ALSTON&BIRD LLP





Environmental ADVISORY -

JUNE 3, 2014

EPA Releases Proposed Clean Power Rule for Existing Power Plants

On June 2, 2014, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) released its Clean Power Plan proposed rule to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from existing fossil fuel-fired electric generating units (EGUs) under Section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (CAA), 42 U.S.C. § 7411(d). An EGU is a boiler, integrated gasification combined cycle (IGCC) or combustion turbine that "(1) is capable of combusting at least 250 million Btu per hour; (2) combusts fossil fuel for more than 10 percent of its total annual heat input (stationary combustion turbines have an additional criteria that they combust over 90 percent natural gas); [and] (3) sells the greater of 219,000 MWh per year and one-third of its potential electrical output to a utility distribution system."¹ All fossil fuel-fired EGUs that were in operation or had commenced construction as of January 8, 2014, are considered an "existing source" and therefore subject to the Clean Power Plan proposed rule. This proposed rule establishes rate-based carbon dioxide (CO₂) emission goals for the power sector for each state and provides guidelines for how states should develop plans to achieve their state-specific goals. If promulgated and successfully implemented, the proposed rule will reduce CO₂ emissions from the power sector to 30 percent below 2005 emissions levels by 2030.

Relying on the little known Section 111(d) of the CAA, the EPA proposal creates a state-federal partnership to reduce GHG emissions. EPA establishes regulations for controlling emissions for existing sources and states must create a plan that establishes standards of performances for those sources and that provides for the implementation and enforcement of those standards.² The standards of performance are based on the best system of emission reduction (BSER), i.e., they must "reflect the degree of emission limitation achievable through the application of the 'best system of emission reduction' that, taking into account the cost of achieving such reduction and any non-air quality health and environmental impacts and energy requirements, the Administrator determines has been adequately demonstrated (BSER)."³ EPA examined strategies states are

² 42 U.S.C. § 7411(d)(1).

³ Clean Power Plan Proposed Rule at 24-25.

This advisory is published by Alston & Bird LLP to provide a summary of significant developments to our clients and friends. It is intended to be informational and does not constitute legal advice regarding any specific situation. This material may also be considered attorney advertising under court rules of certain jurisdictions.

¹ PEPA, "Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units," 129, June 2, 2014, (prepublication version) [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0602], <u>http://www2.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2014-05/documents/20140602proposal-cleanpowerplan.pdf</u> (hereinafter "Clean Power Plan Proposed Rule").

already using to lower CO₂ emissions from the power sector and set BSER are based on four "building blocks": 1) improved efficiency at EGUs, 2) increased use of lower-emitted EGUs, 3) use of other low-emitting and zero-emitting power sources, and 4) end-use/demand-side energy efficiency. To set the proposed statespecific goals under the Clean Power Plan, EPA calculated the CO₂ emission rate each state could achieve through the application of BSER. The goals for each state are listed in Table 8 of the proposed rule, in average pounds of CO₂ per net MWh.

Under the proposed Clean Power Plan, states will have flexibility in creating a plan to meet the goals and can also join with other states to develop a multistate plan. States are not required to apply all of the BSER measures, or apply a BSER measure to the extent that EPA determines is achievable at reasonable cost. Further, states can apply measures that are not BSER, so long as the state achieves reductions at EGUs necessary to meet the state-specific goal EPA set by applying BSER.

Once the final rule is promulgated in June 2015, states will have until June 30, 2016, to draft their plans. However, states that have difficultly finalizing their plans in one year may elect to follow a two-phased submission process. States can request a formal extension by the 2016 deadline, and if EPA grants an extension, they will have an additional year for individual state plans and an additional two years for multistate plans. Under the Clean Power Plan, states would be expected to make "meaningful progress" by 2020 and will be required to meet and sustain their goals by 2030. (Note, EPA is also requesting comment on a five-year compliance plan, which has less stringent CO₂ performance levels.) Beginning in 2022, states must report to EPA on progress made by affected EGUs.

Once final state-specific goals are promulgated in this rulemaking to adopt the Clean Power Plan, states cannot request that EPA adjust its CO₂ goals when developing their state implementation plans to meet those goals. Therefore, industry and states must take a deep dive now into EPA's determination of BSER, the application to its state, and the data used in such computations, as they will be precluded from raising concerns in subsequent rulemakings for the adoption of state plans. Once the Clean Power Plan proposed rule is published in the Federal Register (which is expected shortly), interested parties have 120 days, i.e., until early October, to provide comments. The agency will also hold four public hearings on the rule during the week of July 28 in Atlanta, Denver, Pittsburgh, and Washington, D.C.

For any additional questions regarding this advisory, please contact **Maureen Gorsen**, **Bruce Pasfield** or **Elise Paeffgen**.

If you would like to receive future *Environmental Enforcement Advisories* electronically, please forward your contact information to **environmental.advisory@alston.com.** Be sure to put "**subscribe**" in the subject line.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact your Alston & Bird attorney or any of the following:

Doug Arnold 404.881.7637 doug.arnold@alston.com

Sarah Babcock 404.881.7632 sarah.babcock@alston.com

Ward Benshoof 213.576.1108 ward.benshoof@alston.com

Meaghan Goodwin Boyd 404.881.7245 meaghan.boyd@alston.com

Andrew Brady 213.576.2527 andrew.brady@alston.com

Nicki Carlsen 213.576.1128 nicki.carlsen@alston.com Edward Casey 213.576.1005 ed.casey@alston.com

Lee DeHihns 404.881.7151 lee.dehihns@alston.com

Skip Fulton 404.881.7152 skip.fulton@alston.com

Maureen Gorsen 916.498.3305 maureen.gorsen@alston.com

Ronnie Gosselin 404.881.7965 ronnie.gosselin@alston.com

Maya Lopez Grasse 213.576.2526 maya.grasse@alston.com Mark Johnson 213.576.1089 mark.johnson@alston.com

Clay Massey 404.881.4969 clay.massey@alston.com

Peter Nyquist 213.576.1142 pete.nyquist@alston.com

Elise Paeffgen 202.239.3939 elise.paeffgen@alston.com

Bruce Pasfield 202.239.3585 bruce.pasfield@alston.com

Robert Pontelle 213.576.1130 robert.pontelle@alston.com Geoffrey Rathgeber 404.881.4974 geoff.rathgeber@alston.com

Beverlee Silva 404.881.4625 beverlee.silva@alston.com

Jocelyn Thompson 213.576.1104 jocelyn.thompson@alston.com

Andrea Warren 213.576.2518 andrea.warren@alston.com

Jonathan Wells 404.881.7472 jonathan.wells@alston.com

Diane Wizig 404.881.4954 diane.wizig@alston.com

ALSTON&BIRD LLP ____

WWW.ALSTON.COM

© ALSTON & BIRD LLP 2014