reason to think the two agencies cannot both administer their obligations and yet avoid inconsistency."¹¹

Thus finding that GHGs clearly fall within the definition of "air pollutant," the Court then addressed whether EPA acted arbitrarily and capriciously in rejecting the petition calling for it to regulate GHG emissions from new motor vehicles. The Court found that EPA had so acted. The

⁶ The petition is available at <http://www.icta.org/doc/Pet%20Rev%20-%20Consol%20Order%2010-23-03.pdf>. Briefs related to the case are posted at <http://www.icta.org/global/actions.cfm?page=1&type=364&topic=4>.

⁷ 415 F.3d 50 (D.C. Cir. 2005).

⁸ *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 127 S. Ct. 1438 (2007).

⁹ Id. at 1462.

¹⁰ Id. at 1459.

¹¹ Id. at 1462.

CAA gives EPA discretion on regulating, but that discretion is cabined, the court said: EPA “must ground its reasons for action or inaction in the statute.”¹² Instead, EPA provided “a laundry list of reasons not to regulate . . . [and] it is evident they have nothing to do with whether [GHG] emissions contribute to climate change.”¹³ The court said that if scientific uncertainty on global warming “is so profound it precludes EPA from making a reasoned judgment as to whether GHG emissions contribute to global warming, EPA must say so.”¹⁴ That EPA preferred not to regulate because of some “residual uncertainty ... is irrelevant,” the court said.¹⁵ The court remanded the matter for further proceedings consistent with its opinion, thus sending the petition back to EPA for action.

In short, the Supreme Court decision *required* that EPA make a decision and not simply defer a decision, and it sharply limited which reasons the agency could cite in deciding not to regulate GHG emissions.¹⁶ The only points of discretion afforded EPA were in determining 1) whether GHG emissions contribute to global warming and 2) whether sufficient information existed to make a finding that global warming “may reasonably be anticipated to endanger public health and welfare,” as provided in section 202(a)(1).

GHG Regulatory Prelude – 2007-2008

Now that the Supreme Court decision had been issued, EPA could respond to California’s request for a section 209 waiver. The agency published on April 30, 2007, a notice seeking comment on the section 209 waiver request.¹⁷ NACAA submitted comments on June 15, 2007, supporting California.¹⁸ The agency denied the request on March 6, 2008.¹⁹ The Administrator said he based his decision on his view that section 209(b) was intended to allow California to address pollution problems that were local and regional in nature, not global climate change. Furthermore, he said he did not “believe that the effects of climate change in California are compelling and extraordinary compared to the effects in the rest of the country.”²⁰

On July 30, 2008, EPA released an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Regulating GHG Emissions Under the Clean Air Act (GHG ANPR).²¹ The agency said it was issuing an ANPR to review the potential provisions – regulatory pathways – under the CAA that might be applicable to regulating GHGs. The GHG ANPR also examined the pros and cons of the regulatory pathways and provided information about possible regulatory approaches and technologies for reducing GHG emissions. In the notice, the agency also included critical comments from other federal agencies. The notice also contained a statement from the Administrator that “the ANPR

¹² Id. at 1463.

¹³ Id. at 1462-1463.

¹⁴ Id. at 1463.

¹⁵ Id.

¹⁶ This is strongly criticized by Justice Scalia in his dissent. He says executive agencies routinely decide not to take action based on policy reasons not expressly mentioned in a statute and that the majority failed to give due deference to this prioritization.

¹⁷ 72 *Federal Register* 21260.

¹⁸ The comments are posted at http://members.4cleanair.org/rc_files/4004/CAWaiverComments.Final.61507.pdf.

¹⁹ 73 *Federal Register* 12156.

²⁰ Id. at 12157.

²¹ 73 *Federal Register* 44354.

demonstrates [that] the Clean Air Act, an outdated law originally enacted to control regional pollutants that cause direct health effects, is ill-suited for the task of regulating global greenhouse gases.”²²

On November 26, 2008, NACAA submitted comments on the GHG ANPR.²³ In its comments, NACAA urged that the appropriate authorities under the Clean Air Act be deployed to address global warming. NACAA said the scientific evidence clearly demonstrated that GHGs endanger public health and welfare and thus EPA should promptly issue a GHG endangerment finding. With respect to regulatory pathways, NACAA supported regulating GHG emissions from motor vehicles under the Clean Air Act. For stationary sources, NACAA said it thought the New Source Performance Standards (NSPS) authorities in section 111 of the Act offered the most value. NACAA also supported regulating GHGs under the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program, as long as some adjustments were made. NACAA recommended that the agency consider adopting a regulatory threshold that only captured larger sources of GHG emissions and suggested consideration of a threshold in the range of between 10,000 and 25,000 tons per year (tpy). NACAA said that it believed that the National Ambient Air Quality Standards system was not the best tool for regulating GHGs, nor was the hazardous air pollutant framework in section 112 well-suited for regulating GHGs. NACAA also said that whatever regulatory or legislative path was chosen for limiting GHG emissions, state and local authorities to enact stronger requirements should not be preempted.

GHG Regulations Begin – 2009-2010

On February 12, 2009, following a change in Administration, EPA published a notice to reconsider the agency’s previous denial of California’s section 209 waiver. Furthermore, on April 24, 2009, EPA proposed a finding that GHG emissions endangered public health and welfare and that GHG emissions from new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines were contributing to air pollution that endangers public health and welfare (the Endangerment Finding).²⁴ NACAA submitted comments in support of the reconsideration²⁵ and the Endangerment Finding.²⁶ On July 8, 2009, EPA announced it was withdrawing the previous waiver denial and granting the section 209 waiver.²⁷ The agency found that opponents of the waiver had not met their burden of showing that California did not need its state standards to meet compelling and extraordinary conditions or that California no longer needed its motor vehicle program. On December 15, 2009, EPA issued the final Endangerment Finding.²⁸

With the final GHG Endangerment Finding completed, EPA now could move forward with regulating GHG emissions from new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines. EPA and

²² Id. at 44355.

²³ Comments are posted at http://members.4cleanair.org/rc_files/4004/CAWaiverComments.Final.61507.pdf.

²⁴ 74 *Federal Register* 18886.

²⁵ Comments are posted at

http://members.4cleanair.org/rc_files/4606/CAWaiverNACAAWrittenCommentsonEPARewiewofDenial040609FINAL.pdf.

²⁶ Comments are posted at <http://www.4cleanair.org/Documents/NACAAEndangermentCommentsFINALlthd.pdf>.

²⁷ 74 *Federal Register* 32744.

²⁸ 74 *Federal Register* 66496.

DOT had, prior to the finalization of the GHG Endangerment Finding, proposed to issue joint Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) and GHG emissions standards for new motor vehicles and motor vehicle engines for MYs 2012-2016.²⁹ NACAA submitted comments in support of this proposal on November 24, 2009.³⁰ On May 7, 2010, EPA and DOT issued final GHG emissions standards and CAFE standards for new light-duty vehicles and engines for MYs 2012-2016.³¹

Before finalizing its motor vehicle GHG emissions regulations, however, EPA needed to address the impact of these regulations on stationary source regulatory programs. Once GHGs became a regulated pollutant under the Act, then PSD and Title V permitting provisions would immediately apply to GHG emissions from sources. The thresholds for major source permitting in the Act are 100 or 250 tpy, which – if unchanged – would subject millions of new and existing sources to GHG permitting requirements. Thus, EPA took two actions to address stationary source GHG regulation. The first had to do with timing – when would GHGs be subject to PSD and NSR regulation? On October 7, 2009, EPA issued a proposed reconsideration of its prior regulatory interpretation of the phrases “subject to regulation” and “regulated pollutant” under the Clean Air Act.³² The prior regulatory interpretation was contained in a memo issued by former EPA Administrator Stephen Johnson, which stated the agency’s view that the “subject to regulation” provision of the “regulated NSR pollutant” definition would “include each pollutant subject to either a provision in the Clean Air Act or regulation adopted by EPA under the Clean Air Act that requires *actual control* of emissions of that pollutant.”³³ EPA’s reconsideration stated that this remained the agency’s preferred interpretation. In addition, the agency suggested that a pollutant become “subject to regulation” under the Clean Air Act on the effective date of a control regulation. This would have meant that GHGs would be subject to PSD and Title V permitting programs on the date when the light-duty vehicle rule for MY 2012 vehicles became effective.³⁴ On December 7, 2009, NACAA submitted comments³⁵ suggesting, instead, that EPA adopt an interpretation that a pollutant becomes “subject to regulation” when the control regulation “takes effect.” According to this interpretation, then, GHGs would become a regulated pollutant at the earliest on January 2, 2011, the date the motor vehicle GHG emissions standards would take effect.³⁶

In its final rule, issued April 2, 2010, EPA adopted NACAA’s interpretation on timing. Under Title II, the earliest the regulations could have taken effect would be January 2, 2011, the earliest date a MY 2012 vehicle could enter the stream of commerce.³⁷ This is the date EPA determined GHGs become “subject to regulation” for PSD and Title V permitting purposes.

The second issue EPA faced with respect to stationary source GHG regulation was the threshold at which facilities would be subject to PSD and Title V permitting requirements. Under the statute and regulations, the PSD program applies to any source on a specified list of 28 source

²⁹ 74 *Federal Register* 49454 (September 28, 2009).

³⁰ Comments are posted at <http://www.4cleanair.org/Documents/NACAACommentsonProposedVehicleGHGCAFESTdsFinal112409.pdf>.

³¹ 75 *Federal Register* 25324.

³² 74 *Federal Register* 51535.

³³ *Id.* at 51539 (emphasis added).

³⁴ This would have been July 6, 2010. See 75 *Federal Register* 17004.

³⁵ Comments are posted at <http://www.4cleanair.org/Documents/JohnsonMemoNACAACommentsFINAL120709.pdf>.

³⁶ NACAA also suggested some alternative interpretations that would provide a later effective date.

³⁷ 75 *Federal Register* at 17019.

categories that emits, or has the potential to emit, 100 tpy or more of any pollutant subject to regulation under the Act, or to any other source type that emits, or has the potential to emit, such pollutants in amounts equal to or greater than 250 tpy (“the 100/250-tpy thresholds”). Should the agency have allowed these thresholds to govern soon-to-be mandatory PSD and Title V permitting of GHG-emitting sources, the number of permits that would have to be processed would have been overwhelming.

Accordingly, on October 7, 2009, EPA published a proposal to “tailor” the major source applicability thresholds for GHG emissions under the PSD and Title V programs and to set a PSD significance level for GHG emissions (the Tailoring Rule).³⁸ EPA estimated that the increase in the number of facilities requiring a PSD permit as a result of its GHG emissions under the 100/250-tpy threshold would rise from 280 per year to 81,598 and those needing a Title V permit would increase from 14,700 to 6 million.³⁹ Concluding that these numbers justified a phase-in of the permitting requirements under the legal doctrines of “absurd results,” “administrative necessity” and “one-step-at-a-time,” EPA proposed a phased-in schedule for permitting the majority of large GHG-emitting facilities. The first phase, which would last six years, would establish a temporary level for the PSD and Title V applicability thresholds at 25,000 tpy, on a CO₂ equivalent (CO₂e) basis, and a temporary PSD significance level for GHG emissions of between 10,000 and 25,000 tpy CO₂e. EPA would conduct an administrative feasibility study and then promulgate a second phase. NACAA submitted comments on the proposal that in general supported the thrust of EPA’s proposal but made suggestions to help alleviate the burden on state and local resources.⁴⁰

On June 3, 2010, EPA issued the final Tailoring Rule.⁴¹ EPA adopted several of NACAA’s most important suggestions. First, as noted above, EPA delayed when GHG permitting would begin – to January 2, 2011. Second, EPA raised the GHG threshold and implemented a step-down approach, both of which were changes from its proposed rule. NACAA recommended that EPA raise the proposed GHG threshold to 50,000 tpy CO₂e and then step down to 25,000 tpy CO₂e after three years. In the final Tailoring Rule, EPA raised the threshold to 100,000 tpy major source/75,000 tpy significance level, and implemented it through a two-step approach. EPA also promised further rulemaking in 2011 to assess smaller sources, but said it would not lower the threshold below 50,000 tpy until at least 2016. Third, EPA required sources to include GHGs in Title V permits according to the normal Title V permitting schedule. NACAA had recommended that sources be required to include GHGs in a Title V permit at the time the permit would normally be up for renewal or, for new sources, one year after becoming subject to regulation according to the rules governing Title V. In the final Tailoring Rule, EPA adopted this recommendation, requiring sources to address GHGs when they apply for, renew or revise their Title V permits.

In the latter half of 2010, EPA issued a series of related rules to conform State Implementation Plans (SIPs), SIP approvals and Title V programs to the thresholds in the Tailoring

³⁸ 74 *Federal Register* 55292.

³⁹ 75 *Federal Register* 31535-31536.

⁴⁰ Comments are posted at http://members.4cleanair.org/rc_files/4821/Tailoring%20Rule-NACAA%20Comments-FINAL-122809.pdf.

⁴¹ 75 *Federal Register* 31514.

Rule and to ensure GHGs were considered regulated pollutants in the subject states.⁴² In addition, EPA issued PSD and Title V Permitting Guidance for GHGs⁴³ and a series of white papers that provided technical information that “may be useful in a Best Available Control Technology analysis, but they do not define BACT for each sector.” This guidance was developed with input from a federal advisory group of stakeholders organized under the auspices of the Clean Air Act Advisory Committee. Several NACAA members participated on the workgroup, including the two co-chairs of the NACAA New Source Review subcommittee. The sectors covered include power plants, large industrial/commercial/institutional boilers, pulp and paper facilities, cement plants, the iron and steel industry, refineries and nitric acid plants.⁴⁴

In 2011, EPA took steps to defer GHG permitting requirements for CO₂ emissions from biomass-fired and other biogenic sources. On March 14, 2011, EPA issued guidance for determining BACT for reducing CO₂ emissions from bioenergy production for states to apply prior to the agency finalizing its proposal to defer the application of PSD and Title V provisions to biogenic CO₂ emissions from bioenergy (proposed March 21, 2011).⁴⁵ The rule, finalized on July 20, 2011, defers the application of stationary source permitting requirements to CO₂ from biogenic sources for the next three years.⁴⁶ The rule defers the application of both PSD and Title V permitting requirements and applies only to the emissions of CO₂ from bioenergy and other biogenic stationary sources. EPA plans to undertake a “detailed examination of the science associated with biogenic CO₂ emissions from stationary sources” during this three-year period. The examination will address technical issues that the agency has determined must be resolved before applying permitting requirements, and will include review by EPA’s Science Advisory Board

Recent Developments – Proposals Not Yet Finalized

On November 30, 2010, EPA and DOT jointly proposed GHG emissions and CAFE standards for new medium- and heavy-duty vehicles and vehicle engines.⁴⁷ NACAA submitted comments generally supportive of the proposal.⁴⁸

On December 30, 2010, EPA published a notice seeking comment on settlements setting dates for proposing and finalizing GHG NSPS for power plants and petroleum refineries.⁴⁹ EPA plans to propose GHG NSPS for power plants by July 26, 2011, and finalize them by May 26, 2012, and propose GHG NSPS for petroleum refineries by December 10, 2011, and finalize them by November 10, 2012.

⁴² 75 *Federal Register* 77698; 75 *Federal Register* 82536 and 82254; and 75 *Federal Register* 82246 (finding of failure is at 75 *Federal Register* 81874). Texas-specific notices are at 75 *Federal Register* 82365 and 82430,

⁴³ Guidance is posted at <http://www.epa.gov/nsr/ghgdocs/ghgpermittingguidance.pdf>.

⁴⁴ See <http://www.epa.gov/nsr/ghgpermitting.html>.

⁴⁵ 76 *Federal Register* 15249.

⁴⁶ 76 *Federal Register* 43490.

⁴⁷ 75 *Federal Register* 74152.

⁴⁸ Comments are posted at

<http://www.4cleanair.org/Documents/NACAAFinalCommentsonEPANHTSAProposedHDGHGStds013111.pdf>.

⁴⁹ 75 *Federal Register* 82392 and 82390, respectively.

On January 24, 2011, EPA, DOT and California announced they would work together in setting GHG emissions standards and CAFE standards for MY 2017-2025 cars and light-duty trucks.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ Announcement is posted at

<http://yosemite.epa.gov/opa/admpress.nsf/d0cf6618525a9efb85257359003fb69d/6f34c8d6f2b11e5885257822006f60c0!OpenDocument>.

Timeline of Key EPA GHG Regulatory Actions

1998

April 10, 1998 – EPA General Counsel Jonathan Z. Cannon prepares a legal opinion concluding that carbon dioxide (CO₂) “emissions are within the scope of EPA’s authority to regulate.”

1999

October 20, 1999 – The International Center for Technology Assessment and 18 other organizations file a [rulemaking petition](#) asking EPA to regulate greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from new motor vehicles under §202 of the Clean Air Act.

2001

January 23, 2001 – EPA publishes [notice](#) seeking comment on the petition. 66 *Federal Register* 7486.

2003

September 8, 2003 – EPA publishes [denial](#) of petition for rulemaking. 68 *Federal Register* 52922.

2005

July 15, 2005 – U.S. Court of Appeals for D.C. Circuit [denies](#) petition for review. *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 415 F.3d 50 (D.C. Cir. 2005).

2007

April 2, 2007 – Supreme Court [rules](#) that GHGs fit the definition of “air pollutant” in the Clean Air Act and thus EPA must either make a finding that GHG emissions endanger public health and welfare or declare that scientific uncertainty is so profound that it is unable to make such a finding. *Massachusetts v. EPA*, 127 S. Ct. 1438 (2007).

2008

March 6, 2008 – EPA [denies](#) California’s request for a preemption waiver for California GHG emissions standards for new motor vehicles. 73 *Federal Register* 12156.

July 30, 2008 – EPA [issues](#) Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on Regulating GHG Emissions Under the Clean Air Act (GHG ANPR). 73 *Federal Register* 44354.

- NACAA comments:
<http://www.4cleanair.org/Documents/NACAACommentsonGHGANPRMFINALletterhead.pdf>

2009

July 8, 2009 – EPA [withdraws](#) March 6, 2008 denial of California waiver and grants California waiver of preemption for GHG emissions standards for model year (MY) 2009 and later new motor vehicles. *74 Federal Register* 32744.

- NACAA comments:
<http://www.4cleanair.org/Documents/CAWaiverNACAAWrittenCommentsonEPAReviewofDenial040609FINAL.pdf>

October 30, 2009 – EPA publishes [final rule](#) requiring reporting by suppliers of fossil fuels or industrial GHGs, manufacturers of vehicles and engines, and facilities that emit 25,000 metric tons or more per year of GHG to submit annual reports to EPA (Mandatory GHG Reporting Rule). *74 Federal Register* 56260.

- NACAA comments:
<http://www.4cleanair.org/Documents/CAWaiverCommentsFinal61507.pdf>

December 15, 2009 – EPA publishes [final finding](#) that GHG emissions from new motor vehicles and new motor vehicle engines contribute to air pollution that endangers public health and welfare (Endangerment Finding). *74 Federal Register* 66496.

- NACAA comments:
<http://www.4cleanair.org/Documents/NACAAEndangermentCommentsFINALlthd.pdf>

2010

April 2, 2010 – EPA [finalizes](#) policy interpretation of when the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) and Title V permit programs become applicable to GHGs (Triggering Rule). *75 Federal Register* 17004.

- NACAA comments:
<http://www.4cleanair.org/Documents/JohnsonMemoNACAACommentsFINAL120709.pdf>

May 7, 2010 – EPA and the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) [issue](#) final GHG emissions standards and Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards for new light-duty vehicles and engines for MY 2012-2016. *75 Federal Register* 25324.

- NACAA comments:
<http://www.4cleanair.org/Documents/NACAACommentsonProposedVehicleGHGCAFESstdsFinal112409.pdf>

June 3, 2010 – EPA [finalizes](#) rule that raises the GHG emissions threshold for determining when a source is covered by PSD and Title V permit programs (Tailoring Rule). *75 Federal Register* 31514.

- NACAA comments: http://members.4cleanair.org/rc_files/4821/Tailoring%20Rule-NACAA%20Comments-FINAL-122809.pdf

October 2010 – EPA [releases](#) series of white papers that provides technical information that “may be useful in a Best Available Control Technology (BACT) analysis, but they do not define BACT for each sector.” The sectors covered include power plants, large

industrial/commercial/institutional boilers, pulp and paper facilities, cement plants, the iron and steel industry, refineries and nitric acid plants.

November 2010 – EPA [issues](#) PSD and Title V Permitting Guidance for GHGs (updated March 2011).

November 30, 2010 – EPA and DOT jointly [propose](#) GHG emissions and CAFE standards for new medium- and heavy-duty vehicles and vehicle engines. *75 Federal Register* 74152.

- NACAA comments:
<http://www.4cleanair.org/Documents/NACAAFinalCommentsonEPANHTSAProposedHDGHGStds013111.pdf>

December 13, 2010 – EPA [issues](#) State Implementation Plan (SIP) Call to 13 states to revise their SIPs so that they apply PSD permitting requirements to GHG emissions. *75 Federal Register* 77698.

December 30, 2010 – EPA publishes notice narrowing SIP approval for states with [PSD](#) (24) and [Title V](#) (33) emissions limits for GHGs above Tailoring Rule threshold. *75 Federal Register* 82536 and 82254.

December 30, 2010 – EPA [establishment](#) of Federal Implementation Plan for seven states that have not corrected their SIPs to apply PSD program to GHG emissions sources. *75 Federal Register* 82246. (Finding of failure to submit is at *75 Federal Register* 81874).

December 30, 2010 – EPA publishes notice seeking comment on settlements setting dates for proposing and finalizing GHG New Source Performance Standards for [power plants](#) and [petroleum refineries](#). *75 Federal Register* 82392 and 82390, respectively.

2011

January 2, 2011 – GHGs become a “regulated pollutant” for purposes of PSD and Title V permit programs.

January 24, 2011 – EPA, DOT and California [announce](#) they will work together in setting GHG emissions standards and CAFE standards for MY 2017-2025 cars and light-duty trucks.

March 14, 2011 – EPA [issues](#) guidance for determining BACT for reducing CO₂ emissions from bioenergy production.

March 21, 2011 – EPA [publishes](#) notice of proposal to defer for three years the application of PSD and Title V provisions to biogenic CO₂ emissions from bioenergy. *76 Federal Register* 15249.

July 20, 2011 – EPA [issues](#) rule deferring for three years the application of PSD and Title V provisions to biogenic CO₂ emissions from bioenergy. *76 Federal Register* 43490.