



Businesses and States Support Clean Air Act Action to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Pollution

Numerous American businesses and states support efforts by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through Clean Air Act rules, as demonstrated by recent court documents opposing a request for a judicial stay of EPA action (emphases added with boldface type):

- "[T]hese companies [the Clean Energy Group] believe that EPA regulation of GHG emissions under the Clean Air Act can be an important first step in reversing the current trend of increasing GHG emissions... **these companies support EPA's implementation of reasonable regulations governing GHG emissions from the electric sector under the Clean Air Act.**"¹
 - *Calpine Corporation, Exelon Corporation, National Grid, New York Power Authority, NextEra Energy, PG&E Corporation and Seattle City Light*
- Efforts to block EPA's programs could "**delay investments in small businesses** that would be important sources of innovation."²
 - *The Small Business Majority*
- "[E]very state but one is poised to ensure that sources can obtain preconstruction permits under the Clean Air Act come January 2, 2011."³
 - *National Association of Clean Air Agencies*
- "[Delaying] implementation of the Tailpipe Rule would **result in significant harm to the auto industry ...**" "[M]ovants' statement that '**no one will be harmed by the stay**'... is **simply and patently incorrect** and betrays movants' ignorance of the Tailpipe Rule's importance to the automobile industry. Declarants from six manufacturers have attested to the fact that staying the implementation of the rule would result in tremendous hardship to their companies."⁵
 - *Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers and Association of International Automobile Manufacturers, Inc.*

¹ Declaration of Michael J. Bradley on behalf of Calpine Corporation, Exelon Corporation, National Grid, New York Power Authority, NextEra Energy, PG&E Corporation, and Seattle City Light (D.C. Cir. 2010)

² State and Environmental Intervenor Response to Motion to Stay, Case No. 10-1073 (D.C. Cir. 2010), Exhibit 20.

³ EPA's Response to Motions to Stay, Case No. 09-1322 (D.C. Cir. 2010), Exhibit 13, Attachment 3.

⁴ Intervenor Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers' and Association of International Automobile Manufacturers' Opposition to Motions for Stay, Case No. 10-1092 (D.C. Cir. 2010) ¶ 14

⁵ *Ibid* ¶ 18